1

Archaeology as a Shared Vision

Barbara J. Little

Why do archaeology? That simple question can render an archaeologist speechless, not because there is no answer but because there are many valid answers. One straightforward response is that we do archaeology—and spend public money on it—because archaeology provides benefits not only for professional archaeological research but also for the many participants and publics who use and value it.

While the research values of archaeology are not the focus of this book, those values underlie and support the greater public benefits. Research values support the authenticity that is basic to public benefits (Lipe, this volume). The complexity of the research process, however, may be lost in translation. Discussing the controversial Kennewick case, David Hurst Thomas (2000:xxxviii) points to the power of the media to refocus and sensationalize research results, sometimes with unfortunate and unintended effects. There is no question that archaeologists need to do a better job at identifying and communicating the public benefits of archaeology. One aim of this book is to invite more dialogue among archaeologists and the many publics interested in the field.

The authors of this book illustrate some of the public benefits that extend beyond archaeological research, using sites and artifacts for such purposes as education, community cohesion, entertainment, and economic development. Archaeological research finds its way into textbooks, trade books, other sciences and humanities, museum exhibits, site tours, television shows, magazines, computer games, Internet sites, and school curricula.

The purpose of this volume is to illustrate, promote, and enhance the public benefits of archaeology. Involvement of a diverse and committed public is one important theme. A substantial percentage of the authors

consists of people from outside the discipline, and fewer than a third write from academic institutions. Readers will find a variety of writing styles conveying a range of viewpoints. Even such a variety of authors can only begin to suggest the complexity and variety of the intersection between archaeology and the public.

Archaeologists have long suspected a widespread interest and support among the American public for their work. A national telephone survey by Harris Interactive in the summer of 1999 provided data to support that suspicion. The report summarizes the knowledge that Americans have about archaeology and archaeological sites (Ramos and Duganne 2000). In general, Americans believe that archaeology is important and is valuable and are interested in learning about the past. They believe that archaeology is important because we improve the future by learning about the past and because archaeology helps us understand the modern world. Almost all Americans believe that archaeological objects and sites have educational value. The majority view is that archaeological objects and sites also have aesthetic or artistic value, express personal heritage, and have spiritual value. The research shows that the majority of the public believes that there are and should be laws to protect archaeological resources regardless of where they are found.

Asking the question "What are the public benefits of archaeology?" invites further questions. What are the public benefits of heritage, knowledge of the past, inquiries into the human condition? How do we, here and now, fit into the expansive course of history? These are not questions only relevant in a remote Ivory Tower; they are questions for each of us. These are questions for citizens to address in pondering their relationship with the land and the insights it contains.

Author Jean Auel (1991) sees the value of archaeology in defining our common humanity as defined by compassion, curiosity, art, and invention. She is convinced that ancient lifeways, relevant to all people around the globe, can convince us of our common needs and desires. Indeed, communities all over the country have found that archaeology can bring them together by providing a sense of continuity (see McManamon 1991 and this volume). This benefit of archaeological sites—and of buildings and other historic resources—is partly due to "the universal role that the material culture environment plays in providing cultural continuity and perspective, and hence in linking past, present and future within the experience of any given human generation" (Lipe 1984:2).

The question of "who owns the past" has been raised time and again in the context of the modern preservation movement. Some dismiss this question as a paradox that cannot be resolved (e.g., Chamberlin 1979). Others are far more emphatic in affirming that the past belongs to everyone (see Fagan, this volume). The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, for example, is clear that civilization is made up of contributions from all peoples and that all humanity shares a common heritage (UNESCO 1970). Federico Mayor, former director general of UNESCO, wrote in 1989: "One of the most recent concepts to emerge in our time [is] that of the cultural heritage of mankind as a whole: through its realization that it shares a common destiny, mankind is finding out that it has a shared past, and the history of each country belongs to everyone" (quoted in Timken 1993:93). Lowenthal (1981:236) writes that "the past belongs to everyone: the need to return home, to recall the view, to refresh a memory, to retrace a heritage, is universal and essential." Ernestene Green (1984:270) acknowledges that "archaeologists have become used to the idea that archaeological resources on public lands belong to all Americans and are held in public trust."

