

Cultural Resource Management in Contemporary Society

Perspectives on Managing and Presenting the Past



Edited by Francis P. McManamon and Alf Hatton

ROUTLEDGE



33

1 Introduction: considering cultural resource management in modern society

FRANCIS P. McMANAMON
AND ALF HATTON

WHAT ARE CULTURAL RESOURCES?

We began assembling this collection of chapters with a working title for the volume of *Archaeological Heritage Management in Modern Society*. After some thought and discussion, in part spurred by David Lowenthal's *Possessed by the Past* (1996), we backed away from using 'heritage' in the title. Lowenthal's principal point in his volume is to distinguish between the real remains and well-reasoned, documented interpretations of past actions and events, which he equates with 'history', and careless, popularized physical reconstructions and accounts of history, which he uses the word 'heritage' to define. Lowenthal's concerns in drawing this distinction and considering it at length are with authenticity, accuracy and legitimacy. The principle, or espoused value, of authenticity drives much of the activity from the constituent parts of the contemporary 'heritage industry' (Hewison 1987). Museums, historic houses, national parks, archaeological excavations, townscapes, landscapes, etc. strive to present themselves or the items they contain or seek as the authentic, the 'real thing' (Wickham Jones 1988; Gable and Handler 1996). Authenticity has been one of the main concepts in the world of cultural resource management (CRM) and heritage management, and has been pivotal in almost all debate on the subject of heritage and in the fields of archaeology, anthropology, museum management, conservation, etc. since the Second World War.

Yet to interpret Lowenthal's distinction simplistically would be to ignore the very considerable and growing body of work suggesting that any intervention or intermediation between 'the past', however we may define it within our differing cultural parameters, and experience of it (e.g. through museum exhibition, interpretive programmes, trail leaflets, tour guide commentaries or, for that matter, authoritative written academic histories), changes that very past. One might conceive of this phenomenon as the 'uncertainty principle' of historical interpretation.

In the title and body of an earlier volume, Lowenthal (1985) himself asserts this fundamental point, that *The Past is a Foreign Country*; it cannot be

revisited other than vicariously. This is not to say that the practice of the various professions that sometimes swirl around the term 'heritage', though some abjure the term, should ignore questions of authenticity and interpretation, let alone conservation and documentation. In fact, it is clear that there are degrees of distance from historical fact. Some in heritage endeavours adhere closely to the 'history' of Lowenthal's definition; others range much farther afield. It is important to be able to distinguish among these links to historical fact and real places or things.

The distinction between 'history' and 'heritage' used by some shows no signs of being dislodged despite being a simplistic, or at any rate, underdeveloped conceptual distinction. It is being used actively as the single most important distinction in university promotional literature, e.g. 'History offers us true stories about the past; heritage sells or provides us with the past we appear to desire' (University of York 1996). Yet in other contexts, 'heritage' as distinct from 'history' in the terms described above is not in common usage. In the USA, the Forest Service has adopted the title of 'Heritage Management' for all its programmes dealing with various kinds of cultural resources; the National Park Service has used 'Heritage Preservation Services' as the title for one of its most important CRM programmes.

It also is clear that different perspectives on the world and the past colour personal interpretations of both terms. These underpinning, divergent but conjoining, streams of perspective, activity and belief will require more adjustments in the new millennium. We can expect that more peoples, in particular those with more traditional perspectives, will repossess their pasts. Robinson and Taylor and Anyon *et al.* (this volume) describe the variation among Indian tribes in different parts of the US in pursuing this objective and incorporating western, professional methods and techniques to advance their goals. As this trend continues, new forms of professional practice will emerge, indeed are already emerging. Those of us whose main perspective is from a developed world and a professional stance, will need not only to make further willing adjustments, but also to learn from them, because they represent emergent practice, and will most certainly contain lessons for us in terms of our own actions.

Similarly, those entering this dialogue with a native or traditional perspective must be prepared to adjust and accommodate professional or scientific perspectives. The chapters by Folorunso, Robinson and Taylor and Anyon *et al.* suggest that this is occurring in places throughout the world. Also in this volume, Merriman outlines his view of 'multivocalism' as a means, mechanism and emergent professional standard for dealing with precisely this issue. Adjusting perspectives is never easy; paradigm shifts do not just happen. They require open discussion, willingness to engage in true communication, an environment of equality, and an acknowledgment that some shifting of positions may be desirable (McManamon 1997).

Indeed, that 'the past' should be considered a single, unambiguous phenomenon that can or even should be the subject of attempts, professional or

otherwise, to locate, define and 'stabilize' it, in the sense of Green's (1985) 'sanitization of the past', would be to miss the main point of modern 'critical thinking' approaches to heritage in particular and culture in general. That 'the past' in modern society is not only subject to, but absolutely dependent on, multiple perspectives should be clear to all. That the processes by which individuals and groups define their pasts are as revealing as the contents of these pasts is an essential insight to those whose jobs are involved with 'history' and 'heritage' (e.g. Leone *et al.* 1987; Leone and Preucel 1992).

