Introduction

This presentation was originally submitted by John H. Jameson to Andrea Ciacci as part of a course entitled “Museums and Archaeological Parks.” It was drafted originally as a presentation during person during the December 15-19, 1997 course. When it was learned that Mr. Jameson could not travel to Italy, an Internet conference was set up between Mr. Jameson and the course participants. After e-mailing the text and accompanying graphics to Andrea Ciacci, Mr. Jameson communicated through his office computer and answered questions from the participants in Siena (attached transcript). The participants were located in a classroom where they could view the text and graphics via a computer projector. The participants had reviewed the e-mailed version of the presentation prior to the Internet conference.

General information on the management of parks in the USA

Political Composition

There are two major political categories of historical parks in the United States: those that are managed by State governments (there are 50 states); and those administered by the National Park Service (NPS), U.S. Department of the Interior. The management of parks is done differently in the various states, but each state government creates these parks in order to commemorate an important historic event, place, or person in the state’s history.

Sites managed by the National Park Service have been determined by the U.S. Congress to have national importance. Although Congress created Yellowstone National Park as the world’s first national park in 1872, there was no real system of national parks in the U.S. until the National Park Service was created in 1916.

There are now 376 individual units within U.S. National Park System. Units are designated as national parks, national historic sites, national seashores, national monuments, or other designations, all administered by the National Park Service. The majority of these units have a primary historical
or natural conservation theme and additional subthemes. Although most NPS units contain archaeological resources, most park lands have not been surveyed for archaeological site locations.

**LAND AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT**

Many nations have looked to the U.S. model as an ideal precedent for the management of a national park system. However, the U.S. standards for preservation and minimal modern impacts can be difficult to emulate.

In U.S. national parks, the land, for the most part, is controlled and owned by the federal government and many large parks are established in rural areas away from city encroachments. Thus, it is easier to manage the lands and to prevent adverse impacts from development and natural deterioration.

In many countries, development uses such as timber harvesting and mining are allowed within the boundaries of national parks, making management and resource protection more difficult. For example, in England, most of the national park lands are privately owned and some are used for military training; many political and environmental compromises have to be made for management and preservation.

*Consequences for archaeology and anthropology*

Many U.S. national parks commemorate historical and prehistoric significant time periods, cultures, and events. U.S. museums that display archaeological information are usually termed “natural history” or “historical” museums, not “archaeological” museums per se. Most US state and national parks are considered to be “living museums” that include a visitors center with introductory videos and exhibits, plus wayside exhibits and interpretive signs along walkways and trails. Park rangers give scheduled talks and tours and sometimes engage in role playing. Colonial Williamsburg (a late eighteenth century state capital, now largely reconstructed) in Virginia is a renowned example of a privately run site that displays living history, tours, formal exhibits, visitor centers, and *in situ* archaeological interpretation.

As a privately operated site, Colonial Williamsburg is exceptional in its popularity, scope, and influence on the history of historic site development and reconstructions (Jameson and Hunt 1998).

There are many “cultural” parks in the U.S. that rely on archaeology to supply much of the information about history and the lifeways of both prehistoric (about 15,000 BC to AD 1500) and historic (about AD 1500-present) peoples. For example, at Ocmulgee National Monument in Georgia, a Mississippian (AD 900-1700) period Indian village with temple mounds and a ceremonial earthlodge were studied by archaeologists. Park exhibits of re-
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Fig. 2 – Prehistoric pictographs at Mammoth Cave National Park in Kentucky.
covered artifacts and the reconstructed earthlodge are among the interesting and important features at the park (Figs. 3 and 4).

Another example is from Andersonville National Historic Site in Georgia, where archaeologists supplied important information for the location and reconstruction of the 19th century (1864-1865) prisoner-of-war stock-
ade. One interesting outcome was the identification through archaeology of distinct patterns of original construction of the stockade: portions built by black slaves, versus portions built by prisoners (Figs. 6 and 7).

During the 1864 digging of the stockade wall trench, the uppermost soils were piled toward the exterior of the prison and the deeper red soils were piled toward the interior. When the soils were backfilled around the posts, the posts prevented the two soils from mixing, thereby creating a banding effect. Thus the archaeologists were able to differentiate the position of the original stockade built with slave labor with the stockade built several months later by the prisoners (PRENTICE and PRENTICE 1990) (Fig. 8).