Explicitly discussing the public trust, Ruthann Knudson and Bennie Keel (1995) write that the common history of a nation is recognized as the common property of the group. Archaeology contributes to the "grand enterprise of creating knowledge about the undeniable common thread of our humanness" (Keel 1995:8). They also recognize, however, that there is some opposition by native peoples to archaeology, in spite of the belief common among archaeologists that their discipline truly is in the public interest.

It is part of the ethical code of professional archaeologists that the past belongs to everyone, but ethics and values often differ between tribes and professional archaeologists (Society for American Archaeology 1996). If the past indeed belongs to everyone, it is also true that not all parts of the past may be freely shared. The Zuni in New Mexico, for example, wish to guard religious information (Ferguson 1984; see Swidler et al. 1997). There is a classic conflict between the "archaeological ethic of freedom of inquiry into all categories of data without hindrance and the Native American ethics that remains of Indian culture belong to Indians, that it is tribal prerogative to decide what investigations are undertaken on tribal land, and that certain classes of objects are so sacred that their study would diminish their religious power" (Adams 1984:236). Many tribes, of course, have a

great interest in archaeology and support their own archaeology programs (Echo-Hawk 1993; Swidler et al. 1997; Dongoske et al. 2000; Kuwanwisiwma, this volume).

Archaeologists and indigenous groups are likely to have quite different interests in the events of the past, but there is universal concern for the past (Layton 1994). Mark Leone and Robert Preucel (1992:132) recognize multiple interests in the past, joining many archaeologists in their call for more dialogue: "making the past belongs not to scientists, nor to specific ethnic groups, but to all of us by virtue of our common humanity. However, we do not hold with the hyperrelativist view that all positions are equally valid, but rather we argue that all positions deserve a voice in the context of arriving at archaeological conclusions. Archaeologists have rarely, if ever, seriously asked what are Native Americans' views of their past. The active engagement of such groups, not their exclusion, may be an effective strategy for democratizing the past."

Alison Wylie (1994:10) writes of the dual capacity of archaeology to "incorporate and reproduce racist, nationalist, and other agendas, *and* its democratising power, its capacity to counter 'mythologies' . . . and to support decisive critical reexamination of the assumptions that both inform and are promoted by these agendas." With such capacities, archaeology is profoundly political, and archaeologists have responsibility to other scholars and to the public interested in what archaeologists sometimes consider their own material (Wylie 1994:13). There are many interested publics besides Native Americans, but Native Americans and the archaeologists who study their past have an inescapable and problematic relationship (Swidler et al. 1997).

The use and abuse of science is a long and disturbing story. Scientific racism has left a bitter legacy. As Thomas Crist (this volume) explains, the major source of conflict between archaeologists and Native Americans is the treatment of Native American human remains. In his recent *Skull Wars: Kennewick Man, Archaeology, and the Battle for Native American Identity*, Thomas (2000) describes the history of that conflict. The ongoing tension between archaeology and the people whose past is studied concerns the ownership of the past and the worldwide issue of intellectual property rights (see also Kuwanwisiwma, this volume). Thomas is tentatively hopeful for the future (2000:260): "Once the fundamental dilemma has been defined—that archaeologists no longer exercise sole control over the ancient American past—perhaps the two sides will be freed to form new partnerships and build new bridges."

The poet Gary Snyder has written that for Americans, the "real work" is becoming native to North America. He means that each of us "non-native" Americans must accept citizenship in the continent and come to understand that our loyalties are to the place where we live (Moyers 1995:66). Without an embracing of a common history of the land, it is difficult to imagine resolving the uneasiness of a diverse immigrant nation cohabiting with impoverished indigenous nations. Archaeology is one of the paths that can help us find our way to the elusive connections between all Americans and America.

Many Publics, Many Benefits

There is no single public and no single past. "If we are to develop a new understanding of the past, one that appreciates the complexity of its messages, then we must recognize and learn to deal with a public that is equally diverse" (Molyneaux 1994:6). Members of the public are increasingly aware of the benefits of archaeology, and they are actively involved in guarding those benefits. The many publics who value and use archaeology do so in many ways. Archaeologists and non-archaeologists have entered into a dialogue about respecting all of the varied values of the archaeological heritage.