Asombang, Anyon *et al.* and others in this book frequently use the terms 'heritage management', 'cultural resource management' and 'archaeological resource management' more or less interchangeably. This seems to us to underline a number of points worth consideration while reading the volume: (1) there is as yet no agreed and undisputed term for this topic; (2) all the activities covered by the various terms include both policy making at local, regional, national and international levels of government, as well as the day-to-day business of managing both the organizations that administer 'heritage' and the cultural resources themselves; (3) this merging of policy making and day-to-day management may potentially contain the seeds of mission-failure, in that this wide spectrum can give the impression to outside investigators, or potential funding sources, of a graphic lack of clarity and focus; (4) there are key themes that bind this loose amalgam together globally (as described in the chapters in this volume); and finally, (5) whichever perspective marks our starting point for 'heritage', professional or amateur, developed or developing world, scientist or traditionalist, archaeologist or museum curator, historian or interpreter, academic or practitioner, there is commonality shared by those working on these matters. There is, for example, broad agreement that cultural resources and 'heritage' are more than just *in situ* archaeological resources or out-of-the-ground remains of the past. The resources of concern include above-ground historic, prehistoric and vernacular structures, museum collections, living traditions, and much more, and indeed it is also more than popularized accounts of 'history'. Many of the authors in this volume, for example, consider and discuss resources that are substantial historic structures, some of them very substantial, e.g. the medieval Hindu city of Vijayanagara, and the monasteries, castles and great houses of Northern Ireland. Other authors include non-physical aspects of traditional cultures in their discussions (e.g. Asombang, Anyon *et al.*).

A narrow definition of 'heritage', though a key point in any debate on the topic, seemed to us to confuse the intent and coverage of the following chapters. The authors definitely are dealing with 'the real stuff': how to identify it, document it, care for it and interpret it. Viewed narrowly, 'heritage' did not seem entirely appropriate for an unambiguous term to use for the title of this volume. We were left with 'cultural resource management (CRM)' as a widely used alternative. Yet, this term also has its problems. Mainly, the difficulty with CRM as a term is that it is often used to refer exclusively to archaeological resources. McManamon (this volume) describes briefly the

be effective, CRM must be supported by a national system of statutes, regulations and policies, as well as some level of public financing. Effective CRM also must recognize, understand and address local situations, including the needs and controlling conditions for local human populations. New approaches and developments of methods, techniques and concepts are essential sources of improvement in the effectiveness and efficiency of CRM. Public education and outreach are necessary means of justifying and promoting CRM. Such activities are needed to ensure that present and future generations realize the importance of cultural resources in understanding our heritage, history and selves.

As we have edited these chapters, we have been struck by the many common threads of challenges and opportunities, problems and solutions faced by those concerned with cultural resources, their interpretation and preservation. The commonality connects individuals working in developed and developing countries, at national and local levels, and those working on field activities or physical conservation, interpretation and public outreach, and programme development or administration.

These chapters cover a range of cultural resource types; archaeological sites and districts, historic structures and districts, cultural traditions, collections, archives, and libraries, all are mentioned or considered in detail by the authors. Most of the authors are archaeologists by training, so there is an archaeological emphasis in the subject matter of most chapters, in particular in the examples discussed. The anthropological and historical orientation of professional training in archaeology in the United Kingdom and the United States is apparent in the authors' perspectives. Yet there is much in the volume and individual chapters that will be useful for other specialists in CRM: historians, historical architects, curators and others.

THE NECESSITY OF NATIONAL SYSTEMS

By national systems, we mean those laws, regulations, guidelines and government programmes related to legal mandates for the identification, evaluation, inventory and treatment of archaeological and other kinds of cultural resources. Most countries have such systems which have developed historically within the country or have been set up during colonial eras by colonial governments (Cleere 1984, 1989; O'Keefe and Prott 1984).

To be effective, national public policy for the protection and preservation of cultural resources must have three components:

- 1 it must be a strong statement of national intent to protect and preserve cultural sites, structures and other resource types;
- 2 it must have political support in its implementation; and
- 3 it must be implemented cooperatively among agencies, departments or ministries at the national level, with other levels of government, and with the public.

For a national system to function effectively, the definition of cultural resources must be clear. We suggest that a broad definition for the term be utilized, and most authors of these chapters adhere to such a definition, although several point out that such a broad view is not typical for some CRM projects in their countries. Schofield (this volume) describes efforts in a developed country, England, to define and develop preservation and interpretation strategies in a better way for poorly understood and little recognized types of cultural resources.

National laws and policies are statements of the public interest in the protection and preservation of the nation's cultural resources. This interest must transcend other public interests in at least some circumstances and be considered equivalent to others in most circumstances. The greater the number of other interests, such as housing, revenues, pipelines, etc., that can be required to take into account the protection and preservation of cultural resources as part of their activities, the stronger will be the public policy for cultural resources.