Programs of the Southeast Archaeological Center

The Southeast Archaeological Center (SEAC) continues a thirty-year tradition within the National Park Service of archaeological research, collections and information management, and technical support for national park units located in the Southeast Regional Office of the National Park Service.

The mission of the Center is to facilitate long-term protection, use, and appreciation of archaeological resources in the southeastern USA and beyond.

The Center is composed of the Operational Support Division, which
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Fig. 7 – Archaeological excavation of the stockade posts at Andersonville National Historic Site, Georgia.
During the 1864 digging of the stockade wall trench, the uppermost soils were piled toward the exterior of the prison and the deeper red soils were piled toward the interior. When the soils were backfilled around the posts, the posts prevented the soils from mixing, thereby creating a banding effect. Thus the archaeologist were able to differentiate the position of the original stockade built with slave labor with the stockade built several months later by the prisoners.

carries out park unit support, and the Technical Assistance and Partnerships Division, which conducts a variety of technical assistance projects both within and outside NPS. As a support operation to national park units, SEAC helps fulfill the requirements of various federal laws, regulations, policies, and guidelines for the protection of archeological resources. SEAC also helps to carry out the responsibilities of the Secretary of the Interior to assist other Federal agencies and state agencies in cultural resources compliance, archaeological site stabilization, CRM planning and public education and outreach.

Links between the disciplines of archaeology and anthropology in the USA

Archaeologists in the U.S. are trained as anthropologists with an emphasis in archaeology and obtain advanced academic degrees in anthropology. Archaeology is one of the sub-disciplines of anthropology; the others are cultural anthropology, physical anthropology, and linguistics. Education and training requirements are different for different kinds of archaeology. During the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, academic programs
and departments were established to study American Indian societies, languages, artifacts, and ruins. Archaeology was seen as a method of inquiry to study anthropological subjects. As a result, there are few separate or distinct archaeology departments among universities in the U.S. However, interdisciplinary programs that combine archaeology with various other fields of study are more common (Carlson 1998).

In the U.S., “prehistoric” archaeology focuses on time periods and cultures that preceded European (sometimes termed “Pre-Columbian”) contact and dating from about 20,000 to 500 years ago. Archaeologists commonly specialize in particular time periods or cultural traditions, such as Paleoindian (ca. 12,000 BC to 6000 BC), Archaic (ca. 6000 BC to 1000 BC), Woodland (ca. 1000 BC to AD 1000), and Late Prehistoric (ca. AD 1000 to AD 500). In some regions of the U.S., such as the Great Plains, the Woodland and Late Prehistoric traditions persisted to later times.

The Paleoindian were big game hunters and foragers with a highly specialized stone tool technology. The Archaic period is characterized by an increase in population resulting in larger numbers of bands that traded resources and an increase in the range and types of stone tools, reflecting exploitation of an expanding variety of plant and animal resources. The Woodland and Late Prehistoric periods are marked by major technological changes such as the emergence of distinct pottery-making traditions, increased populations, and more sedentary habitations. The development of Maize agriculture helped Late Prehistoric groups to obtain large and complex sociopolitical systems.

Students in the U.S. who wish to study ancient or classical civilizations (including the Near East, Egypt, early civilizations of the Mediterranean, classical Greece and Rome, and the early civilizations of Asia) are more likely to pursue their studies in interdisciplinary programs that include courses in art, architecture, classics, history, ancient and modern languages, and theology. Students who wish to study more recent historical periods combine history, including archival and oral history research, with courses in historical and vernacular architecture, material culture and folklore, and archaeology.

Historical archaeologists usually major in anthropology or history (Carlson 1998).

In the U.S., historical archaeology is distinguished from prehistoric archaeology in that it uses material and written evidence.

The historical period spans no more than a few hundred years (about AD 1500 to present).

Sites include cities, villages, ranches, isolated homesteads, farms, plantations, and campsites; native and ethnic settlements; churches, missions, meeting houses, and cemeteries; logging, mining, and railroad camps; trading posts; submerged sites and shipwrecks; military forts, encampments, and battlefields; and dumps and trash scatters (SHA 1998).

Archeologists in the U.S. work in research institutions, universities,
museums, parks, and government, or they work as contract archaeologists for government or private organizations.

Although an undergraduate degree (BA/BS) is sufficient to work as a field archaeologist in the U.S. and to perform basic laboratory studies, a Masters Degree (MA/MS) is commonly required to direct field crews.

