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THE PUBLIC MEANING OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL HERITAGE

Barbara Little and Paul Shackel

Barbara Little is an archeologist in the Archaeology Program in the National Park Service's National Center for Cultural Resources. Paul Shackel is Professor and Director of the Center for Heritage Resource Studies in the Department of Anthropology, University of Maryland.

The public meaning of archaeology and the roles that archaeology plays in communities are increasingly recognized as integral to the practice of archaeology in the United States. Archaeology is often a vital component in the creation of national, ethnic, and community identity. Archaeology presented and discussed in public places has tremendous potential to broaden both national and local dialogue about the past and develop more inclusive histories.

The following articles are an outgrowth of a seminar on the "Public Meaning of Archaeological Heritage" held at the University of Maryland. The seminar was part of training developed by the National Park Service (NPS) and the Center for Heritage Resource Studies to reach those interested in and responsible for programs in archaeological research, interpretation, and education in our nation's public parks and historical sites. The articles discuss the public meaning of archaeology and show how archaeologists can create strategies to develop a more visible and inclusive past. They show not only how communities play important roles in the stewardship of heritage, but also how archaeological interpretation can be made relevant to descendant and local communities.

Federal agencies have a mandate for public outreach about archaeology in the Archaeological Resources Protection Act. In her article, Barbara Little describes the "shared competency" for archaeologists and interpreters in the NPS and offers a set of tools available on the Internet. Francis McMenamon highlights the long history of public outreach in U.S. national parks and emphasizes how archaeology can provide visitors access to the long-term reality of diversity in the American past.

Archaeological places of many kinds are recognized as having national or international importance, and these same places often have local meanings and contexts that are broader than that conveyed by archaeological research. In pushing archaeology to address broader stories and meaningful context, Paul Shackel urges persistence and partnerships for the hard work of public outreach. In her discussion of Copan, Lena Mortensen illustrates the complexity of interwoven international, national, and local meanings and economic realities. Jeffrey Huntman describes his work with the Monacan Indians in Virginia, illustrating how archaeology takes on extraordinary public meaning by reversing historical invisibility. Cheryl LaRoche writes of several sites with deep and persistent meaning including the African Burial Ground in Manhattan, Underground Railroad sites, and the shipwreck of the Henrietta Marie, a critically important discovery that had the misfortune to have been found by Mel Fisher and the good fortune to have been championed by the National Association of Black Scuba Divers. From the perspective of county government, Kirsti Urmila describes how demonstrating complex social relations in the past and framing discussions of inequality in the present use archaeology explicitly as a tool to confront racism.

Archaeology in these public places has tremendous potential to broaden our national dialogue about the past and develop more inclusive histories. Archaeology can be a vital component in the creation of national, ethnic, and community identity. These authors push the discipline into the realm of civic engagement and illustrate how archaeology has public meaning far beyond what most of us once imagined.

Some of the presentations from "The Public Meaning of Archaeological Heritage" are now available on the Center for Heritage Resource Study’s website: http://heritage.umd.edu/CHR5Web/nps/training/papers.htm.
ARCHAEOLOGISTS AND INTERPRETERS WORKING TOGETHER

Barbara J. Little

Barbara Little is an archaeologist in the Archeology Program in the National Park Service’s National Center for Cultural Resources.

Public education and outreach are important parts of every sector of the archaeological profession. Private contract firms of all sizes incorporate elements of public outreach into at least some projects. Governments at every level are rightly concerned with the public benefit of the work they require or sponsor and often want education as well as research as a benefit. Academic institutions are engaged in outreach efforts or, responding to the demands of the workplace for which their students are destined, are starting to incorporate education and interpretation into the curriculum (I mean ‘interpretation’ in the public education sense rather than the analytic sense).

The materials that I describe here are available to anyone with access to the Internet. They are free and adaptable and are meant to encourage the widespread education of archaeologists in some of the basic methods and techniques of interpretation. I describe three inter-related tools. The first is the National Park Service’s (NPS) “shared competency” course of study; the second is a pair of online resources—Archeology for Interpreters and Interpretation for Archaeologists—and the third is an online guide to a four-part curriculum that can be adapted to any part of the country, by any institution, to train archaeologists as effective interpreters who produce and evaluate interpretive products.

The “Shared Competency” Course

Many U.S. federal agencies support efforts in archaeological outreach and ground their efforts in the requirements of the Archaeological Resources Protection Act. Within the NPS, there is an ongoing effort to improve the public interpretation of archaeological resources. One of the acknowledged goals of interpretation in the NPS is, ultimately, better protection for the resources. Interpretation aims to encourage visitors to care about park resources and become better stewards of public lands. A related goal is the telling of more complete stories so that visitors have the historical and contextual tools to understand and appreciate not only their own culture and history, but also that of others. This latter goal supports NPS Civic Engagement initiatives that seek to make and keep the parks relevant in our ever-changing democracy.

The “shared competency” in Archeology and Interpretation is the NPS’s first attempt to provide a measure of competency applicable to more than one profession. The NPS defines a competency as “a combination of knowledge, skills, and abilities in a particular career field, which, when acquired, allows a person to perform a task or function at a specifically defined level of proficiency.” A shared competency recognizes that knowledge, skills, and abilities inherent to one discipline may cross over into one or more additional disciplines. Shared competency, stated as “archaeologists and interpreters working together to provide effective and accurate interpretation of archaeological information and resources to the public,” does not replace competencies for either discipline, but it does complement and expand them.

The archaeologist must have a firm foundation in and understanding of the purpose, philosophy, and techniques of interpretation. The interpreter must have an understanding of basic archaeological principles and techniques as well as up-to-date and accurate knowledge of the archaeological resources in the park or region where the interpreter works. Together, both professions work together to create compelling linkages to cultural resources based on current factual research and creative interpretive techniques.

The shared competency course, Module 440: Effective Interpretation of Archaeological Resources, provides the framework and direction for this interdisciplinary training. It can be accessed at http://www.nps.gov/idp/interp (see Module 440 under “Competencies” and “other developmental modules”).

The objectives for the Module 440 curriculum are as follows:

A. Archaeologists and interpreters will be able to:

• Convey archaeological information to audiences in an understandable and usable manner;
• Identify and appropriately present multiple perspectives, or direct audiences to sources for discovering multiple perspectives;
• Work together to develop programs and texts about archaeological subjects; and
• Develop presentations and/or media about archaeological subjects to a variety of audiences.

B. Archaeologists will be able to:
• Describe how interpretation and education meet the NPS and park mission and objectives;
• Describe ways in which meanings may be revealed by creating linkages through tangibles and intangibles to the archaeological record;
• Establish a personal foundation to develop interpretive effectiveness through understanding interpretive purpose and techniques;
• Establish a mission-driven approach to interpretation of archaeological resources, which incorporates both park management outcomes and audience revelation, both of which lead to enhanced stewardship; and
• Explain the interpreter’s role to facilitate the visitors’ experience and relationship to the resource, and how this relationship provides an opportunity for stewardship.