Ministries responsible for heritage preservation and those responsible for economic development, tourism, law enforcement and other related areas must work cooperatively. Solli (this volume) describes the reality of working for intergovernmental cooperation in the treatment of cultural resources within the environmental agencies of Norway, frankly describing the challenges she had to overcome even with bureaucrats sympathetic to related natural resource conservation issues. Likewise, the wider range of circumstances in which the protection and preservation of cultural heritage sites must be considered, the stronger will be the public policy. Unless equal consideration or priority is given to cultural resource protection and preservation as a result of public policy, the policy is not effective. Hamlin (this volume) and McManamon (this volume) describe how laws, regulations and procedures in Northern Ireland and the US strive to balance the socially accepted requirements of modern society in developed countries with the preservation of cultural resources reflecting the diverse histories of the nations.

Statements of public policy alone will not be sufficient; the policies must be implemented forcefully and diligently:

- 1 The national government must develop, or provide for the development of, regulations, procedures, guidelines and programmes to implement the public policy effectively. These documents and programmes provide the details and direct specific activities that translate the general statements of public policy into actions that provide for the protection and preservation of cultural resources.
- 2 The national government must provide funding and staff to ensure the effective implementation of the public policy through the regulations, procedures, guidelines and programmes. The national government may do this directly through its own staff, or it may fund other levels of government to carry out the programmes, or it may develop

some combination of these means of carrying out the programmes to implement the public policy. Asombang (this volume) describes the situation in Cameroon, for example, as one in which the first aspect of implementation has been developed and is being improved; however, funding and staffing for effective implementation are lacking. This difficult situation is one commonly experienced in developing countries and also is mentioned by Folorunso (this volume) for other African countries.

- 3 The national government must provide professional technical assistance in the implementation of cultural resource sites protection and preservation. This assistance may be provided directly by government staff experts or through experts from other levels of government or hired from the private sector, but the need for this level of expertise and technical ability must be recognized. Folorunso (this volume) describes the lamentable lack of expertise and of adequate funds to provide for it in order to undertake appropriate investigations as part of planning and construction of major development projects. He blames this lack more on the absence of political interest or will to undertake such investigations rather than on an overall lack of available funds. Okamura (this volume) describes a nearly opposite problem: a willingness to pay huge amounts of money to excavate archaeological resources in the face of development actions, but a reluctance to modify plans for modern developments to preserve sites *in situ*, as well as the difficulty that an overemphasis on excavation places on the completion of adequate reporting and interpretation of results.

Effective management of cultural resources requires decisions about how the resources can be best protected, preserved, utilized and interpreted. The exact decisions require consideration of why the resource has been set aside for special treatment, its nature and significance, and the contemporary setting of the site. Available information about each of these matters should be marshalled and considered carefully in reaching the treatment decisions. Determinations of which resources are selected for active management depend upon the overall public policy set by the country. Typically, a nation might decide to focus direct protection, preservation and interpretation efforts on resources of national significance. Yet national policy should also recognize that cultural resources of regional or local importance also merit protection, preservation and interpretation. National public policy should be broad enough to provide for these other resources as well, either through funding, technical assistance, regulatory protection, or all of these.

Once the decision is made to manage a resource actively, a management plan should be prepared that documents the rationale for the treatment and describes in detail how the management is to be implemented. The plan should describe:

- 1 activities needed to stabilize or preserve features of the resource;
- 2 the interpretation of the resource and how it is to be presented to the visiting and local publics;
- 3 the means by which any collections and records from the resource are to be preserved;
- 4 activities needed to protect the resource; and
- 5 what, if any, new information is needed to better protect, preserve and interpret the resource.

Plans should also be reviewed and revised as needed on a regular schedule. Finally, the best policy and plan in the world will fail if it is not put into effect by diligent and motivated staff. These staff members who are directly responsible for the daily protection, care and treatment of the cultural resources must be well paid and well trained.

Modern development, commercial activity, and improvement of national economies are important to all nations of the world. Because the activities associated with these processes can be destructive, they often conflict with cultural resource protection and preservation. When this occurs, it is most important to discover what the specific conflict or potential conflicts are early on during the project planning stage. If the potential conflicts are identified early enough, they can frequently be avoided or successfully resolved in a way that harmonizes public policy for cultural protection and preservation with public policy for modern economic development.

Effective and early consultation among officials responsible for development projects and those responsible for cultural resources is sometimes extraordinarily difficult to accomplish. This is one area in which strong national public policy in support of cultural resource protection and preservation is essential. Officials in ministries responsible for development and modernization are unlikely to pay attention to cultural resource concerns without political pressure to do so.

Once cultural resource concerns are recognized as legitimate, then specific alternatives to development projects that would address these concerns can be considered. In order to develop alternatives regarding cultural resources, several steps are usually necessary. First, the resources that will be affected by the project must be identified and their importance evaluated. For resources that are significant enough to be considered for preservation, alternatives ranging from redesign of the project to avoid the site, to excavation of the site to preserve the data in it, should be developed and considered. Once the decisions are made, actions to execute them are necessary. If the decision is made to record a resource and preserve the data, ample provisions must be made for the curation and management of the resultant collection and records, the conservation of necessary artefacts, and the dissemination of the data and interpretations. Rarely will modification of a development project in order to take account of cultural resources occur without cost. The cost is

likely to be less, the earlier consideration of cultural resource preservation is brought into the project planning.

