PUBLIC ARCHAEOLOGY AND THE CULTURAL RESOURCE
MANAGEMENT INDUSTRY IN SOUTHERN ONTARIO

By

Jennifer Birch, B.A.

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of
Graduate Studies and Research in partial
fulfilment of the requirements for the
degree of

Master of Arts

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario

April 24, 2006

ABSTRACT

The growth of the archaeological consulting industry in Ontario has drastically changed how archaeology is done in this province. This new public context has raised questions about accountability, and it has been suggested that archaeologists have an obligation to public education and outreach. This thesis will investigate the public role of consulting archaeologists in Ontario, with reference to a recent survey undertaken among archaeological practitioners in the province for the purposes of this study. The results suggest that the current system of cultural resource management in this province is lacking in policies and practices that permit meaningful communication with the public.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS

AARO   Annual Archaeological Report, Ontario

APA   Ontario Association of Professional Archaeologists

ARC   Archaeological Resource Centre

CAA   Canadian Archaeological Association

CARF   Cataraqui Archaeological Research Foundation

CRM   Cultural Resource Management

FPA   Foundation for Public Archaeology

OAS   Ontario Archaeological Society

SAA   Society for American Archaeology

SfAA   Society for Applied Anthropology

SHA   Society for Historical Archaeology

SOPA   Society of Professional Archaeologists

Chapter One:

INTRODUCTION

The inspiration for this study came from some time I spent working for an archaeological consulting firm during the summer and fall of 2003. Prior to this period I was relatively unaware of two things: Ontario's 11,000 year history of human occupation and the fact that archaeology in Ontario was predominantly practiced as a commercial enterprise driven by the needs of the development sector. Like many people, I thought that archaeology was something that happened 'somewhere else;' somewhere more exotic than southern Ontario. But the reality is that archaeological investigations and discoveries often take place literally in our own backyards. New sites are revealed every day in the cities and neighbourhoods that we live in, and the vast majority of these discoveries occur without receiving a ripple of acknowledgement in the community. Because so much of the land here has been used for agriculture over the last century, many sites remain only as loose scatters of artifacts and ephemeral traces beneath ploughed fields. The remains of historic buildings and features in cities may lie hidden inches below modern asphalt. Because archaeology in Ontario has such a low profile, both literally and figuratively, the people who live here are mostly unaware of the rich history of this area. These realizations led me towards a trajectory of research aimed at understanding how cultural resource management archaeology is practiced in this province and how that practice contributes to the public's knowledge of the past.

The production and recognition of heritage – and particularly archaeological heritage – is always a cultural construct (Carman 2000a: 304). This makes it very important to recognise the social contexts in which modern archaeology is practiced. We

are living in an age where most archaeology has become a form of cultural resource management (Paynter 1990: 60). What this means is that most archaeological research is not driven only by the pursuit of scholarly knowledge, but by the recognition that the destruction of archaeological remains must be mitigated and 'managed' as much as possible in advance of commercial, residential and industrial development. Cultural resource management, or CRM, has radically changed how archaeology is done in Ontario over the last thirty years. A key mechanism of this change has been the entrenchment of responsibilities for archaeological conservation in cultural resource management legislation tied to most land use planning processes. These laws have created the demand for a new kind of professional, the licensed consultant archaeologist who can attend to archaeological concerns tied to development for individuals and corporations. This new public context for archaeology has given rise to a situation in which consulting archaeologists and their employees form a multi-million dollar industry and conduct hundreds of archaeological surveys and excavations throughout Ontario every year.

This new public context for archaeology has raised questions about public accountability. It has been suggested in academic literature and in professional codes of ethics that contemporary archaeologists have an obligation to public education and outreach (Herscher and McManamon 1995; Jameson 2003; Little 2002; Messenger 1995; McGimsey 1984). The cultural resource management process is inextricably linked to public laws, and therefore, to public support. It follows that communication and interpretation aimed at the public is of vital importance. This raises questions about how this obligation translates into everyday practice for consulting archaeologists. Legislative

acts and regulations intended to protect archaeological resources are purportedly in place to preserve knowledge of the past for the benefit of the public. Does cultural resource management archaeology in Ontario, as it is currently practiced, fulfil this aim?

The purpose of this study is to examine the place of public archaeology in the cultural resource management industry in southern Ontario. By 'public archaeology' I am referring to the many ways that archaeologists might communicate what it is they do to the public at large; including but not limited to public digs, publications, giving public talks, multi-media and web-based presentations, etc. In this thesis I am interested in learning about three main things: 1) What is the general attitude towards public archaeology among consultants and how is this reflected in practice? 2) How do consultant archaeologists contribute to the general knowledge of the archaeological heritage of Ontario by non-archaeologists? 3) What are the impediments and barriers as well as the opportunities afforded by the consultant's position in the public discourse on archaeology? In sum, I would like to discover if public archaeology currently has a role to play in cultural resource management and how practitioners in this field facilitate that role despite some of the constraints placed on them by virtue of their positions as consultants. In order to answer the questions I have posed I have conducted a series of interviews with consultant archaeologists and government personnel. The study was restricted primarily to consultants working in urban and suburban areas along the Highway 401 corridor between London and Kingston because these areas have experienced rapid urban and suburban expansion over the last 10-15 years and are where a high proportion of consulting activity in the province takes place. Many of the

practitioners in this area have been working in CRM since it's inception in southern Ontario.

According to John Carman (2000a: 304), we "study the contemporary practices of archaeologists in order to understand what doing archaeology does." The goal of this project is to better understand what doing CRM archaeology "does" with respect to the understanding and awareness of archaeology among the general public. Through studying the social impacts of consulting archaeologists in their public role, I hope that this project will add to the growing body of work on cultural resource management and provide an original perspective on the practice of public archaeology within the context of consulting archaeology. The applied contributions of this research will arise from an examination of opportunities and barriers to public interpretation in the Ontario consulting industry. By providing a forum in which practitioners can voice their views on public accountability and interpretation, I hope that a constructive assessment of this element of cultural resource management will be possible. The results of this study may allow consultants to make more informed choices about how their work might be interpreted to both the wider public and to specific public interests.

Academic publications on the subject of applied archaeology and cultural resource management are disproportionately few compared to the amount of work accomplished (Downum and Price 1999: 226). This is in direct opposition to current employment trends for archaeology graduates (Zeder 1997: 60-67), and does not take into account the fact that the private sector is increasingly where new archaeological data are being produced (Ferris 2002: 74). It is important that academics begin to consider the implications of the growing practitioner community for their disciplines. Through

cultural resource management, archaeological practice has been brought out of the halls

of academe and directly into the public realm. We cannot afford to neglect the new

relationship that has formed between archaeology and the rest of society. Fritz and Plog

raised this warning more than twenty-five years ago and it still rings true today:

> We suspect that unless archaeologists find ways to make their research
> increasingly relevant to the modern world, the modern world will find
> itself increasingly capable of getting along without archaeologists
> (Fritz and Plog 1970: 412).

Overview

The contents of this thesis are as follows: Chapter Two will provide an historical

background and contemporary context for 'cultural resource management' in Ontario. A

brief discussion of the rise of CRM as a practice and an ideology based on a few key

principles will be followed by a description of the laws and regulations that facilitate

CRM in Ontario today and some of the conflicts that arise in the practice of CRM with

respect to ethics and accountability. Chapter Three will provide a similar treatment of the

concept of 'public archaeology' in principle and in practice. An historical context for the

public's involvement in archaeology will be provided as well as some discussion of how

that involvement has changed over time, and particularly how the involvement of the

public in archaeology has changed as CRM has come to dominate archaeological

practice. Some specific benefits that public archaeology can provide will be considered

and there will be a brief discussion of the various interest groups that exist among the

general public.