C. Interpreters will be able to:
• Demonstrate an understanding of the basic principles of archaeology;
• Demonstrate knowledge of pertinent laws, regulations, and policies pertaining to archaeological resources;
• Present programs with factual archaeological content that also present other points of view;
• Demonstrate knowledge of on-site resource preservation activities; and
• Explain the archaeologist’s role in interpretation to facilitate the visitors’ experience and relationship to the archaeological record, with an understanding that interpretation moves beyond a recitation of scientific data and chronologies.

A pair of NPS online distance learning courses are designed to help both interpreters and archaeologists pursue this shared curriculum. Each of the courses includes a selection of questions to assess the reader’s knowledge and understanding of the topics presented. These questions can be used for self-guided study or could form the basis for classroom discussion and student evaluation.

Online Guides for Interpretation
Archeology for Interpreters: A Guide to Knowledge of the Resource (http://www.cr.nps.gov/aad/Aforl/index.htm) helps interpreters learn about archaeological methods, how archaeological interpretations are made, and how to encourage concern for the preservation and protection of archaeological resources. This course covers the content identified in the shared competency curriculum for interpreters as the basic knowledge needed to carry out effective interpretation of archaeological resources.

The companion distance learning course, Interpretation for Archaeologists: A Guide to Increasing Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities (http://www.cr.nps.gov/aad/lforA/index.htm), helps archaeologists to examine the art and science by which interpretations are made. The course focuses on the purpose, philosophy, and techniques of interpretation. It encourages archaeologists to examine and share their work with the public and also to integrate archaeological perspectives into the interpretive management of their parks and programs.

Both interpreters and archaeologists will be particularly interested in the “Case Studies Gallery” in Chapter 7 of Interpretation for Archaeologists. There, you can take advantage of the opportunity to submit your story and help build this gallery into a place where both archaeologists and interpreters can share our ideas and find what others have tried (see “Submit Your Own Story” on that web page).

The Four-Part Program for Archaeologists and Interpreters
The final tool I want to describe is a four-part program designed for the joint participation of archaeologists and interpreters but adaptable to either audience (http://www.cr.nps.gov/aad/SITRES/Inspire/index.htm). This program is a mixed-media course of study, combining classroom lectures, online interactive learning, field trips, and participant projects. The four modules are as follows:

Module I: The Public Meaning of Heritage (seminar in a classroom setting)
Module II: Subject Matter Training (the two online learning guides described above: Archeology for Interpreters and Interpretation for Archaeologists)
Module III: Study Tour of Archaeological Interpretive Programs (trips to case study sites with some classroom activity)
Module IV: Archaeological Interpretive Products and Assessment (classroom presentation and peer assessment of participants’ archaeological interpretive projects)

The four modules are designed to be taken in sequence and are set up so that participants may complete the four-module sequence within one academic or fiscal year. Generally, the course schedule would be as follows: Module I, Fall; Module II, Winter; Module III, Early Spring; Module IV, Late Spring.
participants who take the modules sequentially will complete the program prior to the arrival of millions of visitors visiting public lands and other areas with archaeological stories to tell. Ideally, during the course of the four-module training program, participants would be paired (archaeologists and interpreters) to facilitate interaction between the two disciplines. Again, ideally, before beginning the program, participants would start outlining ideas for development of a new interpretive product that incorporated archaeological information from the place they wish to interpret for the public.

Archaeologists know that America’s archaeological resources embody a rich heritage of human experiences and cultural identities and offer a broad public benefit. Skillful interpretation can establish compelling connections between archaeological resources and the present and can provide opportunities to the public to realize the personal relevance of archaeological resources and the importance of their preservation and protection.
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THE PUBLIC INTERPRETATION OF AMERICA'S ARCHAEOLOGICAL HERITAGE

Francis P. McManamon

Francis McManamon is the Departmental Consulting Archaeologist and Chief Archeologist for the National Park Service.

The National Park Service (NPS) has a long history of interpreting our national heritage to the public in our national parks. Among the first national parks created was Mesa Verde in 1906. Some of the most prominent ancient structures at Mesa Verde, such as Cliff Palace and Spruce Tree House, were stabilized and partially reconstructed shortly after the creation of the park specifically for public interpretation and to encourage more visitation to the park. So, from the beginning of federal management of Mesa Verde, public interpretation and outreach was an important activity.

Public Engagement

America's archaeological heritage is sometimes quite obvious in the visible remains of mounds, earthworks, cliff dwellings, fortifications and other above-ground structures. Other parts of our archaeological heritage—the vast majority, in fact—are much less visible, most frequently hidden beneath the ground surface. Many parks have archaeological remains that are nationally significant and relate to compelling stories about the long history of this land, and yet are all but invisible to the naked eye. For example, Cape Cod National Seashore, created by Congress to preserve public recreational spaces and natural resource values as well as historical resources on the outer Cape, contains hundreds of archaeological sites. These archaeological resources package thousands of years of ancient American history that is far too poorly known by most Americans today and contain information about hundreds of years of historical settlement, as well.

Of course, there are far more archaeological resources outside of national parks than inside park boundaries. And there are federal, tribal, state, and local laws that are designed to ensure that the value and importance of archaeological and other cultural resources like historic buildings and structures are considered and weighed when there is development or other potentially damaging activity. Many archaeologists working for public agencies or consulting firms spend much of their time dealing with the details of compliance with these laws, protecting and

preserving the tangible remains of our heritage for future generations. It is a challenge to wring interesting public interpretation opportunities from the individual projects that comprise much of the daily fare of cultural resource management (CRM) compliance. The overall pattern of results from this web of individual projects may provide more opportunities for telling interesting stories about the past, but integration and synthesis of projects' results has its own challenges.

Sometimes, projects driven by legal compliance and even accidental discoveries of archaeological remains reveal information that is itself compelling. At times, individual projects cause quite a stir. Two recent, well-known examples that have received a great deal of national and even international media coverage are the discovery of Kennewick Man in Washington State and the African Burial Ground in lower Manhattan. Both of these astonishing discoveries require an archaeological perspective to be understood, and both rose to prominence—or notoriety, depending upon your perspective—from more humble origins in the mix of compliance-related activities.

These two cases represent very divergent time periods—one from approximately 9,000 years ago, the other just a few centuries ago. They both raise important issues surrounding management decisions and planning, scientific investigation, relationships with descendant communities, broader public interest, and the meaning of these important discoveries in our national history. Many of the issues they raise are not easy, nor their resolution quick or satisfactory to all. But archaeologists and interpreters need not to shy away from difficult issues. The NPS as a whole has been grappling for means of dealing effectively with difficult histories and with challenges that have roots in our long past but continue into the present.

Civic Engagement

One of the new directions in the NPS today is to take on the challenge of civic engagement. By this is meant using parks and stories that arise from the interpretation of park resources as
tools for a civic dialogue about the issues that face the American people today. Archaeology has a role in providing substance for such public dialogue.