There is a further tension between national and local heritage. National heritage building tends to lean toward more homogeneous versions of heritage. Celebrations of local identity, on the other hand, often instigated by tourism concerns, tend toward creating heterogeneous heritage (see Molyneaux 1994; Tunbridge and Ashworth 1996). In considering the relationship between their discipline and nationalism, some archaeologists are quite hopeful that a critical self-awareness can make archaeology a positive force (e.g., Atkinson et al. 1996; Bond and Gilliam 1994; Kohl and Fawcett 1995; Rowlands 1994). Brian Molyneaux (1994:12) is confident of the goodwill of archaeologists, writing that a goal of the contributors to *The Presented Past*—and, by extension, of other archaeologists working to promote the public benefits of archaeology—is "to achieve a greater measure of social justice in the study of the past in their own countries and situations. They are all motivated by the belief that, if there is going to be a shared vision of the future, there must be a recognition of the multiple pasts that have determined the present in which we stand."

Archaeologists need to be aware of the social and political roles of their discipline if archaeology is truly to be of benefit to the public. Archaeology

can empower local groups by supporting local identities and cultural heritage, but it can also fuel ethnic nationalism and distort the past to serve dangerous political goals (e.g., Molyneaux 1994; Rowlands 1994; Wylie 1994). Michael Rowlands (1994) cautions that the promotion of local identity and "heritage" may divert engagement from national politics, thereby effectively omitting local communities from broader political dialogue. Molyneaux (1994:9) notes that "this problem, that the past is an essential, but dangerous, social need, is a conundrum" and suggests that the challenge is to make people aware of and respectful of the past but not so burdened by it that they cannot adapt to changing conditions.

Communities of many types find that archaeology benefits them in various ways. Francis McManamon (this volume) highlights two types of benefits: those heritage benefits that derive from connections with people in the past; and those research or "history" benefits that derive from archaeological study in the present. Sharing his personal perspective as the Hopi tribal preservation officer, Leigh Kuwanwisiwma (this volume) emphasizes the need for true collaboration between living descendants and archaeologists. Adrian Praetzellis (this volume) describes some of the practical public benefits to the Chinese-American community in Sacramento and the African-American community in Oakland. Crist (this volume) addresses benefits accruing to African-American communities in New York and Philadelphia.

In addition to a large public avidly interested in knowing about archaeological research, there is a large and active avocational community. People who make a living in a wide range of professions find that archaeology offers a satisfying avocation or even a second career. The rewards of patient, often painstaking, sometimes difficult work include the satisfaction of making real contributions to our understanding of the past, the thrill of discovery, and the joy of learning new skills. Lynn Harris (this volume) describes innovative cooperation between sports divers and professional archaeologists in South Carolina, South Africa, and Namibia.

Earthwatch, Elderhostel, Crow Canyon, the Center for American Archaeology, and formal field schools through colleges and universities provide some of the growing opportunities for individuals to participate in archaeology. The Boy Scouts of America recently introduced an Archaeology Merit Badge with carefully designed requirements, and the Girl Scouts are incorporating archaeology into the specifications for several of their badges. Federal agencies such as the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and the United States Forest Service also offer opportunities. Many participants in such programs find themselves "bitten by the archaeology bug." They join the avocational societies in their state and become active contributors to research.

The Forest Service has run the popular Passport in Time (PIT) project since 1991 as part of its Windows on the Past initiative. An average of 2,000 volunteers a year work with archaeologists and historians on such things as excavating archaeological sites, recording oral history, and restoring historic structures (USDA-USFS 1995).

In addition to serving local communities through research and promotion of heritage, and in addition to engaging a large and dedicated avocational community, archaeology also serves other disciplines. Archaeology is truly an interdisciplinary science. It has borrowed from every scientific and humanistic discipline. Physics has given us radiocarbon dating; botany and zoology allow us to analyze past environments and the use of plants and animals; cultural anthropology leads us to living societies to help interpret past cultures; history offers us to the rich documentation of the recent past. The list could go on and on: geology, soil science, art history, geography, materials science, engineering, astronomy. From the perspective of a historian, James Whittenburg (this volume) describes the contribution of archaeology in changing the way historians think about early English life in the Chesapeake colonies. It is not surprising that the tools of archaeology are expansive; after all, it is the whole of human history that archaeologists study.

Similarly, archaeology can contribute to nearly every discipline from which it borrows. For example, archaeology reveals information on environmental stability and change. People have contributed to the success and failure of ecosystems for thousands of years, and they have coped with varying degrees of success. In coping with current environmental trends, archaeology can help in surprising ways. William Rathje (this volume) demonstrates the importance of "garbology," which has made direct contributions to solid waste management and environmental policy.