Finally, the national government must work cooperatively with others to accomplish the job of protecting and preserving cultural resources. All countries have a wide range of types of cultural resources. Some of these may be cared for directly by the national government, in particular those that are of significance to the country as a whole. Others may be of regional, state or local significance and may be cared for by state or local governments, or not directly cared for except for the protection and preservation that can be provided by the private owner. If the public policy calls for the protection and preservation of cultural resources at all of these levels, the national government will have to work cooperatively with these other levels of government and private owners to accomplish this. Cleere (this volume and 1995) reminds us that a few cultural resources transcend national importance and have an international, worldwide significance. A number of these resources, World Heritage Sites or sites that may be eligible for this listing, are in developing countries that often have a difficult time protecting them from damage.

THE IMPORTANCE OF LOCAL SUPPORT

Communities residing near or among the locations of cultural resources have important, sometimes critical, influences on the protection and preservation of these resources. Local populations are always in the vicinity of the cultural resources. Community members protect and maintain these resources when they regard them as their own. Graphic evidence of effective local preservation actions are the millions of historic structures worldwide that continue to be used, inhabited and maintained by their local owners or occupants.

The actions of local officials and local communities increasingly are of importance in cultural resource preservation, protection and interpretation. This has for many years been the case in less developed parts of the world where national governments, lacking statutory authority or the means of enforcing existing laws, were unable to impose policies, regulations and guidelines upon communities distant from the centre of national power. In the current political and social climate in many developed countries, where the mantras of 'less central government' and 'greater local control of public decision making' have taken hold, the power of local communities has increased. Medina (this volume) and Kiryakov *et al.* (this volume) describe political and social situations in Argentina and Russia, respectively, in which local economic, political and social conditions are strongly affecting how archaeological sites, traditional sites, museum objects and historic structures are cared for.

Local communities and their leaders must come to see cultural resources as

part of the assets of their local areas. These resources must be seen as precious things to be preserved, protected and interpreted. The basis for these perceptions may be economic, that is, the cultural resources are seen as a means by which tourists can be enticed to visit local communities, spending money for food, lodging, or other services, while they are there experiencing or viewing the cultural resources. Alternatively, or in complement, the local community may envision the resources as linked personally or culturally to them and as resources of community history and pride that are to be protected and preserved as their community's heritage. Anyon *et al.* (this volume) describe a series of CRM programmes that have been developed by Indian tribes in the US Southwest. The tribes have organized these programmes to accommodate their special religious and traditional concerns.

An example of how local community support for preservation can determine the survival of a cultural resource comes from coastal northern Peru, where archaeological sites are frequently damaged or destroyed by looters. This example, from the Sipan region of Peru (Kirkpatrick 1992), illustrates dramatically how a local community's perspective about local cultural resources can influence the protection and preservation of the resources. Archaeologist Walter Alva, director of a nearby regional public museum, successfully turned local farmers away from looting the Moche tombs of the region. Alva convinced the current inhabitants of neighbouring villages that the local tombs were those of their own ancestors and held the keys to the story of the complex society in which those ancestors lived. He persuaded them to regard the burial mound as part of their heritage, not as commercial resources to be mined with the recoveries sold to others from outside the community. Alva was so successful that the local villagers became protectors of the mounds rather than looters.

The extensive damage that looters of archaeological sites inflict on the cultural heritage has been quantified by Gill and Chippindale (1993: 624-8) for one region. They estimated that 10,000 to 12,000 prehistoric graves in the Cycladic Islands in southern Greece have been plundered over the years, primarily since the Second World War, to obtain stylized anthropomorphic figurines for the art market. Gill and Chippindale estimate that this looting has destroyed 85 per cent of archaeological burials of the Early Bronze Age in the Cyclades, a terrible loss of irretrievable information about ancient times for present and all future generations.

Local attitudes about preservation of historic structures is recognized as a key aspect for the preservation of these kinds of cultural resources. Many western nations have national, state and local programmes that work closely with individual owners and local communities to preserve historic structures. In the UK and USA, for example, such activities form a major part of the national archaeology and historic preservation programmes (e.g. Murtagh 1988; Lee 1992).

How can national programmes establish in local communities and governments the kind of stewardship ethic described above? There are four areas

of attention that can be utilized to develop supportive local preservation attitudes and actions. These are:

- 1 formal and informal education programmes;
- 2 national and local statutes or development controls, such as local zoning;
- 3 partnerships in resource stewardship that link national, state and regional preservation programmes with local communities; and
- 4 the integration of resource interpretation and preservation into local economic development programmes.