"Diversity" is a word that is much overused these days, yet the concept and the reality of American diversity is deeply embedded in our history, heritage, and identity. Archaeology and the stories it can tell about people in both the ancient and recent past is a portal through which we can access American diversity. The stuff of archaeological resources—artifacts, structures, and physical contexts—provides hard evidence of past diversity among Americans of different cultures. Some of these differences have persisted, others have been modified, and some are now only historical. The reality is that encountering and dealing with diversity has been a real aspect of much of American history. These kinds of encounters and relationships continue to challenge people today who are struggling with issues that sometimes are mistaken as being new. Diversity is not new; cultural conflicts and clashes and accommodation are not new. The challenges of living in a changing environment are not new either.

Archaeological resources and an archaeological perspective can lend insights into our national civic dialogues, but not if its results are limited to a small circle of archaeologists. That is one very important reason for this collection of articles and others like it. We need to discuss and debate the public meaning of our archaeological heritage and to share expertise and experiences about how to tell archaeological stories more effectively. Make no mistake—archaeological resources need active interpreting. As pointed out above, most are invisible. All are palimpsests—a complex overlapping and interweaving of the physical evidence of human activities—that need deciphering. In fact, the means of deciphering are also fit subjects for public interpretation.

I hope that discussions on these topics will lead to ways of effectively broadening public conversations to include archaeology and the unique perspective it offers on the distant and recent past. Archaeologists should aim to provide members of the public with the opportunity to understand and appreciate that long view of the past. Government at every level faces increasing demands for accountability and the demonstration of public benefits. Archaeology has a role in the delivery of public benefits to a wide range of communities and a responsibility to let the public in on the important work that we do.

The Role of NPS

The NPS is committed to improving the effective interpretation of archaeology. We are encouraged by the groundswell in the archaeological profession that is looking seriously at improving the presentation of archaeology worldwide. I invite readers to pursue these issues and topics by visiting the NPS Archeology program website (http://www.cr.nps.gov/aa/). There, readers will find a variety of articles, online training courses, and other technical assistance to help with public outreach programs. Even as each of us is enmeshed in the day-to-day demands of management decisions, maintenance issues, audits, reports, and the small and large crises we face routinely, we need to focus on public outreach. It is easy to get lost in the daily details, but it is energizing to remember that there is a larger purpose in the big picture of public meaning.
MEMORY, CIVIC ENGAGEMENT, AND THE PUBLIC MEANING OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL HERITAGE

Paul A. Shackel

Archaeological heritage is an important component of our national story, and we need to look at ways to engage a larger public. Public places, like county, state, and national parks, can reach thousands, if not hundreds of thousands of people every year. Interpreters and archaeologists at public places have a tremendous responsibility to the profession and the public to make archaeology a central issue in interpretation and to connect the meaning of the resource to important and compelling issues.

It is not enough to have gratuitous temporary exhibits or a display of artifacts that identifies their material and function. Archaeologists also need to be careful about making simplistic arguments. We have all seen exhibits at historic sites that praise technological advancements and industrial output as a significant benefit for increasing our material wealth. This type of statement ignores the process of industrialization and the struggle of labor for decent working conditions. However, by placing these items in their larger context, archaeologists and interpreters can tell important narratives related to nationally significant stories. Labor, race, class, and gender should be part of the story. When interpreting archaeological materials, we also need to think about international and national perspectives, heritage tourism, museum interpretation, community involvement, descendant communities, and the protection of archaeological resources. These are important issues that need to be part of the interpretation of archaeological resources.

Memory

What we remember and how we remember as a nation are important issues that allow us to see how public memory develops. A consensus history often occurs when we leave others out of the picture. Those who disagree with a multicultural history have questioned, “how can all these groups, each cherishing its uniqueness and its claim to sovereign attention, be mainstreamed into a single, coherent, integrated history” (quoted in Nash et al. 1998:100–101)? It is a challenge to make minority histories part of the national public memory, and these stories often make the consensus histories much more complicated. However, they also create a richer texture of the past and make it more accessible to other groups.

The National Park Service (NPS) oversees and maintains the National Register of Historic Places, and a quick glance at some statistics is quite revealing about what we as a nation see as important and worthy of remembering. There are over 70,000 places on the National Register of Historic Places, and less than 7% of these are archaeology sites (Little 1999). Fewer than 900 sites on the National Register are connected to African American, Asian American, and Latino heritage (Kaufman 2004).

The representation of traditional peripheral groups on the American landscape has changed significantly since the Civil Rights Act. Until that time, there was very little on the national landscape that could...
memorialize minority groups in the national public memory. Places like Womans Rights National Historical Park, the Frederick Douglass House, and Lowell National Historical Park now tell the stories of women, African Americans, and labor. The telling of stories of traditionally marginalized groups is becoming even more important on the national scene with the redevelopment of many inner cities. Traditional minority communities are being displaced from the landscape with gentrification and the development of transit schemes, like highways and metros. While the heritage of minorities can still be found in traditional folkways, the places may no longer exist, and the historical park is one of the few places where minority stories can be told and passed down to generations (Kauffman 2004). We need to think about how we can make our national heritage more representative of the entire nation, and I think archaeology can be one tool to help create a more inclusive past.

**Civic Engagement and Archaeology**

The process of civic engagement can make places of memory usable to a wider audience by engaging muted and nontraditional communities in a dialog that addresses issues of social importance. Historic sites can become places to understand contemporary social and political issues. They can also be places that teach social justice.

Some examples outside of archaeology may serve to frame our archaeology projects. The NPS sponsored a **Community Study Report** (Bowser 2000) that highlights the organization’s recent experience in helping to organize community and park cooperation to celebrate diversity (http://www.nps.gov/community/Community_report.htm). The report contains many stories that show how the NPS connects with diverse communities and promotes pluralism. For instance, at Alcatraz, the NPS explores the history of the American Indian occupation of the island and relates it to the current activism within the American Indian community. It is part of a larger program titled “Promoting Tolerance,” which “brings emerging leaders from Eastern and Central Europe to the U.S. to learn about techniques to strengthen pluralism and respect for diversity” (Bowser 2000:20). Representatives come from Russia, Bosnia, Estonia, Romania, and Bulgaria. In each of these countries, the practice of democracy is a relatively new concept, and the program demonstrates how differences could be reconciled and minority groups could become part of the political process. The program uses a NPS park to help promote democracy around the world (Bowser 2000:20).

Another example is a compelling exhibition titled **Looking for Liberty: An Overview of Maryland History** at the Maryland Historical Society in Baltimore. **Looking for Liberty** is an interesting, compelling, and thought-provoking exhibit. The exhibition helps visitors to understand the historic struggle for liberties, and it encourages them to contemplate the threats to their own liberties today. The exhibit is very timely, as many Americans today feel that their civil liberties are threatened in the name of patriotism. The
exhibition uses artifacts as props, and it asks visitors to “help tell the story of liberty.” Visitors are asked to comment on the exhibition, and they are told that it is a prototype. They are told that their stories are valuable and may be added to the final and completed exhibition. Allowing people to participate in the story of their past is an important part of making history more socially engaging to communities.