A Masters level degree is also required to work in the private sector (as a contractor), to teach in a community college, and to work for some museums.

A Masters degree is also the usual minimum requirement for work in government agencies, including national parks. An MA/MS with a thesis and a year of field and laboratory experience is the minimum for certification by the Register of Professional Archaeologists. The second graduate degree is the Ph.D., which is required to teach in a college or university or hold a museum curatorship. The Ph.D. degree requires 2-3 years of courses beyond the MA and the successful preparation and oral defense of a dissertation containing original research in a chosen specialization within the field of archaeology (Carlson 1998).

Methodological and historical debate

Consequences of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act

Among the prominent debates in archaeology in the United States, and indeed, worldwide, is the issue of the treatment and disposition of the cultural values and physical remains of indigenous peoples. The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), passed by the U.S. Congress in 1990. NAGPRA requires U.S. agencies and museums to inventory their holdings of Native American cultural items and return such items to Indian tribes and other Native American groups. The act also provides that any intentional excavation and removal of Native American human remains and other cultural items from Federal or tribal lands be conducted only with a permit issued by the National Park Service. Some archaeologists and museum curators have resisted these requirements on the grounds that archaeological and other scientific research will be impeded if Native American artifacts are returned and are not available to researchers. Many Native Americans maintain that it not up to the scientists to determine what is “important” and that cultural values for consecrated materials should take precedence.

A recent (1996) Federal mandate, Executive Order No. 13007, “Protection of Religious Practices and Sacred Sites,” requires the U.S. government to: 1) accommodate access to and ceremonial use of American Indian sacred sites by Indian religious practitioners; and 2) avoid adversely affecting the physical integrity of such sacred sites. Where appropriate, agencies are to maintain the confidentiality of sacred sites.
The curation crises

Since World War II, as a result of the preservation compliance laws that were passed in the 1960s and 1970s, tens of millions of artifacts have been collected by archaeologists and historians in the U.S. Adequate curation and storage space has been severely lacking. New standards for curation, including strict environmental controls, have greatly increased the costs of storage.

Greater attention to public archaeology, education, and outreach

In the past 30 years, since the passage of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, the continuing flow of artifacts and information, as well as the evolution of field methodologies and recording standards, has sharpened the ability to focus on the important aspects and attributes of a rich and diverse cultural heritage. In fact, American archaeologists often cite these success stories as principle arguments and justification for continually building and adding to this vast resource base. However, in our enthusiasm to enforce a bevy of laws and protection mandates, we have sometimes lost sight of the ultimate purpose and raison d’être of the compliance process: to provide public enjoyment and appreciation for the rich diversity of past human experiences. Archaeologists are realizing that they have a moral as well as a legal obligation to encourage and participate in programs that attempt to effectively communicate technically generated information to the lay public (JAMESON 1999, p. 2).

As an example of this recognition, during the 1990s, more programs and funds have been expended by the Society for American Archaeology (SAA) on education than any other activity.

The leadership role of the National Park Service

Historical mission and policy

Among the best equipped to meet this challenge, at least in the federal domain, is the U.S. National Park Service (NPS). The mission or raison d’être of the U.S. National Park Service is to lead America’s conservation movement, including the stewardship of historical resources. Many of these objectives are expressed in the “partnership” activities of the NPS. They include the various historic preservation programs through which the NPS gives grants or other forms of aid or recognition of important resources in the culture of the United States. The mission of the National Park Service has expanded from managing the places that are set aside as America’s national parks to leading the conservation and preservation movement in the United States by managing those parks and also managing other national-level conservation programs.
A National Park Service project is currently underway to strengthen the relationship between archaeology and public interpretation and ultimately to improve how archaeology is presented to the public. Archaeologists, interpreters, and museum educators are collaborating in developing a curriculum that can be used by NPS in training employees in the three career fields. They will be trained together in the skills and abilities (shared competencies) needed to carry out a successful interpretation program. Among the main precepts of the curriculum are the needs for interdisciplinary communication and for sensitive interpretation to multicultural audiences. The initiative stems from a service-wide push to improve training and development of its employees and from efforts in the Southeast Region of NPS to promote better methods for interpreting archaeological resources.

Other exemplary federal programs

The U.S. Bureau of Land Management’s “Intrigue of the Past” program was designed to combat the vandalism and theft of archeological resources by educating young citizens to value and conserve the past. The program targets teachers and their students in the fourth through twelfth grades (about ages 10 to 18 years) and consists of three integral components: quality education materials; in-service and pre-service training for teachers in archeology education, and on-going professional development for Intrigue educators (MOE and LETTS 1998: 24-29).