Archaeology provides important perspectives for other branches of anthropology, including physical anthropology, and forensic anthropologists are trained on excavations. Archaeology has also been of service to law enforcement agencies, particularly in the exacting investigation of crime scenes and the identification of illicit burials. Thomas Crist (this volume) demonstrates the relevance of skeletal analysis to current events, from the

prosecution of war crimes to the fight against racism. Crist promotes the excavation of historic cemeteries as a tool to educate people about science and to dispel racist ideas based on misunderstandings of biology.

Learning from an Authentic Past

Anyone reading the literature on public archaeology will find that much of archaeologists' interest in public outreach stems from the need to protect and preserve archaeological resources. Site preservation was not always a widespread concern. However, rapidly increasing threats to sites have caught the attention of both the profession and the public. Archaeologists have come to recognize their responsibilities to the record of human heritage and, importantly, to the peoples whose heritage is chronicled in archaeological sites (Vitella 1996).

It should not be surprising, therefore, that the benefits of preserving sites often are couched in terms of benefit to archaeology through the creation of a public interested in and supportive of archaeology (e.g., Binks et al. 1988; Davis 1989, 1991). Preserving sites is essential if we are to preserve the public benefits of archaeology. George Smith and John Ehrenhard (this volume) recognize the remains of the past not only as our national patrimony but also as humanity's lifeline.

The issue of authenticity surfaces many times in the chapters of this volume. Authenticity certainly requires the preservation of places and objects. It also requires appreciating a great diversity and complexity in the past. If we are fortunate, such appreciation translates into a better understanding and celebration of diversity today.

We are familiar with the common statement that we can learn from the past to improve the future. In the Harris Interactive survey of public perceptions of archaeology in the United States, respondents answered the question "How important do you feel archaeology is in today's society?" Ramos and Duganne (2000), in analyzing the response, generalize that the public's view about the importance of archaeology is influenced by interest in the past and seeing the value of archaeology as learning about the past to improve the future.

Whether learning about the past takes place at historic places or in the classroom, one of the pervasive ironies of our time is that we insist on editing our understanding of the past, often focusing nearly exclusively on what is judged good or patriotically appropriate (see Metcalf, this volume). But, indeed, how can we expect to learn from the past if we don't see it complete with mistakes and disgraces as well as actions we judge as heroic?

Thomas (this volume) observes that museums, in common with archaeology, retain great public appeal because they offer authenticity. Things that can be trusted as real are highly valued, particularly in a cynical world. Esther White (this volume) describes the experience of integrating archaeology into the programs at Mount Vernon. Archaeology enhances the visitor experience and makes historic house museums even more compelling destinations than they already are.

In a broad view of museums, surely national parks are some of our most visited national museums. Visitors to many national parks see the results of archaeology. Parks in the Southwest, such as Mesa Verde and Chaco Canyon, come to mind most readily because the spectacular ruins have been well publicized, but nearly all parks have archaeological resources. Often the archaeology is less visible than at the two parks mentioned but is nevertheless fundamental to the park's purpose. Reconstructions based on archaeological research are centerpieces at several national parks. Some of these are Saugus Iron Works in Massachusetts, Fort Stanwix in New York, Grand Portage in Minnesota, the Outer Line Cabins at Valley Forge in Pennsylvania, Bent's Old Fort in Colorado, Fort Union Trading Post in North Dakota, Arkansas Post in Arkansas, and parts of Fort Larned and Fort Scott in Kansas.

Many parks offer a variety of ways for visitors to learn about archaeology: tours, pamphlets, interpretive trails and roadside displays, films, and book sales in the visitor center. In most national parks archaeologists are not directly involved with the public but provide essential information to the interpretive staff, who then convey it to visitors. Less frequently, visitors see actual excavation in progress and get to talk to archaeologists. Paul Shackel (this volume) underscores that it is crucial to share with visitors the intellectual content of archaeological interpretations rather than simply the mechanics of excavation. He argues for making national presentations about the past more inclusive by telling stories about all classes and all time periods.

One of the public benefits of archaeology is the same as that of history and science: an educated citizenry. Understanding, or at least awareness, of the methodological and theoretical tools that are used to make interpretations equips people to think critically and to make judgments about the information with which we are bombarded every day. Because stories

about the past are used for many purposes—both noble and nefarious—citizens must be in a position to judge those stories for themselves. Learning the methods, logic, important questions, and some of the results of scientific inquiry helps us all to sort the truth from lies and misrepresentations.