Archaeology needs to be more fully integrated into the civic engagement process. Here is one example: how the Center for Heritage Resource Studies at the University of Maryland is involved in a series of important workshops held in the community of Hampden, Baltimore—a once-powerful industrial center in the city of Baltimore. The mill companies that built the town have abandoned the area, leaving their factories to be reused as warehouses and offices. Despite having lost the basis of its local economy, the community and much of the early workers’ housing still remains. Center Affiliates David Gadsby and Bob Chidester engaged the local community in a dialog about the archaeological process. Through a series of workshops, they learned about the topics that are important to the community. These issues include gentrification, racism, class structure, and labor. Through the process of civic engagement, archaeology has brought the community together to discuss some very important matters that trouble them. These concerns will become part of the archaeology’s research design, and it will be the focus of continued collaboration with the community.

There are other ways to promote civic engagement in archaeology. For instance, St. Mary’s City, the first capital of Maryland, has been the focus of archaeology for many years, and the town has been recovered through extensive excavations. To me, the story of Margaret Brent is both interesting and compelling. She became a landowner in the colony, and in 1648 she petitioned the Maryland assembly for the right to vote, a privilege that only landowners shared. The assembly denied her this right. Her story became a rallying cry for the subsequent women’s suffrage movement. Using this archaeological site and tying it to issues related to gender and women’s rights for school groups or any organization discussing these issues is a powerful use of the place.

Also, the story of the Robinsons at Manassas National Battlefield Park in northern Virginia is compelling. This free African American family lived on what is now the battlefield before and after the Civil War (Figure 1). They replaced and expanded their house by about 1870, and it burned in the early 1990s. Only the chimney remained on the landscape after the house was dismantled by the NPS because of fire damage (Figure 2). The Park administration decided to dismantle the chimney, and in effect erased a significant trace of this African American family from the battlefield (Figure 3). The archaeological material from the Robinsons’ house lot dates from the ante-bellum era into the early 20th century. Manassas National Battlefield Park can expand its interpretation of the place and use the archaeological material to interpret the African American experience during Reconstruction and the Jim Crow era.
It can be a place to engage the public and address issues of race and racism in the larger community. The park interpretation does not have to stop at the Civil War (Shackel 2003).

In local, state, and federally owned parks, it is a difficult task to counter the status quo and do a different kind of archaeology. Based on my personal experience, I can suggest that change only occurs with persistence, partnerships, and public outreach. It is hard work! The data we collect have the potential of telling a much broader story. We need to assert our findings into the public memory.

Archaeological objects can be a touchstone for a dialog that can be placed in broader conversations of the past. If we want to be relevant to society and to be part of an important dialogue throughout this country, we need to think about how we can make our discipline relevant. Archaeologists can address the issues of a diverse past, the social relevance of archaeology, and real-world problem-solving (see Bender and Smith 2000). It is important to motivate students and practitioners of archaeology to convince stakeholders and decision-makers that we can make these contributions.
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THE LOCAL MEANINGS OF INTERNATIONAL HERITAGE AT COPÁN, HONDURAS

Lena Mortensen

Lena Mortensen is the Assistant Director for the Center for Heritage Resource Studies, University of Maryland, College Park.

Copán, an ancient Maya city in western Honduras, is well known among scholars and lay aficionados of the Maya. When most archaeologists think of Copán, they tend to think of it as an impressive and important archaeological site. But Copán is many things to many people. It is simultaneously a UNESCO World Heritage Site, a Honduran National Monument, and a contemporary archaeological park that sustains an important local tourism industry. It is also a sacred site for contemporary Maya and a favorite resource for Mayanist scholars. These simultaneous identities mark Copán as a complex resource and make it a useful place to look at the ways different interested communities derive meaning and value from the archaeological past.

Copán’s Multiple Identities

Honduran archaeologist Ricardo Agurcia describes a mandate for Copán that goes well beyond a limited notion of archaeological value:

Archaeology in Copán is not just about dead people. It is about the growth and development of contemporary populations. It is about feeding poor people, giving them jobs, and making them proud of their heritage [Pena and Johns 2002].

This focus on Copán as a resource for economic development is not new. The major projects at Copán since the 1930s have been conceived jointly as tourism development and archaeological research, always in the service of multiple goals that benefit both national and international interests.

Copán first gained an international reputation when it was depicted in John Stephens and Frederick Catherwood’s famous travelogue from 1841, Incidents of Travel in Central America, Chiapas and Yucatan. Since that time, the ruins have attracted a steady stream of scholars and visitors wishing to learn about the ancient city and the people that built it. Replete with reconstructed temples, intricately sculpted stelae, and an impressive hieroglyphic stairway, Copán is often featured in the pages of National Geographic and other media (Figure 1). For the past nearly 30 years, Copán has been the subject of ongoing academic investigation. During this time, at least ten independently funded research projects have produced several generations of Ph.D. students and a wealth of data, making it one of the most intensively and extensively studied sites in the Maya region. In 1980, the site was inscribed in UNESCO’s list of World Heritage, formally establishing its international significance.

Because of its international stature and scientific value, Copán is a great source of pride for Honduran citizens. The Honduran state has claimed Copán as an important cultural monument since the mid-nineteenth century, and in 1982 it was officially declared a National Monument. As the most salient physical manifestation of the ancient Maya past in Honduras, Copán has become an important symbol in generations of political rhetoric. The site has historically played an integral role in nationalist campaigns that underwrite the modern mestizo identity with the perceived splendor of the indigenous Maya past (Burque 1998; Joyce 2003). Contemporary leaders also recognize and reinforce the importance of Copán as a national symbol, staging political spectacles there, like the 2002 inauguration of President Ricardo Maduro.

The Maya past also plays an important part in the country’s future. Government investment, local entrepreneurship, and World Bank projects have made archaeological tourism at Copán a focal point for regional development. Over the past 15 years, the region has witnessed explosive growth in the Copán tourism sector, benefiting many local residents and boosting the country’s international profile. Over the last decade, visitors to Copán have increased from just under 90,000 in 1994 to 135,000 in 2004 (including Hondurans and foreigners), making Copán the second most popular tourist destination in Honduras as well as an important generator of foreign currency (Figure 2). Many local entrepreneurs have taken advantage of the tourism boom by transforming their homes into hotels and their properties into souvenir stores and restaurants. In 2001, the mayor of Copán Ruinas, the town situated adjacent to the ruins, esti-
The Ministry of Tourism also has a vested interest in Copán as it is the second-largest tourism destination in the country (behind the Bay Islands) and a cornerstone of national tourism development campaigns. IIAH and the Ministry of Tourism often work together to promote and protect Copán, but understandably, their goals do not always coincide. From a national tourism perspective, Copán’s heritage is also a commodity to be marketed that will support regional and even national development.

Unlike most of the archaeologists, technical specialists at Copán are Honduran, and many come from the Copán region. Their interest in Copán has typically been shaped by their familiarity with the site as a fixture in their everyday lives. It is also conditioned by the training they receive in order to work in different capacities for IIAH or for different archaeological projects. Whereas foreign researchers are sometimes transient, many technical specialists work continuously, moving from project to project over time, deepening their knowledge of the site and gaining ever more expertise. Many individuals express loyalty and a responsibility to the site that extends well beyond the bond dictated by employment. Copán heritage for this group is both local and national, personal and scientific.

