

Portland State University

PDXScholar

Anthropology Faculty Publications and
Presentations

Anthropology

Fall 2021

Public and Community Archaeology in the Pacific Northwest

Douglas C. Wilson

Portland State University, doug@pdx.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/anth_fac



Part of the [Anthropology Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Citation Details

Wilson, Douglas C. (2021) Public and Community Archaeology in the Pacific Northwest. *Journal of Northwest Anthropology*. 55(2):40-45

This Article is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Anthropology Faculty Publications and Presentations by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

Public and Community Archaeology in the Pacific Northwest

Douglas C. Wilson

Affiliation Portland State University/National Park Service

Correspondence doug@pdx.edu

Public archaeology in the United States' Pacific Northwest entangles academics, public and Tribal agency archeologists, contractors, educators, students, museum curators, and volunteers. While the connections between these players have changed through time, the regulatory, research, and community aspects of public archaeology have always been linked in some fashion. The foundation of this connection is the laws and policies that protect archaeological resources at the federal, state, and Tribal levels, and through local city, county, and Tribal ordinances (Griffin and Churchill 2003; Deur and Butler 2016). The practitioners give agency to public archaeology, including the many who contribute to research in public spaces and interact with the public in a variety of ways. Museum curators and exhibitors also have embraced public archaeology, highlighting artifacts and belongings of past generations, and interpreting them in anthropological and other ways (Moyer 2006; Flexner 2016; Kale 2017).

While published programming on public archaeology is rare in urban settings in the Pacific Northwest (Warner et al. 2014; Wilson 2015), there has been a continuous, albeit sporadic, program of public engagement tied to archaeology. Some of the earliest historic preservation work in the Pacific Northwest was tied to the Smithsonian Institution's involvement in the planning of Bonneville Dam, which led directly to the founding of the Oregon State Museum of Anthropology and the first archaeological permitting law in Oregon (Griffin 2009:92). This connection among cultural resource management (CRM),

the public, and museums, carries through to the present, although with changes in attention to the curation crisis, collections management, and other issues (Moyer 2006; Childs and Benden 2017). Further, the ways in which archaeologists have interacted with the "public" has changed with shifts from more educational and public outreach to increasing critical and multivocal approaches (Richardson and Almansa-Sánchez 2015). The development of American Indian tribal capacity to provide CRM services including archaeology has increased dramatically over the past 30 years, and partnerships among agencies, academics, and Tribes are now more common.

An excellent example of the integration of multiple communities of Pacific Northwest archaeological practitioners in a single setting is Portland State University's (PSU) Archaeology Roadshow. Pioneered by Dr. Virginia Butler, since 2011 this program has integrated agencies, tribes, museums, private-sector CRM firms, archaeology volunteers, elementary schools, and the students of PSU's Public Archaeology class, to provide exhibits, hands-on activities, and an opportunity for collectors to interact with experts in artifact identification. The author and other National Park Service (NPS) archaeologists and curators have participated as exhibitors and experts every year in the Portland, Oregon, version (Figure 1). The one-day event has also been held in Burns and Bend in eastern and central Oregon. As an archaeologist who straddles the academic and agency sides, I believe the Roadshow is an invigorating arena that allows cultural resources specialists and



Figure 1. The author and Amy Clearman at the National Park Service booth at the 2017 Archaeology Roadshow, Portland State University (Portland State University, Anthropology).

volunteers to engage in outreach with the public while visiting with the many friends and colleagues who attend as exhibitors and experts. Its outward educational and interpretive goals reinforce the building of a diverse community of archaeologists, cultural experts, and museum practitioners. In a microcosm, it is the breadth of archaeological performance and practice in the Pacific Northwest.