Chapter Four will provide the theoretical context of the debate, drawing from the

literature of applied and practicing anthropology, as well as current debates in the field of

heritage management. In particular the work of John Carman (2000a; 2000b) will be discussed, as he strongly advocates for the need to conduct more research into the systems and practices that we use to manage heritage. The methods used in this study will also be outlined in Chapter Four, including a discussion of the selection of participants, interview methods, and the questions that were posed to participants. I will also discuss my use of a grounded theory approach (Dey 1999; Glaser and Strauss 1967) to analyze the data collected.

The Fifth Chapter is where the bulk of the data collected will be presented and analyzed. This Chapter is primarily concerned with two of the main themes of this thesis: 1) What is the general attitude towards public archaeology as a component of consulting; and 2) how consultants actively make a contribution to knowledge about archaeology among the general public. Part A discusses the results of the survey, organized around conceptual categories emerging from the data and Part B contains several case studies that outline successful public archaeology programs and initiatives that have taken place in southern Ontario over the past twenty years and why these programs have or have not survived in the current CRM-dominated climate.

The Sixth Chapter is concerned with the barriers and limitations placed on consultants with respect to public archaeology. The lack of institutional support for public archaeology, as well as some of the consequences of this lack of support will be discussed with reference to what participants claimed most often prevented them from getting more involved with public dissemination. The thesis will conclude in Chapter Seven with a summary of its findings, as well as some recommendations for resolving the issues raised and the implications of what has been discussed.

Chapter Two:

WHAT IS CULTURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT?

Cultural resource management (CRM) refers to the conservation, preservation and

protection of sites and materials that contribute to our understanding of past cultures;

"what things will be retained from the past, and how they will be used in the present and

future" (Lipe 1984: 1). For the purposes of this study, North American strategies for

cultural resource management will be discussed, in particular those being employed in

southern Ontario. Most industrialized nations have developed comprehensive policies

and strategies towards cultural heritage protection and management (McManamon and

Hatton 2000). For example, sophisticated resource protection strategies have developed

in Europe as "archaeological resource management" and in Australia where the field is

known as "cultural heritage management" (Carman 2000a: 304). Strategies for the

protection of cultural heritage are often undertaken at the national or regional level

through federal and state-level policies, yet the loss of information about the past is a

threat of global significance. While CRM is most often understood as a function of

archaeology, it can also involve investigation and preservation of ethnological and

historical knowledge through the collection of oral histories and archival research.

Cultural resource management may also include the identification and protection of built

heritage such as historic buildings, cultural landscapes, and traditional use areas for

conservation and preservation (King 2002: 9).

In the late 1960s and 1970s, many North American archaeologists became aware

that North American archaeology was facing a crisis, in the form of widespread

destruction of archaeological sites (Davis 1972; Lipe 1974; McGimsey and Davis 1977).

The post-war economic boom of the late 1950s and 1960s saw the beginnings of urban expansion on an unprecedented scale and the past three decades has not seen that trend slow significantly. This prompted many North American archaeologists to become concerned with the development and implementation of strategies to actively preserve the archaeological record. These concerns led to the implementation of laws requiring that archaeological resources be identified and salvaged as a matter of course in plans for development. The outcome of these laws has resulted in the formation of a class of professional private-sector archaeologists to attend to concerns about cultural resources. The practice of archaeology in Canada has shifted dramatically over the past three decades from the research-driven pursuits of a small number of professional and avocational archaeologists to a situation in which there is a large number of professional consultants making a living doing archaeology in advance of planned development or construction that involves major alterations to the existing landscape.

Schiffer and Gummerman describe cultural resource management as "a new social philosophy for the treatment of the all too ephemeral materials that contribute to our understanding of the cultural past" (1977: 1). This 'philosophy' has materialised in policies and practices that through planning and management attempt to ensure the "least loss of information" concerning past peoples and cultures (Schiffer and Gummerman 1977: 2). However, cultural resource management can also be characterised as an ideology rooted in colonialism and nationalism. Gero writes that: "Archaeology is fundamentally and uniquely an institution of state-level society. It is only the state that can support, and that requires the services of elite specialists to produce and control the past" (1985: 342). This suggests that archaeology is indebted to the state and so must

legitimise the ideology of that state by using methods, assumptions, categories, explanatory theories and interpretations that legitimise the position of the supporting state (Gero 1985: 342). There have been challenges raised that advocate recognising and reducing the influence of the state on archaeological interpretation (Leone *et al.* 1987). Cultural resource management is even more deeply entrenched and regulated by state bureaucratic mechanisms than regular archaeological practice. However, the subject of CRM as a function of the colonial state is not the immediate concern of this project although the implications of these sorts of theoretical and political discussions on the subject of this study are important to recognise.

The Salvage Principle and the Conservation Ethic: Foundational Principles in Cultural Resource Management

There are two ideas that stand out in the development of CRM policy and practice – the "salvage principle" (i.e. Jennings 1963; Lipe 1974: 214) and the "conservation ethic" (Lipe 1974). The "salvage principle" is the basis of what has also been called 'salvage archaeology,' 'rescue archaeology' or 'emergency archaeology.' This principle holds that it is necessary and acceptable to recover some portion of the archaeological data from sites that would otherwise be destroyed without any recording (Jennings 1985: 281; McManamon 2000a: 46). The salvage principle has often been invoked when making an argument in favour of making use of looted material as data in archaeological research (Wylie 2002: 236). However, here salvage is understood as rapid survey and excavation where cultural resources are in a position of imminent destruction. The terms 'salvage' and 'emergency' excavation were mainly in use in the 1950s and 1960s when post-war development was proceeding rapidly and the need for archaeological

conservation strategies in the United States, and to a smaller extent Canada, were first recognised. Indeed "salvage" archaeology conducted on federal lands in river basins throughout the United States made major contributions to the field through descriptive reports and methodological innovations (Green and Doershuk 1998: 123). By the late 1970s it became clear that the goals of CRM were more about conservation and long-term preservation of resources, as opposed to rapid survey and description of threatened sites (Schiffer and Gummerman 1977: xix). Some criticisms of this approach also claim that excavations done under salvage conditions were not often followed by due archaeological process, including thorough description, analysis, synthesis, collections management and dissemination (Jennings 1985: 281; Lipe 1977: 31; McManamon 2000a: 46). Lipe argues that salvage excavations should only occur after all possible avenues for conserving the resource *in situ* have been exhausted (1974: 214, 229).

William D. Lipe's *A Conservation Model for American Archaeology*, published in 1974, is an excellent and often cited model for active preservation and conservation efforts in archaeology. It was around the time of its publication that CRM began to take shape in the United States and in Canada shortly after (Ferris 2002; Fox 1986). What Lipe advocated was that if possible, archaeological resources should be protected and conserved *in situ* for future use, and that American archaeologists should concentrate on threatened properties, as opposed to excavating non-threatened sites – this is the basis of the "conservation ethic." Wylie (2002: 233) notes that the rationale that Lipe gives for accepting conservationist values remains scientific and research-oriented. He sees the archaeological record as a scientific and anthropological resource, as opposed to a public

resource with "heritage" value. Yet, in many cases, it is the heritage value of resources that seems to have propelled public protection laws.