The National Standards for History set out the significance of history for the educated citizen. One of the primary qualities history conveys is competence in a multicultural world.

> Today's students, more than ever before, need also a comprehensive understanding of the history of the world, and of the peoples of many different cultures and civilizations who have developed ideas, institutions, and ways of life different from the students' own. From a balanced and inclusive world history students may gain an appreciation both of the world's many cultures and of their shared humanity and common problems. . . . Especially important, an understanding of the history of the world's many cultures can contribute to fostering the kind of mutual patience, respect, and civic courage required in our increasingly pluralistic society and our increasingly interdependent world. (National Center for History in the Schools 1996:1)

Although post-contact history is clearly the focus of the national history standards in the United States, the writers recognize that all American citizens need some understanding of indigenous societies. Three of eight standards for kindergarten through fourth grade include some understanding of early native peoples. Standard 3A, for example, reads: "The student understands the history of indigenous peoples who first lived in his or her state or region." The first standard for United States history for grades five through twelve reads: "Comparative characteristics of societies in the Americas, Western Europe, and Western Africa that increasingly interacted after 1450. Standard 1A expects that "the student understands the patterns of change in indigenous societies in the Americas up to the Columbian voyages" and that the student can draw upon data from archaeology and geology as well as upon Native American beliefs.

The national history standards provide a wedge—the need for competence in a multicultural world—that opens the possibility of archaeology and Native American traditional knowledge becoming integral to the curriculum. This goal has not yet been achieved. What is excluded from most public education curricula around the world is the prehistoric past and the past of many indigenous, minority, or oppressed groups. The step between

contempt for prehistoric people as primitive and contempt for contemporary nonagricultural or nonindustrial groups may be far too easy (MacKenzie and Stone 1994). For example, Shirley Blancke and John Peters Slow Turtle (1994) connect native children's well-being and the teaching of their culture and history in the schools.

Educators know that children need to learn how to live in a multicultural society within a multicultural world. Each of the three education chapters here—by Moe, Metcalf, and Jones and Longstreth—address this concern. The authors are convinced that archaeology can teach some of the essential skills for coping with an increasingly complex world. Fay Metcalf stresses that archaeology is one source of authenticity that can set the record straight by dismantling many of the myths and lies believed by so many children and adults. Jeanne Moe describes Project Archaeology, one of the aims of which is to allow children to learn about other cultures and other times and to understand current diversity better. Jones and Longstreth tell us about the ZiNj Education Project, where science becomes fun and challenging, creating a basis for lifelong learning. The approach of the ZiNj program fits in well with current advances in environmental education. Kindling excitement and appreciation is much more effective as a tool for learning and lifelong interest than is delivering messages of loss, fear, and doom (see Sobel 1996).

Many states and professional archaeological organizations have flourishing educational programs for children, as do several private archaeological consulting companies (see Smardz and Smith 2000). Several federal agencies, charged with the stewardship of our national historic places, design and contribute to educational programs. Two outgrowths of the Utah Interagency Task Force on Cultural Resources are discussed here by Moe and by Jones and Longstreth. Archaeologists employed in the public sector frequently give public talks; construct traveling exhibits; create school programs, tours, traveling trunks, curriculum guides, and lesson plans; and participate in archaeology week or month celebrations organized by states. For example, the National Park Service in the U.S. Department of Interior has a Public Education Initiative (see Jameson 1997) as well as the active involvement of many parks.

Promoting the Public Benefits of Archaeology

Archaeological sites and the thousands of years of heritage they contain are enshrined in the public memory in several ways. Archaeological sites

become part of the nation's sense of itself through tourism at the sites themselves; virtual tours on the Internet and via other electronic media; promotion in magazines, books, and movies and on television; education in museums; local exhibits seen in daily life; and in the official state and national registers of important historic places (Little 1999). Carol Shull (this volume) states that for much of the public, the National Register of Historic Places is the most accessible source of information about archaeological sites. Nominations summarize conclusions from technical reports otherwise unavailable to most of us.