Another important focus of archaeological outreach occurs at protected historical sites throughout the region. Fort Vancouver has a long history of public archaeology, including the integration of multiple communities of practitioners within a program of research guided by professional archaeologists (Wilson et al. 2020). While theoretical and methodological approaches have changed, the connection to the public at Fort Vancouver has continued. Archaeology was initiated by NPS archaeologist Louis Caywood in 1947. Caywood employed unskilled laborers and university students in his search to relocate and document the fur trade fort (Wilson et al. 2020:49). Caywood's explorations garnered considerable

newspaper buzz and stimulated public interest (Wilson 2015:225). Kardas and Larrabee's 1969 excavations at the Fort Vancouver Village included professional archaeologists and students of Bryn Mawr and the University of Washington (Kardas 1971). The massive excavations in the 1970s by Hoffman and Ross included the use of volunteers as laborers, including students from the Multnomah School of the Bible and the Oregon Archaeological Society. Lester Ross (1975) even tried his hand at interpretive writing during this project exploring a "hypothetical narrative" of the gentleman's dining customs at Fort Vancouver for the sesquicentennial edition of *Clark County History*.

The massive contract archaeology project associated with the Interstate 5/State Route 14 Project integrated university salvage/contracting arms with federal transportation archaeology. David and Jennifer Chance wrote their first report on the excavations at the Fort Vancouver Village and Vancouver Barracks with the "lay public" in mind, suggesting a desire for public outreach (Chance and Chance 1976). Many university

students participated as paid workers in this project and much of the artifact identification work was conducted by students at the University of Idaho.

Avocational archaeologists have had a major role in public archaeology at Fort Vancouver. Harvey Steele and Charles Hibbs (1985:1) identify the Jail Project as a “milestone in citizen archaeology,” with the role of direct public involvement identified as necessary to garner public support for archaeology, including legislative funding of programs related to archaeological sites. Another field school in the 1980s was conducted at the Carpenter Shop by Oregon State University. The current NPS public archaeology program began in 2001 with a field school that embraced interactions with the visitors to the park. The Northwest Cultural Resources Institute (NCRI) was created as a cooperative partnership based at Fort Vancouver and its affiliated properties. NPS staff, university professors, and subject matter experts facilitate research and training, offer expertise, and support other educational endeavors using National Parks and other protected spaces as laboratories.

An important partnership of the NCRI is with PSU, for cooperative research and training. This partnership conducts research that contributes to the public understanding of Oregon’s and Washington’s historic period (including at Fort Vancouver National Historic Site and other NPS parks); develops public understanding of archaeology and history; and stimulates scientific research on NPS-protected sites and areas. It expands the education of students in historical archaeology and heritage management (Wilson 2015:231).

As part of the development of the NCRI, the public archaeology field school was created. NPS interpreters and archaeologists trained students in public interpretation, using NPS guidance and a unique model of public engagement (Marks 2011; Wilson 2015). As part of this program, NPS staff developed a “Kids Dig!” program that introduced children to archaeological field

work and interpretation, using a mock dig site. Field school students served as assistant interpreters in this program (Wilson 2015). In addition, students engaged with the visiting public to share with them the academic research goals, field methods, and educational values of the work. They were encouraged to develop a dialogue with the visitors to seek their personal connections to the site (Marks 2011; Wilson 2015). A variety of partnerships with educators, disadvantaged communities, and Tribes has brought different stakeholders into contact with archaeology as members of the public or as heritage interpreters (Figure 2). Of note, the use of archaeology to explore the Fort Vancouver Village has brought new perspectives on this essential and diverse community of fur traders (Wilson 2015, 2018). Sixteen field schools have been run with numerous partners and anchored by its academic partners: PSU and Washington State University Vancouver.

While there are many other public and community archaeology examples in the Pacific Northwest, the Archaeology Roadshow and Fort Vancouver’s public archaeology programs demonstrate the entanglement of government, agency, academic, and private sectors in connecting archaeology to the public. These public partnerships with agencies, universities, Tribes, and community partners can improve understanding and stewardship of heritage sites and their constituent archaeological resources. These partnerships can engage many diverse stakeholders tied to traditional, Indigenous, and other narratives about place (Wilson 2015, 2018). Partnerships allow archaeologists to bridge gaps between stakeholders and archaeology and create new means to interpret and discuss objects.