An appraisal of industry practices in Ontario suggests that most threatened sites are mitigated through excavation and sampling as opposed to conservation *in situ* (General and Warrick 2004: 29), although there are notable exceptions such as Richmond Hill's McGaw site (Pihl 2001: 16). The powerful forces of capital and economic development are in nearly all cases aligned against the conservation ethic and the possibility of leaving the landscape in an unaltered state. Cultural resource management in Ontario and throughout Canada operates within a framework of provincial legislation governing land use activities. Although various federal land management departments, such as Parks Canada and the Department of National Defence, have regulations that address heritage resources, a series of political and jurisdictional roadblocks has stalled the passage of Federal legislation protecting archaeological resources (see Burley 1994). Instead of being addressed at the federal level, cultural heritage legislation and guidelines are implemented at the provincial and territorial levels in Canada. In Ontario, the Minister of Culture is, first and foremost, responsible for encouraging the sharing of cultural heritage and for determining policies, priorities and programs for the conservation, protection and preservation of heritage. The legislative mechanisms that regulate this management strategy are the subject of the following section.

Laws Governing Heritage Resource Protection

> *The foundation of cultural resource management is the body of rules,*
> *laws, ordinances and other mandates that specify the responsibilities*
> *of all the parties involved (Miller 1990: 216).*

It has been speculated that over sixty percent of the archaeological sites existing in metropolitan Toronto had disappeared by 1970 (Coleman and Williamson 1994: 67-69). In response, the active and vocal archaeological community in Ontario during the 1960s and 1970s created a demand for the preservation of archaeological resources through legislation (Ferris 1998a: 227). The *Ontario Heritage Act* was introduced in 1974. It was built upon the *Archaeological and Historic Sites Protection Act* (1953) that had provided for some sites across the province to be protected in the past. Today, the effectiveness of the *Ontario Heritage Act* (1974) is regularly criticized today as offering only weak and inadequate protection for the conservation and documentation of cultural resources (Ferris 2002: 58).

Specific legislative texts provide a number of opportunities for the protection of archaeological resources. The primary function of the *Ontario Heritage Act* (1974) is to regulate the practice of archaeology in Ontario through a licensing and reporting system and outline the role of bureaucratic officials and procedures. It asserts the importance of heritage preservation, but alone does little to prevent the destruction of archaeological sites. The *Ontario Heritage Act* (1974) enables, rather than obliges, municipalities to protect local heritage (OAS 2003a: 14). *The Planning Act* (1996) and *The Environmental Assessment Act* (1997) require a review of all development plans and infrastructure projects in light of archaeological interests. This review used to be performed by Ministry of Culture officials, but the responsibility has recently been transferred to municipalities, who control the administrative mechanisms that permit conservation and development, with the Ministry of Culture stepping back into an advisory role. *The Cemeteries Act* (1990) addresses the need to protect human burials. Other acts in place to

protect archaeological sites include *The Aggregate Resources Act* (1990) and the *Timber Management Guidelines for the Protection of Cultural Heritage Resources* (1991). CRM archaeology in Ontario is very closely tied to, and dependent upon, the compliance requirements stipulated by all of these statutes.

Many municipalities have adopted comprehensive planning policies to deal with the conservation of archaeological and heritage resources. These 'Master Plans' document areas of potential or known cultural and heritage resources and can be consulted by municipal planning authorities in advance of development. A study by Coleman and Williamson (1994) indicates that the implementation of these planning policies have resulted in a decrease in unmitigated site destruction on the order of twenty-five to thirty percent in some municipalities. However, as growth and development proceeds, the potential for the destruction of archaeological sites still remains high.

In many ways it would seem that the original purposes behind these laws and the values they represent, have been suppressed by bureaucratic (Carman 2000a: 305) and economic processes. Cultural Resource Management in Ontario is largely conducted as a compliance mechanism that serves the development process rather than an endeavour that aims to discover more about the human past. This problem will be discussed further in Chapter Four. It is this disparity between the social value of archaeology as implied by public law and the role CRM archaeology plays in public knowledge about the past that is at the heart of this thesis. This discussion will now turn to the growth of private archaeological consulting as the main mechanism of cultural resource management in Ontario.

The Private Consulting Industry

While some CRM archaeology in North America is carried out by government agencies, private archaeological consultant firms perform the majority of the work involved in the compliance process. Consultants are hired by development proponents to carry out archaeological resource assessments, site testing and impact mitigation on public and private properties. In the United States, eighty to ninety percent of archaeological research is done by private consultants (Tom Wheaton, personal communication quoted in Smardz-Frost 2004: 79). In Ontario, consultants represent around half of all archaeological licenses issued by the Ministry each year (Ferris 1998a: 235). However, it is important to recognise that a consulting license allows the holder to undertake any number of projects in a given year. For example, between 1993 and 1996 consultant archaeologists as a group reported undertaking an average of 370 projects a year, many of which were field surveys (Ferris 1998a: 235). Between 1991 and 1997 over eighty percent of the 3,000 sites added to the Ontario provincial database were documented by consultants – triple the number of sites documented in all of the years previous to that period (Williamson 1999: 3). These numbers represent knowledge about the past that would have been lost were it not for the current laws protecting cultural heritage.

The results of a consultant's work take the form of an Archaeological Assessment Report that includes the background information, the assessment methodology used, archaeological findings, and an evaluation of site significance and recommendations for the treatment of the site, including any suggestions for public interpretation. One copy of this report must go to the Ministry, the consultant retains one, and one copy goes to the

client upon the completion of work.   Its quality and completeness in the eyes of the Ministry reviewer will determine if the proposed project will be allowed to proceed. The assessment report is often the only form of documentation that a site will receive, and consultants are generally responsible for the conservation and storage of all artifacts, ecofacts, and associated documentation. This report is required for the renewal of licenses to conduct archaeological fieldwork and often completed rapidly, despite the fact that it is the only source of information about that site retained for posterity.

Williamson has identified that there is now a "new archaeological record", composed mainly of 'grey literature' derived from CRM reports (1999: 3). An awareness and understanding of this new archaeological record is necessary to understand the history of human occupation in North America – a past largely shaped by consultants and the governments that regulate their practice, certainly in Ontario. The path of urban development also immediately affects our knowledge of the past - it directs where data will be collected. This is generally opposed to theory-driven, academic research agendas in which research designs direct where investigations will occur. The speed and volume of development also results in more time devoted to new surveys and excavations than to analysis and reporting. Consultants are responsible for generating the vast majority of new archaeological data, and are making a contribution to our ability to understand the first 11,000 years of human occupation in Ontario. However, to what extent is this information being put to work by researchers to better understand the past? Further, how is the public being informed of the archaeological record that lies beneath the places that they live, work and otherwise inhabit?

Problems in Cultural Resource Management: Ethics and Accountability

There have been a number of criticisms leveled at the ethics of CRM and consulting practices within the larger discipline of archaeology. These include, but are not restricted to, debates about business-driven or commercial motivations, the research value of CRM archaeology, the overly positivist, processual style of archaeology practiced in CRM, and responsibilities to the public at large and specific groups among the public such as First Nations (see Green 1984; Zimmerman *et al.* 2003 for a review of common ethical issues in archaeology). A few of these issues will be touched on here in order to place the intersection of public archaeology and consulting archaeology in the context of other debates surrounding the practice of cultural resource management. However, all of these problems will be returned to repeatedly throughout this thesis.