Promoting public benefits of archaeology requires a wide range of tools. Formal commemoration is one tool. Local ordinances are another. Mary Grzeskowiak Ragins (this volume) explains the balancing of interests that makes such an ordinance work in the city of Santa Fe. Grassroots pride in local heritage is clear in Santa Fe, but it is not always evident elsewhere. Writing of the importance of visible reminders of the past to create a place in time, Laszio Agosthazi notes that even tiny details can suggest the past and enrich the townscape. In an ICOMOS collection on archaeological heritage management, he writes (Agosthazi 1993:2): "Areas where historic remains are shown have a strong influence with their rich contents on transforming human cons[c]iousness. I believe that every possibility of apprehending the past—literally each available scrap that remained—should be seized and utilized. These may include the presentation of fragments of reliefs standing in parks or fixed on walls with appropriate explanatory text added. I should call these marks of the past as small lamps helping people to dispel the obscurity of the past."

The vision of surrounding people with visible clues to the past is shared by Terry Goddard (this volume). The city of Phoenix, Arizona, is surrounded and underlain by archaeological sites, but public appreciation of this fact was not a foregone conclusion. Goddard urges archaeologists to make archaeology politically relevant, especially through the mechanism of public art, which has great power to convey a sense of community and continuity.

Whether one lives in a community with visible reminders of the past or chooses to travel to historic tourist destinations, there is nothing quite so compelling as personal experience of a place to begin to understand its significance. Sightseers, tourists, and locals all visit such places and there is clear economic benefit to capturing the tourist trade. Communities and the managers of travel destinations also see tourism's drawbacks of short- and long-term damage to both resources and community privacy. We need a

careful balance between providing opportunities and hospitality for visitors and protecting often fragile resources. Katherine Slick's how-to guide (this volume) encourages archaeologists to take an "activist" approach to promoting tourism, while understanding that tourism is not an unmixed blessing.

Satisfying interpretation may require a balance among a realistic variety of perspectives in presentations about the past. Interpreters in many locations have become more sensitive to Native American culture, particularly since the passage of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA). They have reassessed exhibits, removing offensive displays such as human skeletons. For example, at Aztec Ruins National Monument, a temporary exhibit label from the early 1990s read: "We used to think nothing was wrong with showing objects from the so-called 'Warrior Burial.' But after consulting with the Hopi Tribe, we learned that exhibiting those burial items was highly insensitive. The Hopis were deeply disturbed about their separation from the person accompanying them as well as their display. We have removed the items, and will develop an appropriate replacement exhibit."

Peter Stone (1994:16) critiques static views of the past and offers archaeology as a way to challenge and change interpretation constantly: "While many (?most) museums and historic sites seem to be concerned with the presentation of a frequently static, well-understood past that reflects the achievements of a specific period—and frequently a particular section of society—as part of a national inheritance . . . modern archaeology is more concerned with questioning the validity of any interpretations or presentations of the past."

In sharing the excitement and value of their ever-changing discipline, archaeologists are using media beyond public schools and museums. For the "virtual visitor," the World Wide Web offers nearly unlimited opportunities in the wide world of archaeology. Terry Childs (this volume) demonstrates how that electronic medium provides ways to promote heritage, educational, and economic as well as research benefits of archaeology.

Unfortunately, it is almost a truism that archaeologists write in a jargon-laden, obfuscating way. Jargon in any specialized discipline develops as a shorthand to make communication more efficient, but to the uninitiated, such language is obscure and confusing. Writing for public audiences is a daunting prospect for most archaeologists. Peter Young and Mitch Allen offer a compelling pair of chapters in this volume about different aspects of the writing process. There is a large audience for archaeology,

and people deserve the very best efforts of archaeologists to write well. Clear writing is needed whether one is writing magazine articles, books, Internet pages, or television scripts. Brian Fagan (this volume) reminds archaeologists of their identity as storytellers and of the responsibilities that come with the profession.

The Power of Archaeology

Following are a few of the many uses and benefits of archaeology that are illustrated by the chapters in this volume. Tourism councils, museums, and parks have learned that authentic archaeological projects and findings bring people in and keep them coming back. Community leaders find that archaeology can build community links in the present as well as the past. Planners and citizens find that archaeology can contribute to a sustainable community where cultural heritage is valued and nurtured.