Increasingly, interpretation of archaeological resources emphasizes the role of audience-centered interpretation and the engagement of diverse audiences as “stakeholders and primary contributors to the meaning-making process, rather than as passive consumers” (NPS 2017:1). Archaeologists should embrace this goal in public



Figure 2. Portland State University student, D. Woolsey, interpreting to visiting children at the 2010 Public Archaeology Field School at the Fort Vancouver Village (National Park Service).

archaeology to explore different meanings and the truth of past historical narratives. Plumer (2018) has found that the public in the Portland, Oregon, metropolitan area has a high awareness of archaeology but with varying perspectives on its relevance or how they connect with it. Archaeologists are well positioned to explore how the past has relevance to different segments of the population. As students of people's past practices based on their belongings, archaeologists can explore contemporary significance and diverse audience perspectives recognizing that historical, cultural, and environmental legacies evolve through time.

Beyond exposing myths associated with social/collective truths, archaeologists should have a stronger role in connecting people's history, identity, and perspectives to the social practices of ancestral peoples and illuminating aspects of heritage that have been silenced or are hidden (Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2012). Archaeologists have begun and should continue to directly engage with Indigenous and other stakeholder communities to decolonize interpretation,

seek social justice and equality, and address shared research goals (Kryder-Reid et al. 2018; Cody 2019; Gonzalez and Edwards 2020). Other projects should build on the engagement of artifact collectors and private property owners to aid in CRM, like Tipton's (2020) recent study. Others should explore the heritage values of communities tied to colonial sites like Clearman (2020) has done at the "first" Fort Vancouver.

The prospects for public archaeology in the Pacific Northwest are great. The community I see at the Archaeology Roadshow is the core of a growing movement. By engaging in partnerships with diverse stakeholders and increasing the connectivity of these practitioners and segments of the public, archaeology will continue in its varied roles and likely become more relevant in the future. Archaeologists will address, in a material way, the changing notions of what is important about heritage, what is worth telling, and what should be preserved.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many thanks to my colleague and friend Virginia Butler, who has been an inspiration for the building of a community of heritage in the Pacific Northwest. The support and enthusiasm of the students of PSU, Washington State University Vancouver, and friends and volunteers who have participated in public archaeology at Fort Vancouver is gratefully acknowledged. A special thanks to my wife and children for their continued support of my work. The views expressed in this article do not necessarily reflect the views of NPS or the U.S. government.

REFERENCES CITED

- Chance, David H., and Jennifer V. Chance
1976 Kanaka Village/Vancouver Barracks 1974. University of Washington, Office of Public Archaeology, Institute for Environmental Studies, *Reports in Highway Archaeology No. 3*. Seattle.
- Childs, S. Terry, and Danielle M. Benden
2017 A Checklist for Sustainable Management of Archaeological Collections. *Advances in Archaeological Practice*, 5(1):12–25.
- Clearman, Amy Carolyn
2020 Engaging Communities in Archaeology on Private Property in an Urban Neighborhood: The Search for the First (1825–1829) Fort Vancouver, Vancouver, Washington. Master's thesis. Portland, OR: Portland State University. *Dissertations and Theses Paper 5584*.
- Cody, Tia Rachelle
2019 LiDAR Predictive Modeling of Kalapuya Mound Sites in the Calapooia Watershed, Oregon. Master's thesis, Portland, OR: Portland State University. *Dissertations and Theses Paper 4863*.
- Colwell-Chanthaphonh, Chip
2012 Archaeology and Indigenous Collaboration. In *Archaeological Theory Today*, edited by Ian Hodder, pp. 267–291. Malden, MA: Polity Press.
- Deur, Douglas, and Virginia L. Butler
2016 Incorporating Archaeology into Local Government Historic Preservation and Planning: A Review of Current Practice. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 82(2):189–203.
- Flexner, James L.
2016 Introduction: Dark and Bright Futures for Museum Archaeology. *Museum Worlds: Advances in Research*, 4(1):1–3.
- Gonzalez, Sara L., and Briece Edwards
2020 The Intersection of Indigenous Thought and Archaeological Practice: The Field Methods in Indigenous Archaeology Field School. *Journal of Community Archaeology & Heritage*, 7(4):239–254. <<https://doi.org/10.1080/20518196.2020.1724631>>.
- Griffin, Dennis
2009 The Evolution of Oregon's Cultural Resource Laws and Regulations. *Journal of Northwest Anthropology*, 43(1):87–116.
- Griffin, Dennis, and Thomas E. Churchill
2003 Cultural Resource Management in The Pacific Northwest: Working Within the Process. *Journal of Northwest Anthropology*, 36(2):27–42.
- Kale, Cameo E.
2017 Preserving the Past Together: Cultural Resource Management, Collections Management Professionals, and the Accessibility of Archaeological Collections. Master's thesis, Seattle: University of Washington.
- Kardas, Susan
1971 "The People Bought This and the Clatsop Became Rich." *A View of Nineteenth-Century Fur Trade Relationships on the Lower Columbia between Chinookan Speakers, Whites, and Kanakas*. Doctoral dissertation, Department of Anthropology, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, PA. Ann Arbor, MI: ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