The "client-oriented approach" was a term initially coined by Fitting (1978: 13) in the early days of CRM. He was concerned with the situation where archaeologists would receive funding from clients to conduct salvage archaeology and then concentrate on their own research goals, rather than the goals of the client who was paying for the work to be done (Raab 1984). A few years later, references to this problem indicate that the situation had turned around completely (Raab 1984: 55; Raab *et al*. 1980: 541; Fitting 1984). These authors describe a client-oriented approach as one where questions that are of importance to the client are answered, primarily obtaining legal clearance for the client to proceed with development, without answering any significant archaeological research questions or contributing to the public's awareness of the cultural value of the resource. There has been a division of opinion on the compatibility of problem-oriented research and serving the needs of bureaucracy and business (Raab 1984: 52). Some archaeologists

are highly skeptical about the value of research carried out under the constraints and conflicting obligations that characterize CRM (Dunnell 1984; King 1979; Willey and Sabloff 1980: 262) but others have argued that not only are high quality research and CRM compatible, but they are inextricably linked and dependent on one another (Raab 1984; Schiffer and Gummerman 1977). The quality of fieldwork and research is a concern among many Ontario archaeologists and was cited repeatedly by participants in this study and in the small amount of literature available on consulting in Ontario (Williamson cited in Carruthers 1997: 150; Cleland 2001). These concerns include the quality and research value of data collected in the field, the problem of the growing backlog of unanalyzed archaeological collections and the proper storage and curation of these collections.

Another key ethical issue in CRM archaeology is the crucial responsibility to the public at large and to specific public interests such as First Nations, Native Americans and various other descendant communities. The evolving relationship between North American archaeologists and Native Peoples is one of the most important issues we are faced with (Burley 1994: 94; Ferris 2003; Nicholas and Andrews 1997; Rosenswig 1998; Yellowhorn 1998). Canada is one of many countries that have made indigenous populations submit to colonization and where archaeology has been developed by the colonizers. Indeed, according to some the most conspicuous social feature of North American archaeology is its alienation of Native peoples (Trigger 1990: 195-197). The evolving relationship between archaeology and First Nations is an important issue for many Ontario archaeologists (Carruthers 1997: 152-154; Ferris 1998b, 2003; Yellowhorn 1998). Involving First Nations in consulting projects in a meaningful way can be

difficult given the politically adversarial nature of the relationship between archaeologists

and some First Nations and the pressures archaeologists are under to serve their clients in

as expediently a manner as possible. The result is often that CRM archaeology is behind

the rest of the discipline in terms of addressing the relationship of the discipline to First

Nations, whose heritage comprises a major resource from which consultants derive their

livelihood. In addition, communication and education aimed at a public audience

(Carruthers 1997: 156; Williamson 1986) is an ongoing concern. It is this issue that will

be the subject of the majority of this thesis and will be addressed in detail in the next

chapter.

There is a small amount of literature available that assesses the cultural resource

management industry in Ontario (Carruthers 1997; Ferris 1998a, 1998b, 2002; Fox 1986;

Williamson 1998). There are several key issues that have been raised regarding current

practices within the archaeological community. One of these is factionalism among the

community of consultants that has developed around the operation of commercially

competitive businesses and has created gaps in communication among practitioners.

Archaeological professionalism and the need for internal greater cohesiveness, is cited as

being a top concern (Ferris 1998b) and will be returned to in the discussion of statements

from participants in this study.

Increasingly, consultants are the active face of archaeology in Ontario, operating

on the "front lines," through involvement with clients, municipal planners, and the public,

introducing and promoting the archaeological record as an important component of the

landscape (Ferris 1998a: 236). For this reason, it is consultants who are in a good

position not only to discover knowledge about the past, but also to share it with the

public. Consultants are also in a good position to educate the public about the social value of archaeological resources and the need for substantial regulations protecting those resources from imminent destruction. The livelihood of their business depends on public support for the legislation that drives the compliance process. For these reasons, it is important that communication between the archaeological consulting industry in Ontario and the public at large be established and maintained. The following chapter will define the concept of "public archaeology" in principle and practice.

Chapter Three:

DEFINING PUBLIC ARCHAEOLOGY IN PRINCIPLE AND PRACTICE

It has been said that the goal of CRM programs should be the conservation of cultural values and the maximum effective conservation and utilization of these resources for the public good (McGimsey and Davis 1977: 110). In Canada, there are public laws in place to protect archaeological resources. It follows that the public is the ultimate consumer of archaeological knowledge, and that this information should be put to use for the public good. Archaeology is our only way of understanding much of the first 11,000 years of human occupation in North America, but archaeological material is passive and silent on its own. If archaeology is going to benefit and be valuable to society, archaeologists must interpret it for the general public by actively promoting the results and the merits of archaeological research.

Consider Lipe's statement identifying public education as *the* essential component of CRM programs: "Public education and its objective, public support, are a key to the whole undertaking. *Without this, we don't stand much of a chance*" (Lipe 1974: 216, emphasis mine). Public support for archaeological conservation is necessary; otherwise, arguments could be made that efforts to preserve the archaeological record are an unnecessary expenditure. Since most people do not have an adequate understanding of archaeological terminology to benefit from the technical reports that consultants produce, it is incumbent upon archaeologists to present this information in an accessible manner. As Jameson notes: "When research is not adequately made meaningful to the nonspecialist, it is ultimately an empty endeavour" (1997b: 13). There are many benefits

that archaeological knowledge can provide to the general public and these will be discussed in detail below.

The "public" in public archaeology may be interpreted as having two meanings: it can be interpreted as the state and its institutions, who impose regulations governing the practice of archaeology, or, the individual members of society, whose reactions form public opinion; those who, in theory, should ultimately benefit from the archaeologist's research (Merriman 2004: 1-2). But, as will be shown below, our understanding of public archaeology has been drifting from the former towards the latter over the last thirty years.

What is Public Archaeology?

Public Archaeology is an ambiguous term. In fact, Brian Fagan (2002: 256) says that it may not be desirable to impose a definition upon it as this might restrict the myriad ways that archaeologists might engage with the public. However, based on the considerations of those who have written extensively about the subject, such a definition will be attempted here. The term "Public Archaeology" came into widespread use with the publication of Charles R. McGimsey III's 1972 volume of that name. For McGimsey, there is no such thing as "private archaeology" given that the shared history of humanity affects every aspect of our lives, and people therefore have an inherent right to that knowledge (1972: 5). Indeed, it would seem that in American archaeology, the terms "public archaeology" and "cultural resource management" were originally envisioned as being used interchangeably (Neumann and Sanford 2001: 5). For instance, Pat Garrow, a pioneer of the CRM industry in the US, considers: "all archaeology done

by CRM firms [to be] essentially public archaeology because the public ultimately foots

the bill in one way or another" (personal communication cited in Smardz Frost 2004: 78).

The situation in the United States is different from that in Canada because there are

considerably more archaeologists employed by state and federal departments such as

State Historic Preservation Offices and the National Parks Service that are active in

public education programming and actively contribute to the literature on public

archaeology (i.e. Jameson 1997a; Smith and Erenhard 2000). American archaeologists

do seem to more closely associate "public archaeology" with CRM, going so far as to

speak of "public archaeology/cultural resource management" (Smith and Krass 2000). In

Canada and specifically in Ontario, public archaeology is not identified with cultural

resource management, but rather with public outreach and education (Williamson 1986:

85; Lea and Smardz 2000).