Other employees of the park, some long term and others very temporary, have a different vision of Copán and what it means to them and others. Many of the people employed at Copán recognize its central importance in the local economy, especially in...
recent years as coffee and tobacco industries have declined. They know, however, that their own employment opportunities as excavators, guards, masons, and in other positions are typically dependent on political party affiliation or a chance relationship with people in positions to hire, such as foreign project directors. They also recognize what Copán means to archaeologists and others who work in positions of power there. They can see, as one worker expressed, that "coming to Copán means to be famous." This individual was not referring to people like him, but rather commenting on how managers and archaeologists are featured in the media and frequently meet with foreign dignitaries.

Tour guides at Copán also have a distinct interest in Copán. Most are directly dependent on the state of the park, and their own expertise, for their livelihood. Some would characterize their interest as purely economic. But they are also the most direct public mediators of the park, and many have developed their own personal sense of stewardship based on their experiences in guiding. As individuals who walk the grounds nearly everyday, and who invest in learning about the overall context as much as they can, many guides believe they have a unique perspective on Copán. Some guides even consider themselves the most vigilant stewards of all.

People employed in the local tourism industry tend to have strong opinions about what goes on at the Copán park because they know their business depends on its continued success as a tourism destination. And while most tourism workers acknowledge Copán’s importance as a cultural monument, and as a source of scientific data, they are primarily concerned with its operation as a tourist attraction and speak out loudly against any decisions taken that they perceive will threaten this status.

The local public, residents of the town of Copán Ruinas and surrounding communities, also tend to share a distinct connection to the ruins. Almost every family in the vicinity has at least one member who has worked in the ruins in some capacity, for instance on a research project, as a guard, or doing maintenance. Archaeological, restoration, and conservation projects have employed thousands of individuals, providing them with short-term, and in some cases longer-term, income, as well as an intimate perspective on some aspect of archaeological work. Because of the long-term connections and relationships between the town and the site, fostered by the many research projects and international visitors that bring them together, local residents tend to feel protective of Copán as their own local heritage.

Although there are other kinds of interested groups that can be described, I will only mention one more, the Chortí Maya, many of whom still live in the region and consider themselves the descendants of the original builders of the ruins. In recent years, the Chortí have become very politically active in Honduras, incorporating
COLONIAL LEGACIES AND THE PUBLIC MEANING OF MONACAN ARCHAEOLOGY IN VIRGINIA

Jeffrey L. Hantman
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It is a long understood and difficult truth that the population size, territorial boundaries, social identities, and even the tribal names of many Native peoples in the Eastern United States were vastly transformed by the impact of European diseases and colonial domination. In the Virginia colony, the Algonquian (Powhatan) and Siouan (Monacan) speaking people were as dramatically affected, and as rapidly decimated in number, as any other people or region in the Middle and Southeastern United States between the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (see Wood 1989). The legacy of this colonial history in the modern-day interface between archaeology, Native American political concerns, and the larger public is a series of issues about territory, history, identity, and the legitimacy of claims for cultural patrimony. The ethnographic record in Virginia after the early seventeenth century is very thin, and oral traditions are not necessarily known or shared with outsiders. Archeology, when done collaboratively with tribal groups, is in a position to help address some of the contemporary public issues still extant as a result of colonial-era legacies.

Over the past 15 years, students from the University of Virginia and I have worked with the Monacan Indian Nation of central and western Virginia. The interaction began as a straightforward, if limited, effort on my part to share information on research I was doing and ideas I was publishing on colonial-era Monacans. It is pertinent here to acknowledge that when I began to do research and write about the archaeology and ethnohistory of seventeenth-century Monacans and what I perceived as the formidable role they played in the Jamestown era in the Chesapeake, I was not aware that there was a contemporary Monacan Indian community of approximately 800 tribal members, based just one hour from the University of Virginia (today the tribal numbers are closer to 1,400). When I did first hear of the community, I heard many disparaging and unfounded assumptions about who they were, often from people who had not visited the community or met community members. All this was a function of centuries of invisibility for Indians in the Virginia interior caused by colonial policies, population decline, and the eugenics-driven, racial-categorizing policies of the twentieth century in which Virginia tenaciously reclassified Indians into the generic category of "colored" (Smith 1992).

It should be said, too, that the Monacan community also chose to be out of public view, a centuries-old survival strategy in the face of colonial and later state policies. Situated just an hour from Charlottesville and less than that from Lynchburg, the Monacan community is nestled in the mountains ten miles from a major road. It was relatively easy to be out of view. For decades, Monacan children could not attend public schools. An Episcopal Mission established in the early twentieth century supported a one-room, log cabin school that was in use through mid-century (Figure 1). This all changed in the 1980s as the Monacans actively sought public recognition. Official state recognition was awarded in 1989 after a thorough review of history and opinion sought from other tribal groups in Virginia, and today the Monacans are one of eight state-recognized Indian tribes in Virginia, and the only one located in the western part of the state.

I first met with the Tribe shortly after official and public affirmation of their identity had occurred. Outsiders were still met with understandable caution. I had been invited to attend a Tribal Council meeting to discuss the possibility of working jointly on a modest traveling museum exhibit about the Monacan community, past and present. It was right at the outset that I realized what I had considered important, but fairly esoteric, research on the Indian-English relations in colonial Virginia struck a positive chord with the Monacan people, and that archaeology in this region would have public meanings far beyond what I even imagined at that time. They understood the lingering impact of colonial-era history and subsequent state policy from their own experience. The archaeology provided a new narrative and a counter-narrative. This prelude is all necessary to understanding the brief overview I offer below of the ways in which archaeology has had some impact on the Monacan community's understanding of their own deep history and on a public understanding of who this Virginia tribe was, and is, today. I will focus on two issues, examples among many,
that archaeological studies were able to address that are legacies of the colonial era: Invisibility/Continuity and Territory.

Invisibility/Continuity

The story of colonial Indian history might seem well known—from the publication in the seventeenth century of the writings of Jamestown colonist John Smith, to the Disney-animated film about Pocahontas and John Smith, to the anniversary commemoration of the setting of the Jamestown colony planned for 2007. But the focus of that Indian history is actually quite limited—it only addresses the people who lived in the area immediately surrounding Jamestown and only the early seventeenth century. Until recently, most people throughout Virginia would have been hard-pressed to say more about other tribes, regions, or time-frames in Indian history. And this left the Monacans in a state of virtual invisibility, past and present.