- Kryder-Reid, Elizabeth, Jeremy W. Foutz, Elizabeth Wood, and Larry J. Zimmerman
2018 "I just don't ever use that word": Investigating Stakeholders' Understanding of Heritage. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 24(7):743–763.
- Marks, Jeffrey
2011 Defining a Unique Model of Public Engagement and Evaluating its Implementation at the 2011 NPS Fort Vancouver Public Archaeology Field School. Master's thesis. London, UK: Institute of Archaeology, University College.
- Moyer, Teresa S.
2006 Technical Brief 19: Archeological Collections and the Public: Using Resources for the Public Benefit. *U.S. National Park Service Publications and Papers*, No. 119. <<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/natlpark/119>>.
- National Park Service (NPS)
2017 *Foundations of 21st Century Interpretation*. Interpretive Development Program, Stephen T. Mather Training Center, Harpers Ferry, WV: National Park Service.
- Plumer, Martin John
2018 How Can Community Engagement in the Local Past and Archaeological Research be Mutually Beneficial? A Case Study in Community Archaeology from Sauvie Island, Oregon. Master's thesis. Portland, OR: Portland State University. *Dissertations and Theses* Paper 4543.
- Richardson, Lorna-Jane, and Jaime Almansa-Sánchez
2015 Do you even know what public archaeology is? Trends, Theory, Practice, Ethics. *World Archaeology*, 47(2):194–211.
- Ross, Lester A.
1975 Luxury in the Wilderness. *Clark County History*, 16:39–47.
- Steele, Harvey, and Charles Hibbs
1985 Fort Vancouver: 1984–1985 Jail Project, Archaeological Excavations by the Oregon Archaeological Society. Report to the National Park Service, Vancouver, WA, from the Oregon Archaeological Society, Portland, OR.
- Tipton, Katherine Louise
2020 Archaeologists, the Public, and Collectors: Establishing a Regional Database of Archaeological Sites on Private Land and Collections with a Process for Professional-Public Archaeological Research in the Portland, Oregon Area. Master's thesis. Portland, OR: Portland State University. *Dissertations and Theses* Paper 5534.
- Warner, Mark, Tracy Schwartz, Stacey Camp, Jessica Goodwin, Amanda Biemann, and Tim Mace
2014 Public Archaeology in the West: A Case Study from Boise, Idaho. *Journal of Northwest Anthropology*, 48(2):213–234.
- Wilson, Douglas C.
2015 A Mongrel Crowd of Canadians, Kanakas, and Indians: The United States National Park Service Public Archaeology Programme and For Vancouver's Village. *Journal of Community Archaeology and Heritage*, 2(3):221–237.
2018 The Fort and the Village: Landscape and Identity in the Colonial Period of Fort Vancouver. In *British Forts and Their Communities: Archaeological and Historical Perspectives*, edited by Christopher R. DeCorse and Zachary J. M. Beier, pp. 91–125. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.
- Wilson, Douglas C., Katie A. Wynia, Amy Clearman, and Cheryl Paddock
2020 Archaeological Overview and Assessment, Fort Vancouver National Historic Site and the Vancouver National Historic Reserve, Clark County, Washington, and Clackamas County, Oregon. National Park Service, Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, *Northwest Cultural Resources Institute Report* No. 21. Vancouver, WA.