Nick Merriman clarifies this distinction in his introduction to the volume *Public

Archaeology* in which he considers three separate definitions of the term 'public

archaeology' (2004: 3-4): Initially, CRM was envisioned as 'public archaeology'

because it relied on public support to convince legislators and developers that

archaeological sites needed protection and excavation, and it needed non-archaeologist

members of the public to help do the labour. In fact, many of the salvage and rescue

excavations done prior to the rise of CRM as an industry were accomplished with

volunteer manpower.

Later, as the CRM industry grew and archaeology became more professionalized,

the direct participation of the public decreased. What developed is a situation in which

the state and its agents implement planned cultural resource management strategies and

mitigation activities. This is 'public archaeology' because "the public interest is thought to be served through the preservation of cultural resources, or their careful recording during destruction" (Merriman 2004: 3). This philosophy does not serve the public interest in the present so much as it does in a "vaguely defined future time called 'posterity' when the resources, or the records of them, may be consulted" (Merriman 2004: 3). This is the philosophy upon which many legislative texts and cultural resource management strategies in North America seem to rest. Archaeological data is banked, often unanalysed, for use by future researchers, while contemporary archaeologists move along to the next contract or project.

In recent years archaeologists have realised that the current public's interest in archaeology had not been addressed in the CRM approach. This has lead to a 'public archaeology' that includes the public interpretation of archaeological knowledge and how it is produced to become a subject and profession in its own right (Merriman 2004: 3, 2003). This third definition of public archaeology is encapsulated by John Jameson (2003: 21): "Public archaeology in America can best be understood as encompassing the CRM compliance consequences as well as educational archaeology and public interpretation in public arenas such as schools, parks and museums." This philosophy of public archaeology has been developing into one in which the interests of archaeologists have become more closely aligned with the public's own interests (Merriman 2004: 3, Smardz 2000).

While the above three definitions are very important for tracing the development of public archaeology, in the early years of the twenty-first century an even wider definition of public archaeology has emerged in response to the variability and reflexivity

that has come to characterise the social sciences: 'Public archaeology' is *"concerned with any area of archaeological activity that interacted or had the potential to interact with the public"* (Schadla-Hall 1999: 4, emphasis mine). This is the definition to be employed in the course of this project. In Ontario, Williamson has similarly stated that "public archaeology is thought of as the ways and means by which archaeologists as professionals relate their discipline to the public at large" (1986: 85). He also points out that the messages and images presented to the public may vary widely and depend entirely on the specific author and/or the project in question. What we consider to be public archaeology must be flexible to allow for the various means by which that information about archaeology might be presented to an audience of non-archaeologists.

Types of Public Archaeology

For some, 'public archaeology' has meant having the public visit an archaeological site and perhaps participate in the excavation of less-sensitive portions of that site. The view presented here is that 'public archaeology' happens whenever archaeologists translate their highly technical work into a message designed for consumption by an audience of non-archaeologists. This can take a variety of forms, ranging from formal programs and presentations to informal exchanges that some may not even consider public archaeology, *per se*.

Some of the best examples of formal programs of public archaeology in North America are the Crow Canyon Archaeological Centre in Cortez, Colorado (Heath 1997), and the now-defunct Archaeological Resource Centre in Toronto, Ontario (Smardz 2000). Such programs often involve a combination of workshop and/or classroom activities and

excavation under close supervision, and can vary in length from day programs to month-long programs that can include overnight stays. Other hands-on experiences are often offered by avocational organizations and non-profit organizations such as the Cataraqui Archaeological Research Foundation in Kingston, Ontario. Archaeologists will also often give talks to school groups and organizations. Archaeology is often present in the media, mentioned in newspaper articles and radio programs and on television, either as the subject of a popular program or mentioned in news reports. One survey conducted in the United States showed that the public's primary source of information about archaeology was television (Ramos and Duganne 2000). Museums and museum-style exhibits are also a familiar way of presenting archaeology. The combination of authentic materials, visual media and explanatory text in exhibits particularly lends itself to the presentation of archaeological information.

Print media are another important form of public archaeology. They may include brochures, posters, and a wide variety of books aimed at readers with a variety of levels of comprehension. Published materials can be long-lived and can reach a wide audience. The Internet has been recently touted as providing a more "democratic" access to archaeological materials and interpretations (McDavid 2004: 160), and will likely be the most rapidly expanding field of public archaeology in the next decade. Public archaeology may also happen more informally, or incidentally, when interested members of the public see a crew excavating and stop to ask what they are doing. This happens quite frequently. In areas of high public traffic, a project may employ a person to answer questions and give tours of the site because these sorts of encounters can distract the excavators from the actual work of excavation. One particular area of public archaeology

that deserves particular attention from CRM archaeologists is how to teach archaeology without having people come onto the site. This is because time, liability issues, professional obligations and other constraints on CRM excavations do not admit bringing the public to the site, resulting in the need for the interpretation of "sites without sights" (Davis 1997).

The Public Benefits of Archaeology

In the past, archaeologists have undertaken public outreach in an effort to solicit the public's support for archaeological conservation legislation and the resulting projects (Smardz 2000, Merriman 2004: 3). Archaeological fieldwork is labour-intensive and at one time volunteer labour was essential to salvage projects. In recent years, archaeologists have come to realise that this approach to public archaeology, despite its good intentions, was blatantly self-serving in that its primary concern was protecting the resource from which professional archaeologists derive their livelihood. With the recognition that archaeologists must be more accountable to the other interests, approaches to public education have been developed that focus on the benefits that archaeology can provide to the various publics in our society (Smardz 2000). These benefits fall into two main areas: the conceptual categories of history and heritage.

David Lowenthal (1998) has defined history and heritage as interrelated yet different ways in which information about the past can be mobilized to serve the needs of the present. He views "heritage" as encompassing those places and stories which have personal and community associations. Heritage commemorates people and events. It can be intensely personal; yet can strengthen communal ties through references to a shared

past. Lowenthal likens heritage to religious doctrine in that individuals "elect and exalt our legacy not by weighing its claims to truth, but in feeling it *must* be right" (1998: 2). This critique implies that viewing the past as heritage can undermine the more legitimate pursuit of "history" (1998: 102), the supposedly objective study of the past.

The growth of an international heritage industry has resulted in archaeological sites being valued not only for the meaning they hold for local and descendant communities, but also as potential resources for economic development. The development of sites for consumption and/or for purposes of leisure generally involves manipulation of the educational and entertainment values of archaeological materials and knowledge, sometimes to mixed results. The heritage benefits of archaeology are tied to the fact that archaeological sites are real places where real events took place (McManamon 2002: 32). They are invaluable resources for providing people with a "sense of continuity" and a temporal context for contemporary life (Lipe 1984; McManamon 1991). Lipe has discussed the "universal role that the material cultural environment plays in providing cultural continuity and perspective, and hence in linking past, present and future within the experience of any given human generation" (1984: 2). However, this sense of continuity is troublesome in Ontario given that the bulk of the archaeological record represents the heritage of the indigenous inhabitants of this land and not the heritage of Euro-Canadians who currently dominate the population or the large and growing multi-cultural population in southern Ontario.

The "history" benefits of archaeology are based in the rationale that the archaeological record is often our only source of information about the distant past. Analysis of the archaeological record helps us to understand some of the larger patterns

in the past, and how these patterns relate to larger theoretical questions such as human migrations, the development of agriculture or certain technologies (McManamon 2002: 35). Archaeology as historical 'fact' also has innumerable benefits to teachers, students and the general public and can be employed as an educational tool. In addition to being used to teach history and the social sciences, archaeology can also help teach principles of geography, math, science, and logic (NRCS n.d.).