Identifying the late precolonial sites that my students and I were excavating in ancestral Monacan territory as Monacan sites, and referring to them by that name rather than in the jargon of archaeological culture complexes, was a first step toward connecting archaeology to Monacan history and ending that invisibility. Part of the community’s difficulty in receiving recognition as Indian people in the twentieth century could be tied to their comparatively obscure colonial and precolonial history. The archaeology served to offset that difficulty in simply documenting that people were on the landscape and had been there for some time in continuous settlement of the region even if sites were moved frequently. Further, they were agricultural and lived in villages. All of this offset erroneous perceptions that derived from colonial-era ethnography. The Tribe evaluated what I was writing about Monacan archaeology and history, and selectively adopted some of it (as all people do) into their own histories and sense of their past. While having a collective sense of a deep past is important, it was sharing that message with a modestly wider audience that was of greatest interest in the early years of our collaboration.

The idea of developing the small traveling exhibit was adopted by the Monacan Tribal Council. A grant from the Virginia Foundation for the Humanities (VFH) made the development of this exhibit possible, and the impact was fairly significant. A traveling exhibit that could be placed in schools was desired, as leaders of the Tribe were now being asked to travel to local schools and discuss Monacan history and identity with students, teachers, and curriculum planners (Figure 2). It is worth noting that archaeology and related ethnohistory was a small part of the exhibit. The Tribe was particularly interested in “talking” about the recent past and present in this exhibit. But the archaeology served to connect this more recent history to a place in the deeper history of Virginia, as well as to the familiar Jamestown story. In this way, the exhibit was a success. A video produced by members of the Tribe about this time also included archaeology and ethnohistory in establishing the deep history of the tribe for an audience new to the name and identity of Monacan. The video was widely distributed, most effectively to schools. The result helped to reverse the invisibility that even state recognition could not offset.

Territory

A final important issue concerns the dramatic transformations in territory from the colonial era and contemporary identification with ancestral territory. The Monacan community of today is focused on one small community centered in an area called Bear Mountain, in Amherst County, Virginia. Two centuries of settlement continuity there help establish the recent historic claims to tribal status in-state, but leave open, if not in fact obscuring, any connection to a larger territory. It is the case that small expatriate communities of tribal members live today in Maryland, Tennessee, and Georgia, families whose parents or grandparents moved out of Virginia to avoid racist state laws and policies enacted during the eugenics era. Accordingly, a fluid and noncontiguous tribal affiliation is not presumed in the present.

On the basis of archaeological information, including settlement pattern data and especially a distinctive burial mound complex, a larger territory that is Monacan can be discerned
Figure 2: This traveling exhibit, including one panel on archaeology and three on the recent community history was used by Monacan tribal leaders when meeting with students, teachers, and curriculum planners on the local level. Today this exhibit has been largely supplanted by a popular Monacan living-history program at the Natural Bridge National Historic Landmark and other widely seen public venues.

(but see Boyd 2003; Hantman et al. 2004). The “original core” of what was Monacan territory is derived from a known place—that is, the area that is shown on John Smith’s map of Virginia as “Monacan.” From there, archaeological survey and excavation data strongly suggest that a neighboring region given a different name by the colonial observers (“Mannahoac”) was virtually undifferentiated materially, or in terms of burial ritual, from the Monacan “core.” The public implications of this archaeological research, vetted by the Monacan Tribe, relate largely to issues of cultural patrimony. Human remains from two of the burial mounds have been returned to the Monacans following NAGPRA review of their claim, and the remains have been reinterred in the historic Monacan cemetery on Bear Mountain. In consultation with the Tribe, bioarchaeological analyses were conducted prior to the reinterment (Gold 2004). In another example, a collection of more than 20,000 artifacts collected in ancestral Monacan territory by amateurs, then curated by the National Park Service since the 1940s, is in the process of being returned to the Monacan Tribal Museum. The University of Virginia is inventorying the collection so as to facilitate its transfer to the Monacan Indian Museum.

The public meanings of a Monacan archaeology begin with the value placed on the knowledge of deep history, and even individual identity (Hantman 2004), by the members of the Tribe themselves. These meanings extend to concerns beyond the boundaries of the Tribe to issues of public identity and acceptance, recognition, and legal status with respect to cultural patrimony. The Monacans have come out of the long shadow created by colonial-era writing and policy and are now very much a part of the cultural history of the region as well as the contemporary political and cultural landscape. Archaeological data have been one part of this very public transformation brought about by the Monacan people themselves.
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HERITAGE, ARCHAEOLOGY, AND AFRICAN AMERICAN HISTORY
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Locked beneath the sunken ships, venomous structures, abandoned cemeteries, and forgotten former towns and plantations that comprise the archaeological record lay the material remains of an African American history of place. Archaeological investigations into a variety of sites raise new questions that release scholarship from the boundaries and limitations of written histories. Alternative knowledge that emerges from archaeological practices has the potential to generate controversy, public engagement, and scholarly activism. Passionate public responses combined with scholarly commitment indicate the level of importance and depth of meaning associated with several African American archaeological sites. The impact and implications of archaeological knowledge can be seen among the intersections of local activist communities, academe, regional economic interests, and national and global issues that bring new thematic combinations in African American history.

For sites such as the African Burial Ground in New York City, the Henrietta Marie, a slave ship that sunk off the coast of Florida in 1700; or Underground Railroad sites, nonverbal communications, the language of material culture, and cultural landscape analyses must be interpreted in conjunction with maps, deeds, probate, and census records to piece together an African American history of place. For each of these sites, the public, stakeholders, descendant community members, or committed professionals took action to ensure survival of historical and cultural heritage. At the African Burial Ground in New York City, for example, the public was involved in rescuing historical and cultural property at Broadway, Duane, Elk, and Reade Streets on a site that historic maps indicated had been the location of an "African Burying Ground." The rugged topography of early Manhattan helped preserve a portion of the cemetery buried 23 feet below street level (Castanga and Tyler 2004). The original cemetery was approximately six acres; its use spanned the greater portion of the eighteenth century.

Although the concept of a "site of conscience" is currently limited to museums, throughout the conflict and contentiousness of the past 14 years, the African Burial Ground has been a site consistently marked by public stewardship. Through both public reaction and scholarly activism, the African Burial Ground meets the definition of a site of conscience. The cemetery site possesses the "unique power to inspire social consciousness and action" and is a vehicle through which "new conversations about contemporary issues in historical perspective" are introduced and realized (International Coalition n.d.). In addition to meeting the primary definition of a site of conscience, the Burial Ground, through the Office of Public Education and Interpretation, meets the remaining criteria: (1) interpreting history through historic sites, (2) engaging in programs that stimulate dialogue on pressing social issues and promote humanitarian and democratic values as a primary function, and (3) sharing opportunities for public involvement in issues raised at the site (Figure 1).

Stakeholders

For African American heritage sites such as the African Burial Ground or the Henrietta Marie, scholarly or public activism was required to insure scientific and archaeological investigation. Stakeholders vary from site to site; they are idiosyncratic and particular to the individual circumstances of discovery. As a result, it
is imperative that we understand who the various stakeholders really are. How well do we understand the people we serve, our ethical clients (Mack and Blakey 2004)? Among the New York public not associated with governmental agencies, educational institutions, or archaeological firms, an older population consisting primarily of black women was at the forefront of the movement to save the site. This mature population recognized the importance of heritage in ways that often elude younger generations. These elder community members saw or see themselves as placeholders, with a responsibility to protect heritage sites until the next generation is in position to offer support or take up the fight.