Opportunities for local communities to learn about cultural resources and how they are studied and preserved, help to maintain a constituency that will support these activities, even to build larger and stronger public support. Archaeologists have embraced public education and outreach as an important tool for preservation (e.g. see Lerner and Hoffman, Jameson, and Moe this volume; also, Stone and MacKenzie 1990; Stone and Molyneux 1994; Jameson 1997). Historians, historical architects, and others concerned with the interpretation and preservation of cultural resources also have recognized the importance and benefits of public education and outreach programmes (e.g. Selig 1989, 1991; Shull and Hunter 1992; Boland and Metcalf 1993). Initially, much of this public-oriented effort was justified as a means of providing some return to the public for the public funds typically used in CRM projects. Increasingly, however, public agencies are discovering that by providing opportunities for public interpretation, and even for public involvement in CRM projects, they also can generate local public interest in, and support for, their cultural resource programmes.

But what message or messages about cultural resources should be conveyed in public education and outreach programmes? It is important to craft the appropriate approach to reach different publics (Potter 1990; McManamon 1991). Communities have different pasts, or differing perceptions of what happened in the past. These variations should be taken into account in developing a public outreach programme. Medina (this volume) describes these kinds of variations in local communities in Argentina based upon history and social and economic factors. To address the local factions in this situation, she recommends the development of a series of public exhibits to describe the cultural histories of the region as a means of establishing a commonly agreed upon cultural heritage. Ultimately, Medina hopes that sufficient agreement can be reached for a formal regional cultural museum to be established.

When considering what educational and interpretive messages are appropriate, one of the messages must be of local interest sufficient to attract individuals with no special knowledge about cultural resources. Community-specific messages are essential to successful public education, but outreach programmes also should directly or indirectly make general points related to the value of cultural resources, the care that must be used when studying or treating or using these resources, and the often fragile, sometimes non-

renewable, nature of cultural resources. Such general messages need to be incorporated in educational, volunteer and other public outreach programmes designed to work over the long term on the prevention of archaeological looting, neglect and vandalism of historic structures and other kinds of wanton destruction of cultural resources (Lerner 1991: 103; McManamon in press).

Local action by individuals often determines whether cultural resources are preserved or destroyed. Law-abiding and conscientious citizens will not vandalize, loot or otherwise wantonly destroy cultural resources if they understand that such actions are illegal and/or diminish the cultural heritage left to all people. Therefore, national and local programmes of CRM must coordinate successfully so that the preservation messages they promote are heard effectively and consistently. Robinson and Taylor (this volume) and Green and Davis (this volume) describe archaeological programmes in the States of Rhode Island and Arkansas, respectively, in the US that effectively integrate national, state, local and private interests for interpretation and preservation. Both examples describe the important role played by partnerships between the state programmes and local organizations and individuals in accomplishing common goals.

Working with local communities on protection programmes and public education and outreach programmes has become an important part of heritage site management in many parts of the world. We suggest that this ought to become a general standard by which CRM and individual programmes should be judged in the future. Isolated academic interest alone will be insufficient justification for expending public funds to protect local cultural resources. It is important for such an interest to link with locally credible outcome or benefit. Until this connection is made, the long-term preservation aspect of CRM is unfinished.

Many of the data collection CRM activities, in particular non-invasive and non-destructive methods and techniques, such as archaeological survey and historic building recording, can be justified as intelligence gathering, adding to the general pool of knowledge and understanding of a given cultural resource or series of them. Yet even these efforts ought to be widely communicated to the public in terms of their ownership of the resources and results, and their improved quality of understanding of their cultural identities. This will require CRM workers to develop evaluation measures that reflect multiple outcomes, rather than simply tourism and visitation, as well as professional and academic ones from CRM activity.

It is not only from looting, vandalism or other illegal activities that archaeological sites and other kinds of cultural resources must be protected. Local individuals and groups of concerned citizens are among the most effective means of working for the protection of sites in local development schemes and land use plans. Seeden (this volume) describes the considerable archaeological, architectural and textual record that has been preserved due to international, national and local support during the redevelopment of Detroit Central District. Yet she also points out some failures of local and national public and private 'follow through' for all the preservation work that

originally was envisioned, thus emphasizing the importance of such support and effective coordination.

Individuals among the general public can serve as the eyes and ears of national and other public officials who are responsible for cultural resource preservation. Certainly, there are not enough officials or trained specialists in the United States or other countries to serve such a widespread monitoring function, nor will there ever be. Some of the necessary preservation work requires national-level experts and funding; however, regular maintenance is also required to keep vegetation from overwhelming monuments, working its way between stone and into stucco. Such regular maintenance might be accomplished most readily by local efforts applied carefully and systematically.

THE NEED FOR NEW APPROACHES AND DEVELOPMENTS

Like other academic, professional or scientific fields, CRM benefits from new ideas and improvements in method and technique. Many CRM activities are part of the 'cost of business' for governments, so improvements in efficiency and reductions in cost are especially important. Improvements in recording and documenting methods have regularly contributed to more effective and efficient work in CRM. Fritz (this volume) presents a systematic method for describing and interpreting complex historical monuments, including major archaeological, architectural and textual components. The method and techniques of Fritz's 'surface archaeology' were developed in the 1960s and 1970s as part of intensive pedestrian archaeological surveys of arid parts of the US Southwest for scientific investigations. These methods and techniques have since been widely adapted and modified for a range of archaeological investigations throughout the world. The adoption of these methods and techniques for recording the abandoned medieval city of Vijayanagara has both scientific and resource management applications.