Not all benefits will apply to every situation or excavation, but the potential public benefits of sites must be considered when a consultant is deciding how an archaeological resource will be "managed." Benefits will vary depending on the segment of the public being considered. According to Watkins *et al*. (1995: 34): "a responsible archaeologist will identify potentially affected groups and will make every effort to establish contact with these people." An awareness of the many publics for archaeology should be essential for any professional archaeologist.

The Many Publics for Archaeology

The ambiguous nature of public archaeology is further complicated by the fact that there are a number of different 'publics' to be considered (McManamon 1991). When developing a strategy for the public interpretation of archaeology, the audience being aimed at must be considered, and the message and the format structured to play to the interests of various groups (Herscher and McManamon 1995: 43). There may also be specific cultural, emotional, spiritual or political issues to consider for specific publics such as First Nations and other descendant communities. These subsets of the public will be discussed briefly here and expanded upon further in Chapter Five.

The General Public

The general public is a category that includes everybody.   The only thing that classifies this group is that they are not archaeologists. There have been two notable studies conducted in North America on public attitudes towards archaeology (Pokotylo 2002; Ramos and Duganne 2000). Both examine public understanding and opinions of archaeology at the national level, in Canada and the United States respectively. The results of these surveys showed that North Americans are generally supportive of archaeology and believe that knowledge about archaeology is of value and should be taught in elementary schools. In particular, they emphasised the historical and educational value of archaeology. However, both surveys indicated that the public's knowledge of archaeology and what archaeologists do includes some major misconceptions; for example, that archaeologists study dinosaurs. The Canadian survey indicated that archaeology is not conceived as being part of the "public trust." Many respondents thought that archaeological materials had significant monetary value and that individuals had the right to own archaeological objects. Correcting this impression represents a significant challenge to archaeological educators (Pokotylo 2002: 120), and has important implications for this project. According to Pokotylo, "after three decades of increasing public archaeology activities, one of the most positive conservation measures the profession can take is improving the general level of public knowledge about archaeology, and demonstrating the benefits of archaeology to society" (Pokotylo 2002: 124). If the public is knowledgeable about how archaeologists "read" remains

from the past and the benefits of archaeological research, they will be more interested and involved in the conservation and protection of cultural heritage resources.

McManamon (1991: 123) suggests that it would be sensible to subdivide the general public into groups so that messages may be more focused and effective. There are many interests to be considered within the general public including, but not limited to, First Nations, teachers and students, avocational archaeologists and societies, politicians and bureaucrats and developers. However, there are many other segments of the public to be considered. For example, Karolyn Smardz has identified the importance of communicating with an increasingly multicultural public. Her work with the now-defunct Archaeological Resource Centre in Toronto included using archaeology to interpret the experiences of 19th century immigrants to Toronto to recent immigrants, with the intent of making them more comfortable in their new home (Smardz 1997: 105).

First Nations

Over the past few decades the archaeological community has become increasingly aware of the importance of establishing a dialogue with First Nations. This awareness has largely arisen in North America as a result of the revitalization of Native cultures and communities, and their interest in the way their past is produced and interpreted. Yet, Native peoples have justifiable suspicions about archaeologists and their motives for appropriating Native cultural heritage. Native peoples have been disenfranchised from their past in a number of ways, including the removal of traditional and ritual objects by collectors and governments from their communities and by being subjected to scientific experts, such as archaeologists, authoring their past in ways that often ignore traditional

knowledge. There are serious discussions taking place about the rights of Native groups to access the material remains of their cultures (Ferris 2003; Watkins 2003). This has resulted in the introduction of repatriation laws under NAGPRA in the United States (McCarthy 2002). In Canada, there is hope that archaeologists and First Nations can resolve these issues through meaningful collaboration and communication rather than legal action. However, constructive communication between archaeologists and First Nations is only just beginning to develop in Ontario and there is still a long road to be travelled before a mutually beneficial relationship can be achieved.

Teachers and Students

Teachers and students are an important subset of the public for archaeological education. Many archaeologists make presentations to school groups and many public archaeology programs cater to, and sometimes depend on, working with school groups during the school year. Archaeology can provide stimulating subject matter for teaching a wide range of subjects (McManamon 2000b: 21) and many archaeologists and educators have taken advantage of this potential (Smardz-Frost 2004). In *The Archaeology Education Handbook*, Smardz and Smith emphasise that every future adult in North America will be a student first, that it is at this time that their values are forming, and that children have a remarkable way of influencing the adults in their life (2000: 28).

Avocational Archaeologists

One of the most important audiences for archaeological messages is people who already have a keen interest in archaeology. This segment of the public can often be

reached through organizations such as the Canadian Archaeological Association (CAA) and the Ontario Archaeological Society (OAS). Local and regional societies are also important conduits for public education and generally have common goals and purposes: to promote archaeological research, to hold meetings for discussion and exchange of information, and to provide information to the public (Davis 2000). Avocational archaeologists are generally very keen, will come out to public talks, and are eager to learn and help archaeologists wherever possible. The challenge with this group may be providing adequate opportunities for them to get involved in archaeological investigations and research.

Government – Bureaucrats and Politicians

Since the mechanisms for CRM in Ontario are governed by parliamentary laws, government officials at all levels are another important audience for messages about archaeology. This subset of the public is small but significant (McManamon 1991: 125) because of their influence in areas affecting archaeological preservation such as strengthening legislation, municipal land use planning, and as potential sources of funding, although the latter function has declined significantly in the last twenty years.

Developers

Developers are necessarily in contact with consulting archaeologists on a daily basis. They are the ones who hire consulting archaeologists and directly fund fieldwork. This makes developers an extremely important audience for the value and necessity of protecting cultural resources. Educating developers about the value and purpose of

archaeology is often done informally through business transactions, yet it is a facet of public archaeology that we would be foolish to overlook.

These descriptions of some of the audiences for messages about archaeology are at best superficial and in Chapter Five I will discuss how consultants engage with each of these groups. The nature and location of a particular project may also suggest potential audiences for public archaeology. There are innumerable different types of audiences for archaeology, and each of these groups may use archaeological information in different ways. A responsible archaeologist will make every effort to establish contact with various public groups and make recommendations in their report for the involvement of these groups. The concept of responsibility and ethics is an important factor in this debate, and it is important to examine the codes and standards of professional ethics as they apply to archaeological practice and responsibilities to the public.

Ethics and Professional Conduct: Why Should Consultants Communicate with the Public?

> *Contributions to public education and outreach should be*
> *standard parts of the professional activities of every archaeologist.*
> *(McManamon 2000b: 18)*

It is especially important for consultant archaeologists to engage with the public. They are deriving economic benefits from the commercialisation of the archaeological record (Jameson 2003: 160). Also, consultants, as opposed to academic archaeologists, are those most frequently in contact with the public, particularly in their dealings with developers, municipal land planners, government officials and the public at large. However, the need for public education is not addressed in a formal manner in the

legislative framework or in provincial policies related to CRM. Not even a cursory

mention is given to how the accumulated data should serve the public good, or function

as a "public trust." In the United States, public interpretation is a mandated activity for

cultural resource managers in private firms and government agencies whose contracts are

in any part funded by the Federal Government (Messenger 1995: 70). Since this is not

the case in Canada, nor in Ontario, the onus of public outreach and interpretation falls

upon the individual archaeologist or firm. After all, if archaeologists do not act as

advocates for proper preservation and responsible use of the archaeological record, who

will (Lynott and Wylie 1995: 28)?