As part of the Section 106 process and other state and local mandates, required oversight meetings are generally held during business hours. Frequently, retired members of the descendant community have the time to attend mid-day meetings and emergency sessions. Stakeholders often self-identify or self-select and have no official designation or affiliation. Within the process of reclaiming an archaeological site, contentiousness initially may be viewed by stakeholders as more productive than partnership, and from this ethos comes the certain knowledge that reclamation of a site may depend upon effective power sharing. At the New York African Burial Ground, stakeholders recognized interpretation as a political act and that intense provocation could be an effective force for change.

For the *Henrietta Marie*, the National Association of Black Scuba Divers (NABS) worked tirelessly to
ensure that the wrecked ship was scientifically excavated and nationally publicized. The Henrietta Marie sailed from London in 1697 and again in 1699 and eventually sank off New Ground Reef in the Florida Keys in 1700, where it settled in 12 to 32 feet of water. The ship was discovered off the coast of Florida in 1988 by Mel Fisher, a treasure salvor considered a pariah among underwater archaeologists. The history of the ship was deemed less valid by academicians, due to the circumstances of discovery and was not scientifically investigated for several years. NABS was largely responsible for commemoration efforts and insisted that the historical legacy was too important to be lost. The Wreck of the Henrietta Marie, by Pulitzer Prize-winning author Michael Cottman (1999), chronicles rescue efforts and is a powerful example of public response to archaeology. The book and a national exhibition make the history of the ship accessible to the public.

Underground Railroad

Scholarly attention to the topic of the Underground Railroad led Congress to mandate implementation of a study by the National Park Service (NPS) in 1993 and to establish the Network to Freedom in 1998 when Congressman Rob Portman (R-Ohio) co-sponsored the National Underground Network to Freedom Act with Congressman Louis Stokes (D-Cleveland). The Network to Freedom Act links Underground Railroad sites across the country into a network maintained by NPS which, in conjunction with the National Underground Railroad Freedom Center in Cincinnati, has become the institutional custodian of Underground Railroad history. Throughout the years of neglect, however, local and family historians understood the relevance of preserving their stories.

In the absence of strong documentation in the form of written records supporting Underground Railroad activities, historians and other researchers find little to no basis for historical analysis or claims by local historians. Archaeologists from the National Forest Service, however, are excavating Underground Railroad sites in Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois. Through a combination of archaeological, family, and historical records, archaeologists are realizing that free people of color involved with the Underground Railroad adopted a radical stance in helping one another, often risking their own freedom to ensure the escape of family, friends, or loved ones, as well as strangers. One must literally create this history by first identifying and confirming sites and then looking at census data, deed books, slave schedules, and old maps in order to formulate historical perspectives and create a thematic presence. Heritage resources cannot be effectively established until after historical analyses have been completed.

History

Combining a critical mass of archaeological sites such as the Underground Railroad sites identified by the National Forest Service opens new historical perspectives. Multidisciplinarity, informed by landscape studies and combined with the material record generated through archaeology, adds dimension and alternative paths to historical inquiry. However, archaeological contributions to American history in general and to African American history in particular continue to be both overlooked and undervalued. From the plantation economy, to an understanding of foodways, medicinal, and spiritual practices, to bioanthropological data, archaeology has made significant and long-lasting contributions to understanding African American history.

Archaeological inquiry answers questions unavailable to historians where the supporting documentary record is simply unavailable. Archaeology, therefore, is one of the most powerful tools leading to African American cultural heritage. Analysis of material culture retrieved from archaeological sites has contributed to understandings of African American religious, social, biological, and cultural structures. Archaeology is a tool that contributes compensatory information that enriches history. Questions derived from archaeological investigations are separate and distinct from those arising from historical sources. Furthermore, the language of the landscape informs an understudied and overlooked African American history of place within efforts to reclaim an African American past.
Heritage and History

Generational transmission of cultural legacies and traditions, communal histories, artistic expression, identity, and sustained cultural values combine to form heritage. A historical component is necessarily included in any definition of heritage. History precedes heritage. If the historical record is not preserved, neither heritage resources nor historical legacy can emerge.

Sites once dense with African American cultural expression lay forgotten beneath the earth. Were it not for archaeological investigation of a site, resurrecting and reclaiming the past, history would have been completely lost. But for many of these sites, African Americans in conjunction with other concerned citizens recognized the importance of the story that lay behind the silences, the lack of preservation, and the collective forgetting associated with archaeological rediscovery. Archaeology is not an end in itself; it is, rather, a conduit, an avenue leading to renewal of black history. One of the greatest archaeological finds of this century exists, in part, because of the relentlessness of the New York descendant community in a space and time when there should have been no discussion, no less contentiousness associated with investigation of the African Burial Ground. This and other examples reveal the struggles that surround preservation of African American history and heritage as African Americans look for ways to negotiate their cultural capital.
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EARLY CITIES
NEW PERSPECTIVES ON PRE-INDUSTRIAL URBANISM
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THIS COLLOQUIUM brings together scholars from multiple disciplines to present new data and new views in order to advance our knowledge of early cities and hopefully illuminate problems facing modern cities. Internationally respected archaeologists BRUCE Trigger and COLIN REYNOLDS will give the Sackler Lectures, which will culminate in a special evening reception followed by a reception and set of lectures.
USING THE PAST IN CALVERT COUNTY, MARYLAND
ARCHAEOLOGY AS A TOOL FOR BUILDING COMMUNITY
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This brief discussion of two examples of how the past is used in Calvert County, Maryland follows from the assumption that the past always serves the present, with good, bad, or indifferent motivations and corresponding results. County planners, with citizen participation, have articulated constructive uses for the past. The goals toward which planners use the past are to foster a sense of place, recognize or establish community identity, and support the preservation of cultural resources that citizens value as important to a good quality of life. Archaeology is a tool suited to these ends with the added goal to address racism. Archaeology, especially public archaeology, can contribute to all of these goals through consistent and persistent demonstration of the complexity of social relations in the past. Archaeologists can facilitate open discussion of social inequity on the sites we interpret and equip people to see inequity in the present.

In any undertaking that builds on these ideas, the first step is to establish legitimacy. In the cases cited here, legitimacy has been constructed in partnership with the public archaeology program at Jefferson Patterson Park and Museum, a state-run facility dedicated to regional archaeology, and with the public schools. Calvert County has crafted policy to underpin such partnerships under the rubric of heritage. The policy is written in documents, such as the Calvert County Comprehensive Plan, the Zoning Ordinance, and the Southern Maryland Heritage Area Heritage Tourism Management Plan. There is no necessary relationship between policy and content, but policy can be crafted in such a way as to drive a wide variety of projects to serve policy goals. Major objectives of the Calvert County Comprehensive Plan, for example, are to control growth and build strong communities. Heritage education and preservation are explicitly named in the plan as tools to these ends. Content that engages citizens in history may meet the action items included in the Comprehensive Plan.