The U.S. National Forest Service’s “Passport in Time” is a national program designed to give volunteers an opportunity to assist in survey, excavation and restoration of significant historic and archaeological sites on public land. The program also emphasizes sensitive interpretation and relevancy to Native American history and culture.

“Battlefield” archaeology

One emerging specialty in U.S. historical archaeology studies is in the realm of what could be called “battlefield” archaeology.

This work is based on the assumption that military sites exhibit a military site pattern with a regimented and uniform construction layout, architectural artifacts dominating the assemblage, and with personal artifacts being predominantly male and military oriented. The military, because of its material culture, is an archeologically recognizable unit. The military is a rigidly structured and stratified sub-cultural unit by its very nature. The of-
ficers assume the higher authority and status; in effect becoming the various levels of staff and line managers. The enlisted personnel, since they bear the brunt of waiting for or being committed to combat, are lower on the class scale. They are easily equated to working class in the greater society. Military sites are easily defined archeologically, and are usually relatively compact social, cultural, and physical units; which make them ideal study sites. Military sites also have unique aspects, that are related to their function; the prevention or making of war. In that area the military site offers a unique perspective on the behavioral aspects of a culture or cultures in conflict (Scott and Hunt 1998).

A battlefield, compared to a fortification, might be expected to be the least likely place to find archeologically definable behavioral patterns.

But, those who engage in combat fight in established manners and patterns in which they have been trained. It is precisely this training in proper battlefield behavior that results in the deposition of artifacts that can be recovered by archeological means and interpreted in anthropological perspectives.

Archaeologists have demonstrated that battlefield studies can yield information on combatant positions used during the course of the battle.

They can also provide details of dress, equipage, and in some cases individual movements. Archaeological investigations can retrieve information on troop deployment, firing positions, fields of fire, and weapon types present.

Studies of artifact patterning can also reveal unit or individual movement during the battle, weapon trajectory, and range of firing by determining forces of impact. Battlefields viewed in an anthropological context should be seen as the physical and violent expression of a culture or cultures in conflict (Scott and Hunt 1998).

Recent battlefield archaeology at parks such as Saratoga (Snow 1981), Custer Battlefield (Scott and Connor 1986; Scott and Fox 1987; Scott et al. 1989), and Monroe’s Crossroads (Scott and Hunt 1998) has confirmed the contributions of this emerging specialty among U.S. archaeologists.

John J. Jameson Jr.*
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Appendix

Transcript of Internet discussion/conference between John Jameson and the participants in the University of Siena’s “Parks and Museums” course, 9:30-10:55 am, Dec. 18, 1997.

[I had given (e-mailed) them a suggested topical outline and accompanying graphics (attached), which they projected on a screen before the participants prior to and during the discussion. The general theme of the discussion was of their choosing, but I tried to adapt my experience to the subject matter. I had also suggested that, for additional background to the discussion, they look at the SEAC web site. They told me that they had printed out the SEAC web pages and had distributed copies to the course participants prior to our Internet conference. We used the CU-SEEME video conferencing program that is available for free downloading on the Internet.] – John Jameson, 12/18/97.

* [John Jameson]: I am on line now.
* [Parks and Museums]: We are on line too.
* [John Jameson]: Have you received the 7 additional graphics I sent today?
* [John Jameson]: If you desire it, I will be glad to expand the outline of the lecture for the publication. If so, please tell me what subjects you would like me to expand for the publication.
* [Parks and Museums]: We are downloading the latest graphics.
* [Parks and Museums]:... 9 messages in all
*Parks and Museums*: Dear Mr. Jameson, my name is Andrea Zifferero. I am in charge of this course and I am glad to know you in this remote way. I have just one problem: I would like to let people attending this course have the proper time to read your text. I suggest to maintain this contact, in order to put some questions to you.

*John Jameson*: That is Ok with me. I am sorry if the graphics are not very clear.

*Parks and Museums*: Mr. Jameson, we are ready for the contact.

*Parks and Museums*: Are you there?

*John Jameson*: Yes.

*Parks and Museums*: Ok. First of all, what’s the weather like in Florida?

*John Jameson*: It is very sunny and nice. You should come here!

*Parks and Museums*: We are very sorry you couldn’t come here. I hope there will be another occasion to meet in a next future.