Price (this volume) describes the dilemma faced when physical conservation of a monument is necessary. Questions about how much and how to conduct conservation treatment are faced constantly in CRM. By exploring how conservation treatments have been decided upon in the past, he is able to show the changes in professional and public attitudes towards different kinds of treatments. In the past, and in some countries still, intrusive techniques were considered appropriate and reconstructions based upon incomplete information were common. Price acknowledges that no easy, and probably no single answer exists for all places and situations, although he points out that more detailed and precise means of recording existing original conditions ought to be thoroughly utilized prior to any conservation treatment so that this information is not lost due to the treatment process itself.

The problem of looting of cultural resources is not a new one. Since ancient times, antiquities and monuments have been among the 'spoils of

war'. There are more ancient Egyptian obelisks in Rome, for example, than in Cairo or Luxor because of the ancient Roman occupation of Egypt. Yet we must continue to fight against the commercialization of archaeological resources and other kinds of cultural resources. Morton and McManamon (this volume) review what is known about the current trafficking in archaeological objects and what proposals have been made to reduce this illegal activity.

THE CENTRAL ROLE OF PUBLIC EDUCATION AND OUTREACH

We hope to see the experience of 'heritage' and the results of CRM take a more central place in everyday experience. More and better public education and outreach will be needed to accomplish this goal. We know that the audiences for museums are limited in the most general sense, and in most cases, to the relatively well educated. Why not seek and find the means of delivering alternative experiences from cultural resources for those less culturally predisposed to museum visiting? The chapters related to education and outreach explore some of these issues, e.g. in direct education of school-age children as a means to educate, but also enthruse, future users of heritage. They also outline the considerable difficulties involved in attempting evaluation of such programmes. Hence, our plea that outcomes and uses of cultural resources, e.g. interpretation, education, exhibition, be planned as part of the overall strategy for its conservation, not simply bolted on as an afterthought, or as a weak justification for *de facto* decisions taken, driven by our professional concerns, and from within our professional, relatively closed, circles.

Moe, for instance, describes the initiation of a long-term strategy in the USA to preserve a fragile archaeological record through school-age education. The two programmes she reviews experienced marked differences in the success of their attempts to change attitudes as between rural and urban areas, consistent with virtually all other large-scale social programmes. Do we need different heritage interpretive strategies that reflect this?

Jameson (this volume) explores the issues in developing public interpretation as a function of the different aims of archaeologists and interpreters. He illustrates some of these issues in describing the public education and outreach activities of the US National Park Service.

Merriman (this volume) tackles much the same cluster of themes from an altogether more fundamental approach, that of professional standards in museum interpretation. As he indicates, though there is a finely tuned awareness among academic archaeologists of issues such as evidence and narrative, this seldom seems to permeate museum interpretive work. He cites the work of the Archaeological Resource Centre in York as one exception, and posits multivocalism as a new professional standard in interpretation.

Davis (this volume) provides a timely reminder that the preservation movement and those professionally employed in preservation sometimes need to consider a much wider area, the natural environment on which the human play is staged. This is something human history specialists have tended more and more to overlook in their work, both in excavation and in public education, save in the use of samples (soil, seed, fibre, animal remains, etc.) as evidence underpinning the interpretation of essentially human occupation and experience. He describes innovative interpretive work in museums in getting across the centrality of environment as part of the museum's fundamental communication obligation. His widening of the agenda in this way opens up the opportunity for more points of contact across the heritage spectrum.

CONCLUSIONS

The following chapters describe the status, condition, issues, successes and challenges of CRM in the modern world at the end of the twentieth century. They provide descriptions of actions and conditions necessary for effective CRM programmes. They also point out challenges that must be faced and overcome to have effective programmes. They focus on archaeological sites, although many range more widely among other types of cultural resources. This Introduction has attempted to generalize about what is necessary for effective CRM, no matter what kind of cultural resources are being considered. Archaeological resources can often stand as examples to illustrate issues of conservation, interpretation, preservation or more general management for all kinds of cultural resources. We have emphasized, however, that archaeological sites should be considered and incorporated into the overall cultural resource protection and preservation programme of a nation rather than as distinct from historic structures or other kinds of cultural resources. This seems especially true for countries in many parts of the world where archaeological remains incorporate so many architectural elements and where many ancient sites also contain texts and inscriptions or are referred to in written records.