Organisations and societies such as the Society for American Archaeology

(SAA), the Canadian Archaeological Association (CAA) and the Ontario Archaeological

Society (OAS) have developed admirable codes of ethics and statements of conduct.

These include a responsibility to public interpretation and outreach by all members,

regardless of vocation. The Society for American Archaeology, North America's largest

archaeological organization, has emphasized the principle of "stewardship" as the core of

an ethical practice of archaeology (Lynott and Wylie 1995: 28).

> The archaeological record [in its many forms] is a public trust.
> The use of the archaeological record should be for the benefit of all
> people…Stewards are both caretakers and advocates…Archaeologists
> should use their specialized knowledge to promote public
> understanding and support for the long-term protection of the
> archaeological record (SAA Ethics in Archaeology Committee 1995).

The Canadian Archaeological Association and Ontario Archaeological Society are the

organisations that the participants in this study are most likely to belong to. These groups

affirm in their codes of conduct that archaeologists have an ethical obligation to public

education and outreach. It is incumbent upon archaeologists to stimulate public interest

in archaeology by disseminating data and interpretation as broadly as possible, in an easily accessible manner, to explain appropriate archaeological methods to interested people and encourage people to act as stewards for the archaeological record (CAA 2004a; OAS 2003b). The CAA also has a code of conduct specifically pertaining to Aboriginal peoples that emphasises the need for communication of archaeological research with Aboriginal people in a timely and accessible manner and a respect for the validity of oral history and traditional knowledge (CAA 2004b). The CAA and the OAS also have awards set up for excellence in public archaeology, a clear indicator that contributions to public education are valued by these organisations.

The Ontario Association of Professional Archaeologists (APA) is a professional organization primarily composed of consultant archaeologists. The Association of Professional Archaeologists' code of ethics states that archaeologists should respond to public requests for information when possible and encourage the interest of native groups in their heritage (APA 1990) – which reads as an obligation to the public, but not necessarily to outreach.

Membership in archaeological organizations with a code of ethics is voluntary. Even for members, the codes of ethical conduct are only principles; they are ceilings of behaviour rather than floors of practice. Individuals whose actions obviously and grievously divert from good practice codes of conduct may be ejected from an organization, but generally codes are meant as guidelines. The rationale for doing public archaeology is similar to many of the ideas underlying the practice of applied anthropology, being that anthropologists can no longer afford to ignore the people they study. Likewise, archaeologists can no longer afford the impact the study of past

societies has on living ones (Downum and Price 1999: 226). Archaeologists are increasingly becoming aware of their role in defining issues related to cultural identity and heritage development and have become involved in many community-based archaeology programs (Shackel 2004: 2). Such programs have developed into the subfield of "applied archaeology" which seeks to do archaeology for reasons outside of the traditional academic agenda, and to give voices to traditionally marginalized groups of the past and present (Downum and Price 1999; Shackel and Chambers 2004). There have been many excellent and innovative programs developing within this field, particularly those that seek to involve and empower First Nations and Native American communities in the production of archaeologically-derived knowledge (i.e. Nicholas and Andrews 1997; Swidler *et al*. 1997). The implications of the social impact of archaeology will be discussed further in Chapter Four. The next chapter will also present the theoretical and methodological direction of this study.

Chapter Four:

APPLIED ANTHROPOLOGY AND THEORIZING A FIELD OF PRACTICE

In this chapter I will situate consulting archaeology in Ontario within the broader anthropological framework. I will then discuss the need to "theorize a realm of practice" (Carman 2000a) which can be achieved through development of a body of knowledge that will help us to understand the practice of contemporary consulting archaeology in Ontario, and in particular the practices of consultants in their public role.   In the second section, the methods employed in this study will be explained, including the selection of participants and the tools employed in data collection.   Finally, I will describe and provide a rationale for the grounded theory approach I employed to analyse the data and develop the patterns that I see emerging.

Situating Cultural Resource Management within Applied and Practicing Anthropology

Applied anthropology generally refers to the practice of anthropology in a non-university setting where anthropological principles are used to address contemporary problems (Ervin 2000; SfAA 2005). While academic, university- or museum-based anthropologists are engaged in teaching anthropology and research, where the goal is a general contribution to knowledge, applied anthropologists often work in mixed employment contexts, based in universities but also engaging in work for development agencies or private firms, and as consultants. Further, "practicing anthropology" is a distinction that has emerged since the 1970s in order to describe anthropology employed entirely outside of an academic setting. Practicing anthropologists often employ

anthropological methods and perspectives in policy research and implementation (SfAA 2005). At times the line between practicing and applied anthropology is blurred as individuals tack back and forth between academic and non-academic pursuits over the span of a career. Most of applied and practicing anthropology is concerned with socio-cultural anthropology and deals primarily with contemporary peoples and societies. Yet public archaeology and cultural resource management, mutually or exclusively, have been identified as two areas in which applied archaeologists have traditionally been active (Ervin 2000: 2; van Willigen 2002: 205-223).

Marietta Baba (1994) has raised a number of questions about the consequences of a growing applied and practitioner community. She has also addressed and clarified the tripartite distinction between academic, applied and practicing anthropology (1994: 175). While this distinction is in many ways idealised (Reed 1997: 3), Baba points to the need to recognise the new relationships between academic and non-academic anthropology, and the long-term significance of this relationship (1994: 174). In particular, attention must be paid to the potential for practitioners to contribute to large-scale philosophical and theoretical trends in the discipline of anthropology.

The Growth of Applied and Practicing Archaeology

Cultural Resource Management has grown out of traditional archaeological research in a manner similar to how applied anthropology has grown out of socio-cultural anthropology. Both fields have experienced explosive growth in the last three decades. The growing practitioner communities in anthropology and archaeology will have important long-term implications for these disciplines.   These implications include

innovations in method and theory, and control over funding and the data base that future researchers will have access to. This last point is especially important here as the CRM archaeologists in this study are producing the archaeological record from which all future knowledge of the past of southern Ontario will be interpreted.

There has been a marked increase in the number of anthropologists with graduate training employed outside of a traditional academic setting (Baba 1994: 174). This trend exists for all fields of anthropology, and is particularly apparent in archaeology where increasing numbers of graduates find employment in cultural resource management. Melinda Zeder's (1997) research on employment contexts among the members of the Society for American Archaeology attempts to quantify the employment contexts in which contemporary archaeologists find themselves. Her numbers indicate that forty-one percent of archaeologists surveyed were employed in government (twenty-three percent) and private (eighteen percent) contexts (1997: 47). However, other recent surveys by the Society for Historical Archaeology (SHA) and the Society of Professional Archaeologists (SOPA) show notably different employment distributions and are dominated by practicing archaeologists. Zeder's survey of SAA members likely over-represents archaeologists employed in academic contexts, as the SAA is primarily an academically oriented organization, much like the Canadian Archaeological Association. Therefore, while these surveys indicate trends in the membership of individual organizations they are not representative of the actual number of practicing archaeologists in North America.

The work of Neal Ferris (1998a; 2002) can help us to understand the scale of practicing archaeology in Ontario. While consulting licenses still represent around half of all licenses to conduct archaeology issued each year, a consultant's license allows the

holder to undertake an unlimited number of projects. In 1997, consulting firms across the

province employed 75-100 people full time and another 75-100 field and laboratory

technicians seasonally (Ferris 1998a: 236). As of 2002, consulting archaeologists were

responsible for well over eighty percent, and in one year as many as ninety-six percent, of

new archaeological sites discovered (Ferris 2002: 74). Given that the volume of

archaeology done in a consulting context has been steadily increasing over the past

several years, as the scale of development increases one can only expect that these

numbers have grown, and at least remained fairly stable.