Cultural groups find that archaeology can contribute to the preservation of their history and tradition. Avocational archaeologists find the opportunity to make a direct contribution to research about the past. Historians find that archaeology provides both new information to complement the written record and important new questions about the past. Writers, newspaper reporters, and television producers find that archaeology is educational entertainment that sells. Teachers and students find that archaeology can help teach principles of math, science, geography, and logic as well as history and human diversity.

As M. P. Pearson (1993:227) has noted, "through archaeology we visit different times and different cultures, with some aspects similar to our own lives and others very different. In this exploration of sameness/difference we may come to see just how arbitrary and historically rooted are our own "universal truths."

. . .

The turn of the millennium has encouraged a great deal of stocktaking around the world: looking to the future and looking back to gain perspective and lessons from the past. The interest in heritage that has been growing over the past few decades is currently booming, and it is not likely to be a passing fad. Archaeological sites and collections are part of our heritage, both globally and locally. The study of archaeology has the potential to teach about the contingency of all human endeavor. As we expand our view of the past to include the struggles, successes, and failures of all peoples from all times and situations, our wisdom—and compassion—ought also to expand.

References

Adams, E. C. 1984. Archaeology and the Native American: A Case at Hopi. In *Ethics and Values in Archaeology*, ed. E. L. Green, 236–42. New York: Free Press.

Agosthazi, L. 1993. Monuments as Managing Factors in Forming Townscape. In *Archaeological Heritage Management*, ICOMOS International Scientific Symposium, 10th General Assembly, Sri Lanka, 1–3. Colombo, Sri Lanka: ICOMOS.

Atkinson, J. A., I. Banks, and J. O'Sullivan (eds.). 1996. *Nationalism and Archaeology: Scottish Archaeological Forum*. Glasgow: Cruithne Press.

Auel, J. 1991. Romancing the Public. In *Protecting the Past*, ed. G. S. Smith and J. E. Ehrenhard, 123–27. Boca Raton, Fla.: CRC Press.

Binks, G., J. Dyke, and P. Dagnall. 1988. *Visitors Welcome: A Manual on the Presentation and Interpretation of Archaeological Excavations*. London: English Heritage.

Blancke, S., and C.J.P. Slow Turtle. 1994. The Teaching of the Past of the Native Peoples of North America in U.S. Schools. In *The Excluded Past: Archaeology in Education*, ed. P. G. Stone and R. MacKenzie, 109–33. London: Routledge.

Bond, G. C., and A. Gilliam. 1994. Introduction. In *Social Construction of the Past: Representation as Power*, ed. G. C. Bond and A. Gilliam, 1–22. London: Routledge.

Chamberlin, E. R. 1979. *Preserving the Past*. London: J. M. Dent and Sons.

Davis, H. A. 1989. Learning by Doing: This Is No Way to Treat Archaeological Resources. In *Archaeological Heritage Management in the Modern World*, ed. H. Cleere, 275–79. London: Unwin Hyman.

———. 1991. Avocational Archaeology Groups: A Secret Weapon for Site Protection. In *Protecting the Past*, ed. G. S. Smith and J. E. Ehrenhard, 175–80. Boca Raton, Fla.: CRC Press.

Dongoske, K. E., M. Aldenderfer, and K. Doehner (eds.). 2000. *Working Together: Native Americans and Archaeologists*. Washington, D.C.: Society for American Archaeology.

Echo-Hawk, R. 1993. Working Together: Exploring Ancient Worlds. *SAA Bulletin* 11(4): 5–6.

Ferguson, T. J. 1984. Archaeological Ethics and Values in a Tribal Cultural Resource Management Program at the Pueblo of Zuni. In *Ethics and Values in Archaeology*, ed. E. L. Green, 224–35. New York: Free Press.

Green, E. L. 1984. Concluding Remarks. In *Ethics and Values in Archaeology*, ed. E. L. Green, 264–72. New York: Free Press.

Jameson, J. H., Jr. (ed.). 1997. *Presenting Archaeology to the Public: Digging for Truths*. Walnut Creek, Calif.: AltaMira Press.

Keel, B. C. 1995. The Public Trust. In *The Public Trust and the First Americans*, ed. R. Knudson and B. C. Keel, 7–8. Corvallis: Oregon State University Press for Center for the Study of the First Americans.

Knudson, R., and B. C. Keel (eds.). 1995. *The Public Trust and the First Americans*.

Corvallis: Oregon State University Press for Center for the Study of the First Americans.