Treatment and care of cultural resources raise many questions, and it is important to approach any intervention carefully and conservatively. Any changes to cultural resources are likely to cause some destruction. Therefore, it is useful to recall the rule-of-thumb followed by many conservators and preservationists today, that it is better to preserve than to restore and better to restore than to reconstruct. Along this same line of thought, given the usual constraints on qualified staff and funding for CRM, it is better to identify and evaluate resources than to impact them in other ways unless necessary for preservation. The non-renewable nature of many kinds of cultural resources makes it essential to limit destructive intervention to situations in which the resource is threatened with destruction from other forces or in which the need for new treatment is undeniable.

Public policy for CRM is an essential matter if a modern nation is to be able to preserve its history and heritage in the face of modern pressures. A nation that does not preserve its past is unlikely to have much of a future, either figuratively or literally. Cultural resources are the material remains of a nation's history that require some special considerations. In developing and implementing national public policy in this area, the leaders of nations must recognize the importance of history, heritage and the cultural resources that reflect them, to their people, to future generations, and to the rest of the world. This recognition of the importance of these resources should lead to the development of strong national policies for protection and preservation and the strong implementation of such policy.

At the close of the twentieth century, the kinds of remains we consider important have a much wider range than those that were regarded as monuments at the beginning of the century. We recognize a wider, richer cultural heritage. Having a wider scope and distribution, cultural resources also are more widely claimed and disputed. As we move into the new century, those of us working in this field need to reach out, be effective advocates and form alliances with others concerned for similar, though probably not the same, reasons that we are. As we do so, we need to remember what we have learned; this is one of the functions of reports on current successes and challenges, such as this volume.

REFERENCES

- Andah, B. (ed.) 1990. *Cultural Resource Management: an African dimension*. Ibadan: Wisdom Publishers.
- Boland, B. and F. Metcalf 1993. Teaching with historic places. *Magazine of History* 7(3), 62-8.
- Cleere, H. (ed.) 1984. *Approaches to the Archaeological Heritage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cleere, H. (ed.) 1989. *Archaeological Heritage Management in the Modern World*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Cleere, H. 1995. Cultural landscapes as world heritage. *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites* 1(1), 63-8.
- Cooper, M.A., A. Firth, J. Carman and D. Wheatley (eds) 1995. *Managing Archaeology*. London: Routledge.
- Follows, D.S. 1988. Holistic interpretive planning. In *Proceedings of the First World Congress on Heritage Presentation and Interpretation*, J. Lunn (ed.), 113-18. Edmonton, Alberta: Alberta Culture and Multiculturalism, Historical Services Division.
- Popp, M. 1997. *Managing Museums and Galleries*. London: Routledge.
- Fowler, D.D. 1982. Cultural resource management. In *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory*, M.B. Schiffer (ed.), 1-50. New York: Academic Press.
- Prochot, I. 1996. Histoqual: the evaluation of service quality in historic properties. In *Managing Cultural Resources for the Tourist, Tourism and Culture, Towards the Twenty-first Century, Conference Proceedings*, M. Robinson, N. Evans and P. Callaghan (eds), 119-32. Sunderland: The Centre for Tourism and Travel in association with Business Education Publishers.