*John Jameson*: I would very much to come another time—with more lead time, I think I could come there.

*Parks and Museums*: We would like to have some more information about the professional situation of archaeologist in USA, please.

*John Jameson*: Can you be more specific? There are many jobs, but the competition is great.

*Parks and Museums*: Can you tell us if there are many unemployed archaeologists in USA?

*John Jameson*: Not very many. Most students can find a job, if only as a field crew member or laboratory worker at first.

*Parks and Museums*: What are the relations between NPS and individual units that you mentioned?

*Parks and Museums*: Do they simply apply national strategies or they can elaborate their own ones?

*John Jameson*: The units make up the entire national park system. Employees of NPS manage the individual units (parks, sites, monuments, national preserves, etc.).

*John Jameson*: They have a national strategy (regulations and policies), but each unit prepares separate planning documents.

*Parks and Museums*: Can you give us more information regarding artifacts collected in last 50 years without inadequate storage space?

*John Jameson*: There are millions of artifacts collected in response to government-required laws and regulations for development. Not enough storage space is available. Also, government-required curation and storage standards have improved, making it more expensive to store and preserve artifacts.

*Parks and Museums*: Can you gave us an idea on the number of visitors per year? Secondly, is this number enough to cover the expenses and maintain the whole system?

*John Jameson*: I do not know the exact numbers. Some popular parks (like Yellowstone Park in Wyoming) have 2-3 million visitors a year. I guess the numbers for the entire system would be 20 million or more.

*Parks and Museums*: Can you indicate the “top ten” units that succeeded in break-even point (except Mount Rushmore)?

*John Jameson*: Our budget is not adequate to cover the costs of maintenance.

*John Jameson*: Do you mean that did not lose money overall? That would be difficult to determine, since some income comes from the sale of contracted concessions and entrance fees.
*Parks and Museums*: How many people work full-time in Yellowstone Park?

*John Jameson*: About 100 would be my guess – much more during the high tourist season in the summer.

*Parks and Museums*: I could get more exact figures at a later time if you desire.

*John Jameson*: Can you tell us how many employees have an university degree? Do you have volunteers working in your units?

*Parks and Museums*: About 90% have degrees. We have many volunteers. Many parks depend on volunteers to keep the park running.

*John Jameson*: I think 90% have degrees. We have many volunteers. Many parks depend on volunteers to keep the park running.

*Parks and Museums*: Are you planning new NPS units in the USA? And, if so, how many and where?

*John Jameson*: The U.S. Congress creates new parks. There are about 2-3 added each year. New parks will be created in every region of the USA.

*Parks and Museums*: In your opinion, is the demand of new units come from the national strategies or from general public? Do the people support the creation of new parks?

*John Jameson*: From all these sources. The public usually supports the creation of new parks, because it will increase tourism and local income, and because of the prestige factors.

*Parks and Museums*: Americans are in general more patriotic than europeans. We wonder to what extend parks related to the National ethos, like Gettysburg or Alamo, are visited during the year in relation to those connected to aboriginal populations of North America.

*John Jameson*: I would guess that the “patriotic” sites are visited more, but nearly all parks have heavy visitation. There is increased interest recently in Native American sites, even by non-Indians. I think it speaks well for our public education about archaeology and prehistory.

*Parks and Museums*: We would like to have some more information about the Congress that will take place next year in Australia. Do you know if there’s a web site dedicated to this?

*John Jameson*: The organizers have stated that the Australian Parks and Wildlife Service will post a web site soon. I can send the URL to you when I receive it.

*Parks and Museums*: There is also an international listserve for heritage interpretation, and I can send that e-mail address to you also.

*Parks and Museums*: Are the policies concerning the parks and their management evolving in new agendas like, for example green issues, sustainability?

*John Jameson*: I am organizing a session at the Australian conference. Do you know of persons who might want to participate?

*Parks and Museums*: We are considering your kind offer and we will let you know in a near future. Unfortunately we have to

*John Jameson*: I did not receive the last sentence.

*Parks and Museums*: close this session. We would like to thank you very much for your participation. Grazie e a risentirci presto.

*Parks and Museums*: You can’t hear, but there’s an applause dedicated to you.

*John Jameson*: I have enjoyed the communication very much! I hope to get to Italy and University of Siena some day.

*Parks and Museums*: Goodbye.

*John Jameson*: Goodbye, and I will look forward to future communications!