Kohl, P. L., and C. Fawcett. 1995. *Nationalism, Politics, and the Practice of Archaeology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Layton, R. (ed.). 1994. *Who Needs the Past? Indigenous Values and Archaeology.* London: Routledge.

Leone, M. P., and R. W. Preucel. 1992. Archaeology in a Democratic Society: A Critical Theory Perspective. In *Quandaries and Quests: Visions of Archaeology's Future,* ed. L. Wandsnider, 115–34. Center for Archaeological Investigations, Occasional Paper no. 20. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University.

Lipe, W. D. 1984. Value and Meaning in Cultural Resources. In *Approaches to the Archaeological Heritage,* ed. Henry Cleere, 1–11. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Little, B. J. 1999. Nominating Archaeological Sites to the National Register of Historic Places: What's the Point? *SAA Bulletin* 17(4): 19.

Lowenthal, D. 1981. Conclusion: Dilemmas of Preservation. In *Our Past before Us: Why Do We Save It?* ed. D. Lowenthal and M. Binney, 213–37. London: Temple Smith.

MacKenzie, R., and P. G. Stone. 1994. Introduction: The Concept of the Excluded Past. In *The Excluded Past: Archaeology in Education,* ed. P. G. Stone and R. MacKenzie, 1–14. London: Routledge.

McManamon, F. P. 1991. The Many Publics for Archaeology. *American Antiquity* 56(1): 121–30.

Molyneaux, B. L. 1994. Introduction: The Represented Past. In *The Presented Past: Heritage, Museums and Education,* ed. Peter G. Stone and Brian L. Molyneaux, 1–13. London: Routledge.

Moyers, B. 1995. *The Language of Life: A Festival of Poets.* New York: Doubleday.

National Center for History in the Schools. 1996. *National Standards for History.* Basic edition. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Pearson, M. P. 1993. Visitors Welcome. In *Archaeological Resource Management in the UK: An Introduction,* ed. J. Hunter and I. Ralston, 225–31. Dover, N.H.: Alan Sutton, Inc.

Ramos, M., and D. Duganne. 2000. *Exploring Public Perceptions and Attitudes about Archaeology.* Prepared by Harris Interactive for the Society for American Archaeology. <http://www.saa.org>

Rowlands, M. 1994. The Politics of Identity in Archaeology. In *Social Construction of the Past: Representation as Power,* ed. G. C. Bond and A. Gilliam, 129–43. London: Routledge.

Smardz, K., and S. J. Smith (eds.). 2000. *The Archaeological Education Handbook: Sharing the Past with Kids.* Walnut Creek, Calif.: AltaMira Press.

Sobel, D. 1996. *Beyond Ecophobia: Reclaiming the Heart in Nature Education.* Great Barrington, Mass.: Orion Society.

Society for American Archaeology (SAA). 1996. Society for American Archaeology Principles of Archaeological Ethics. *American Antiquity* 61(3): 451–52.

Stone, P. G. 1994. Introduction: A Framework for Discussion. In *The Presented Past: Heritage, Museums and Education,* ed. P. G. Stone and B. L. Molyneaux, 15–28. London: Routledge.

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

Thomas, D. H. 2000. *Skull Wars: Kennewick Man, Archaeology, and the Battle for Native American Identity.* New York: Basic Books.

Timken, B. C. 1993. World Heritage Education: A Prototype for Teaching Young People. In *Archaeological Heritage Management,* ICOMOS International Scientific Symposium, 10th General Assembly, Sri Lanka, 92–99. Colombo, Sri Lanka: ICOMOS.

Tunbridge, J. E., and G. J. Ashworth. 1996. *Dissonant Heritage: The Management of the Past as a Resource in Conflict.* New York: John Wiley and Sons.

UNESCO. 1970. *Protection of Mankind's Cultural Heritage: Sites and Monuments.* Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

USDA-USFS. 1995. *Passport in Time Accomplishments,* Region 6. United States Department of Agriculture, United States Forest Service. Tucson, Arizona.

Vitella, K. D. (ed.). 1996. *Archaeological Ethics.* Walnut Creek, Calif.: AltaMira Press.

Wylie, A. 1994. Facts and Fictions: Writing Archaeology in a Different Voice. Reprinted in *Archaeological Theory: Progress or Posture?* ed. I. M. Mackenzie, 3–18. Brookfield, Vt.: Avebury/Ashgate Publishing Company.