Content also has helped to shape policy. In Maryland, jurisdictions are required to rewrite their comprehensive plans, providing cyclic opportunities for heritage practitioners to influence policy. It is important for archaeologists and interpreters to get involved in planning activities in the jurisdictions in which they practice. They can be effective lobbyists for community participation, as well, and may be able to identify and bring communities that might not otherwise be heard into the planning process.

Tourism offices are also potentially potent allies in providing public access to interpretive sites and activities. Archaeologists and interpreters must maintain constructive relationships with tourism marketers to ensure that heritage tourism content is accurate, appropriate, and managed sensitively with respect to the needs of communities where resources are located.

Case 1: Public Archaeology at Suweek's Cabin Site
Jefferson Patterson Park and Museum (JPPM) was established in 1983 as an archaeological preserve and interpretive site. When a needs-assessment project in the early 1990s revealed that JPPM was perceived as “white space,” the research and education departments wove two projects together: one to search for African American perspectives on JPPM, the other to reach out to African American communities to offer assistance to document and celebrate their histories and heritage. The projects came together in the public archaeology program to connect living African American families with sites on JPPM property.

Oral histories were collected from members of a family that traced their heritage to women who had been enslaved at what is now JPPM. Mining the memories of family elders for names and dates, researchers found documents, such as death certificates, that yielded new information and created productive avenues for further investigation. Recollections of elders in the family gave new meaning and a name—Suweek's Cabin Site—to at least one site already identified. Documentary research and archaeology established the site as representative of the family's first home as free tenant farmers after Emancipation. Family members participated in all phases of research, and JPPM staff instituted regular meetings with descendants to share information and give updates on planned activities.
Figure 1: A child's alphabet plate in association with writing slate and pencil fragments suggests that the occupants of Sukeek's Cabin Site were teaching and learning at home.

Sukeek's Cabin Site was the focus of the public archaeology session in 2000 and 2001. Work at the site provided opportunities for family members to mingle with archaeology volunteers who were not related. Early on, the cooperative context produced the question, “why do you care?” and prompted nonrelatives to answer in a way that showed their interest in and readiness to identify with the former occupants of the site and, by extension, to identify with the living family members. Before fieldwork began, and at the beginning of each new field season, the family was invited to a meeting and site visit. Gathering at the site was at least as important as the participation of family members in site clearing because it included all kin who were able to travel to the site and not just those physically able to work at it. At the gatherings, the family conferred its blessing on the project and JPMM spokespersons affirmed their commitment to work to uncover the family’s history and to tell the stories truthfully.

The site is situated out of the public area on top of a ridge, at the end of a trail up a hill and through woods. The time it takes to walk to the site affords an opportunity to equip visitors with the ability to see human agency of the past in the setting. The relative marginality of the site with respect to the nineteenth-century plantation—as well as the present uses—is pointed out in numerous examples along the way. By the time visitors reach the site, they are ready to “see” the former occupants and understand their relationship to other sites and people on the property. Visitors are shown a sample of artifacts to support interpretations about the use of various spaces on the site. Fragments of a child’s alphabet plate are shown with pieces of writing slate and slate pencil fragments (Figure 1). Interpreters suggest that the people who lived here were teaching and learning at home during a period when public education was not available to African American children. The artifacts provide entry into discussions about land and labor before and after the Civil War, education, and race-based differences in access to services that most Americans now take for granted.

Because Sukeek’s Cabin Site is not accessible to everyone, public programs, brochures, a web page, interpretive panels and small exhibits have been created for use by people who cannot physically get to the site. These products also help carry the content beyond the site. Another means of extending the experience is a course developed for training teachers.

Case 2: The Landscape of Segregation Tour

The Landscape of Segregation Tour was initially conceived as a component of a teachers in-service to fulfill a state requirement for training in multicultural education. The requirements should be in place in other states as they follow a Federal initiative. Training has also been offered to history and social studies teachers in a summer institute. The tour applies the same objectives as the tour to Sukeek’s Cabin Site on a much larger scale and directly addresses the issue of achievement gaps between white and African American students in county schools. One assumption is that low expectations are as much to blame as any other single factor. An intuitive solution is to raise expectations through raising the value of local history and experience by using the past of local African American communities to confer depth and complexity upon their young members.

The tour focuses on African American life after the Civil War. Before boarding a bus, teachers are shown historic maps and aerial photographs of the area. Sukeek’s Cabin is pointed out on a 1902 USGS map, along with comparable dots indicating dozens of African American households along the shoreline at the beginning of the twentieth century. There are no African American households on the waterfront at the beginning of the twenty-first century—the meaning and value of waterfront has changed.

The first stop on the tour is a pull-out above two cemeteries that abut each other between two United Methodist churches. One is historically African American, the other historically white.
Figure 2: Albert Canit enlisted in the 2nd Regiment Light Artillery, U.S. Colored Troops in 1863. He returned to Calvert County, where he became a community leader. He is one of several men buried in this cemetery who resisted slavery through military service.

The church properties were both donated by the same white man in the mid-nineteenth century. The landscape prompts questions that easily permit a discussion of the history that created it, including schisms in Methodism and other social institutions over slavery, legislation regulating African American worship, resistance to slavery, and how people built community to meet their collective needs.

The tour proceeds into the cemeteries to show the subtle ways that the boundary between them is maintained. Teachers are led to the graves of Sukeek's descendants and "introduced" to other families, including men who won their freedom by enlisting in the U.S. Colored Troops. Before leaving the cemetery, teachers' attention is drawn to the buildings and other landscape features that demonstrate the continuity of multiple activities centered around the African American church—a community center since its founding. The church was arguably the only public arena in which African Americans enjoyed autonomy well into the twentieth century (Figure 2).

The tour then continues to an Episcopal church, founded more than a century before the Methodist movement took off in Calvert. Names of the dead are discussed in light of their connections to families who converted to Methodism and their connections to former bondsmen. The tour proceeds past the farm of former slaveholders to an African American farmstead. The two farms were once connected; a path through the woods is visible on the 1938 aerial. On the porch of the farmhouse, a descendant of the African American farmer greets the tour and, through her craft of storytelling, gives a powerful interpretation of the landscapes and relationships in the rural neighborhood. The last stop on the tour is the oldest standing one-room school built for African American children in the county. The building, roughly 15 by 17 feet, held up to 40 students in seven grades until 1934. Finally, the teachers return to a modern classroom setting with all the aerials and maps and discuss what they have seen, felt, and learned.

The tour and courses have been popular with participants. Teachers are multipliers of audience. An investment of resources to offer such a course will pay off in classrooms for years to come as teachers apply what they have learned. Teachers may also provide feedback into policy; Calvert County teachers recommended to the school board that all new teachers be required to take a course in local history.

Concluding Thoughts
The Calvert County case-study projects were designed to address identified needs with existing resources. Partnerships were critical to the success of both projects. The partners involved have counterparts in many locales: school systems, local government, museums, churches, etc. A landscape-based project is guaranteed to be locally relevant, which will make it easier to engage potential partners and audiences.
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