- Gable, E. and R. Handler 1996. After authenticity at an American heritage site. *American Anthropologist* 98, 568-78.
- Gill, D. and C. Chippindale 1993. Material and intellectual consequences of esteem for Cycladic figures. *American Journal of Archaeology* 97, 601-60.
- Green, O. 1985. Our recent past: the black hole in museum collections. *Museums Journal* 85, 5-7.
- Gurian, E.H. (ed.) 1995. *Institutional Trauma: major change in museums and its effect on staff*. Washington, DC: American Museums Association.
- Harrison, R. (ed.) 1995. *Manual of Heritage Management*. London: Butterworth Heineman.
- Hewison, R. 1987. *The Heritage Industry: Britain in a climate of decline*. London: Methuen.
- Hooper Greenhill, E. 1994. *Museums and their Visitors*. London: Routledge.
- Hunter, J. and I. Ralston (eds) 1993. *Archaeological Resource Management in the UK: an introduction*. Phoenix Mill, Gloucestershire: Institute of Field Archaeologists/Alan Sutton Publishing.
- Hutt, S., M. McAllister and W. Jones 1992. *Archaeological Resource Protection*. National Trust for Historic Preservation. Washington, DC: The Preservation Press.
- International Committee on Archaeological Heritage Management (ICAHM) 1996. *Archaeological Remains In Situ*. Proceedings from the Second ICAHM International Conference, 11-15 October 1994. Ottawa, Canada: ICOMOS-Canada.
- Jameson, J.H., Jr (ed.) 1997. *Presenting Archaeology to the Public*. Walnut Creek, California: Altamira Press.
- Janes, R.R. 1995. *Museums and the Paradox of Change: a case study in urgent adaptation*. Calgary, Alberta: University of Alberta Press.
- Keene, S. 1996. *Managing Conservation in Museums*. Oxford: Butterworth Heinemann.
- King, T., P. Hickman and G. Berg 1977. *Anthropology in Historic Preservation: caring for culture's clutter*. New York: Academic Press.
- Kirkpatrick, S.D. 1992. *Lords of Sipan: a true story of Pre-Inca tombs: archaeology and crime*. New York: William Morrow & Company.
- Knudson, R.A. 1986. Contemporary cultural resource management. In *American Archaeology: past and future*, D. Meltzer, D. Fowler and J.A. Sabloff (eds), 395-413. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Lee, A. (ed.) 1992. *Past Meets Future: saving America's historic environments*. National Trust for Historic Preservation. Washington, DC: The Preservation Press.
- Leone, M. and R.W. Preucel 1992. Archaeology in a democratic society: a critical theory perspective. In *Quandaries and Quests: visions of archaeology's future*, L. Wandsnider (ed.), 115-35. Occasional Paper 20. Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, Carbondale, Illinois: Center for Archaeological Investigations.
- Leone M., P. Potter and P. Shackel 1987. Toward a critical archaeology. *Current Anthropology* 28, 283-302.
- Lerner, S. 1991. Saving sites: preservation and education. In *Protecting the Past*, G.S. Smith and J.E. Ehrenhard (eds), 103-8. Boca Raton, Florida: CRC Press.
- Lowenthal, D. 1985. *The Past is a Foreign Country*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Lowenthal, D. 1996. *Possessed by the Past*. New York: The Free Press.
- Lunn, J. et al. 1988. *Proceedings of the First World Congress on Heritage Presentation and Interpretation*. Edmonton, Alberta: Alberta Culture and Multiculturalism, Historical Services Division.
- McGimsey, C.R. 1972. *Public Archeology*. New York: Seminar Press.
- McManamon, F.P. 1991. The many publics for archaeology. *American Antiquity* 56, 121-30.
- McManamon, F.P. 1992. Managing America's archaeological resources. In *Quandaries and Quests: visions of archaeology's future*, L. Wandsnider (ed.), 25-40. Occasional Paper 20, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, Carbondale, Illinois: Center for Archaeological Investigations.
- McManamon, F.P. 1997. Why consult? *Common Ground: Archaeology and Ethnography in the Public Interest* 2, 2.
- McManamon, F.P. in press. Archaeological messages and messengers. In *The Public Benefits of Archaeology*, B. Little (ed.). Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Middleton, V. 1995. Vision, strategy and corporate planning: an overview. In *Manual of Heritage Management*, R. Harrison (ed.), 3-11. London: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Moore, K. (ed.) 1994. *Museum Management*. London: Routledge.
- Murtagh, W.J. 1988. *Keeping Time: the history and theory of preservation in America*. Pittstown, New Jersey: The Main Street Press.
- O'Keefe, P. and L.V. Prott 1984. *Law and the Cultural Heritage, Vol. 1: discovery and excavation*. Abingdon, England: Professional Book.
- Potter, P. 1990. The 'What' and 'Why' of public relations for archaeology: a post-script to DeCicco's public relations primer. *American Antiquity* 55, 608-13.
- Rains, A. (Chairman) [1966] 1983. *With Heritage So Rich*. The National Trust for Historic Preservation. Washington, DC: The Preservation Press.
- Schiffer, M.B. and G. Gummerman (eds) 1977. *Conservation Archaeology: a guide for cultural resource management studies*. New York: Academic Press.
- Selig, R. 1989. Anthropology in public schools: why should we care? *Anthropology Newsletter* 28.
- Selig, R. 1991. Teacher training programmes in archaeology: the multiplier effect in the classroom. In *Archaeology and Education: the classroom and beyond*, K.C. Smith and F.P. McManamon (eds), 3-8. National Park Service Archaeological Assistance Study 2. Washington, DC: Department of the Interior.
- Shull, C. and K. Hunter 1992. Teaching with historic places. *Social Education* 56, 312.
- Smith, G.S. and J.E. Ehrenhard (eds) 1991. *Protecting the Past*. Boca Raton, Florida: CRC Press.
- Stone, P.G. and R. MacKenzie (eds) 1990. *The Excluded Past: archaeology in education*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Stone, P.G. and B. Molyneaux (eds) 1994. *The Presented Past: heritage, museums, and education*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Tabata, R.S., J. Yamashiro and G. Cherem (eds) 1991. Joining hands for quality tourism: interpretation, preservation and the travel industry. Proceedings of the Heritage Interpretation International Third Global Congress. 3-8 November 1991. Honolulu, Hawaii.
- University of York 1996. History and heritage, consuming the past in contemporary culture. Proceedings of the Interdisciplinary Conference, University of York 1996. Undated flier promoting the proceedings of that conference.
- Wickham Jones, C.R. 1988. The road to Heri Tat: archaeologists and interpretation. *Archaeological Review from Cambridge* 7, 185-93.
- Wilson, R.L. (ed.) 1987. *Rescue Archaeology: proceedings of the Second New World Conference on Rescue Archaeology*. Dallas, Texas: Southern Methodist University Press.
- Wilson, R.L. and G. Loyola (eds) 1981. *Rescue Archaeology: papers from the First New World Conference on Rescue Archaeology*. The National Trust for Historic Preservation. Washington, DC: The Preservation Press.