The Gap between Academia and Practice

The "gap" that exists between academic and practicing anthropologists is an issue

that has been addressed in the literature of applied anthropology (i.e. Baba 1994: 182;

Reed 1997). Generally, among anthropologists and archaeologists, there is the perception

that academic or theoretical work is more valid or more prestigious than applied or

practicing work. As Baba (1994) points out, practicing anthropologists have different

priorities, different obligations and are generally under greater time pressure than

academics. Ferris (2002: 79) has identified this problem in the archaeological consulting

industry in Ontario, noting that the archaeologists' time is often stretched thin trying to

keep up with contract and reporting deadlines, and their scholarly contributions often

suffer as a result.

Similarly, Baba has identified an "ethics gap" between practicing and academic

anthropologists. Academics frequently view applied practice as "less ethical" than pure

anthropology and fear that practitioners will be forced into ethically compromising

situations (1994: 182). There is a prevailing attitude among academics that work is done in a way that is "quick and dirty" resulting in data and research of questionable scientific validity (Baba 1994: 182) or that they produce "client-oriented" reports that answer the questions that are of importance to the client (Raab *et. al.* 1980: 541), without answering any significant archaeological research questions. Indeed, consultants themselves often question the quality of the work of other consultants.

These sentiments are reflected in the composition of academic departments in North America, as well as in the courses they offer and this situation has created a significant gap in education and training. For example, in a Society for American Archaeology survey of 343 anthropology departments in the United States and Canada (Smith and Krass 2000: 25), more than half indicated that teaching public archaeology/cultural resource management was "not a high priority." Further, this indicates that they still make a distinction between "public archaeology/cultural resource management" and "real archaeology." The education and training of participants in the present study, which I believe demonstrates this gap, will be discussed further in Chapter Five.

The gap between CRM and academic archaeologists that began to form in the 1970s now seems very difficult to span. According to Kelley and Williamson (1996: 12) archaeologists in heritage management and CRM seem to be more remote from the other sub-disciplines of anthropology than their academic colleagues. Academic archaeologists can spend their entire careers without considering CRM. Could CRM archaeologists then argue that they have no need for academic training? (Orser 2001: 465). This is highly unlikely. In fact, the minimum level of education required to receive a professional

license in Ontario is a Master's degree, yet no Bachelor's or Master's degree that specifically focuses on CRM archaeology exists at an Ontario university. It seems illogical that academic archaeologists have so little interest in the mechanisms that protect the resource base from which they derive their livelihood. Baer has recommended that anthropology should reduce elitism by doing research on its own associations, departments, mythology, work places, etc. (1995: 45). I agree entirely and believe that the study at the heart of this discussion takes a meaningful step in that direction.

Theorizing a Field of Practice

Following earlier proponents of a self-reflexive approach in the social sciences and archaeology specifically (Clifford 1988; Hodder 1986; Leone *et al.* 1987), John Carman (2000a; 2000b) has discussed the need to theorize public archaeology and heritage management, which has predominantly been an applied or practical field. He advocates doing research on the structures and processes established to manage heritage and to study what archaeologists actually do. This will form a body of knowledge about what constitutes the actual practice of managing cultural resources and the sometimes-unconsidered consequences of that practice. Carman's rationale is that by studying the practices of contemporary archaeologists in their public role we can endeavour to understand what doing archaeology does, borrowing from an idea by Foucault, who observes: "people know what they do; they frequently know why they do what they do; but what they don't know is what they do does" (quoted in Dreyfus and Rabinow 1983: 187). Such a body of knowledge will help us to gauge the effects of heritage protection

practices in present-day culture and allow us to make theoretical statements about what these practices actually accomplish (Carman 2000a: 305-308). This will add to the growing body of literature on applied archaeology in general (Downum and Price 1999: 227) and provide a foundation from which we can launch an effective critique of our current structures and practices for managing heritage (Carman 2000b: 7-8).

Cultural Resource Management and Archaeological Theory

CRM archaeology is largely tied to the processual, positivist paradigm that was widespread in American archaeology at the time of its conception in the 1970s. Indeed, the scientific basis of processualism has been cited as providing CRM with its methodological and scientific authority, yet has been widely criticised for adopting an overly positivist, rationalist approach and falling short in its ability to infer many aspects of past human behaviour (Trigger 1989: 327; Smith 1994: 302). Postprocessual or interpretive archaeology developed in reaction to this and has attempted to integrate recent anthropological approaches, such as the role of material culture in social relationships, the importance of ideology and symbolism, and recent philosophical approaches from the broader social sciences including Western Marxism (Hodder 2000: 5; Hodder and Hutson 2003; Shanks and Tilley 1988; Smith 1994).

CRM archaeology has admittedly had little engagement with current theoretical movements in academic archaeology (Williamson 1999: 4). Laurajane Smith's work (1994; 2000; 2004) has been very influential for both situating archaeological heritage management within archaeological theory, as well as discussing how aspects of contemporary social theory can illuminate archaeological discourse and the real social

impacts of archaeological practice. Smith points out that postprocessual theory "explicitly claims to have politicised archaeology" nevertheless "heritage management remains largely untheorized, yet is the form of archaeological practice which most directly engages with politics" (1994: 300). However, this engagement with politics mostly occurs in the form of bureaucratic management.

> In the course of this process, the original purpose behind such laws and values they were intended to represent and allow to operate have been masked: instead of being a 'cultural' matter (in the everyday sense), preservation of the material past has become a bureaucratic process (Carman 2000a: 305).

Carman's work concentrates on what it is that archaeologists do in the process of managing the material remains of the past and his primary concern is establishing a firm body of knowledge about what practices actually take place in that process, the ultimate purpose of such research being "the development of a body of theory that will help us to understand what that field means in terms of our own contemporary culture" (2000a; 2000b).

Theorizing the Impact of Consulting Practice on Public Archaeology in Ontario

While there are many aspects of the practice of consulting archaeology in Ontario that need to be investigated academically, the aim of the present study is to investigate how the development and practice of CRM archaeology in Ontario has affected the way that the results of archaeological investigations are made available to the public. Recently, there has been a number of works that address public archaeology in North America and elsewhere (e.g. Carman 2002; Jameson 1997a; Little 2002; Merriman 2004) and public archaeology in Canada (e.g. Lea and Smardz 2000; Smardz 2004), yet there

has been, to my knowledge, no work done that explicitly addresses the connection between cultural resource management and public archaeology in Canada. This thesis takes a step towards filling that gap.

In this project I am striving to develop a body of knowledge that will add to our understanding of the contemporary practice of consulting and CRM archaeology in Ontario and specifically how elements of this practice facilitates or does not facilitate communication with the public. I will seek to establish the connections that practitioners make between the two fields, and also where the disconnections between CRM and public archaeology occur. The three main themes that I am investigating are: 1) What is the general attitude towards public archaeology as a component of consulting and how is this reflected in practice? 2) How do consultant archaeologists contribute to the general knowledge of the archaeological heritage of Ontario by non-archaeologists? 3) What are the limitations and opportunities afforded by the consultant's position in the public discourse on archaeology? The section below outlines the methods I have employed in order to answer these questions.

Methods Used in this Study

In order to obtain information about the relationship between public archaeology and the practice of cultural resource management in Ontario, seventeen interviews were held with archaeologists and government personnel. Maintaining the anonymity of participants is very important. In the interests of preserving the confidentiality of the participants in this study, the names of individuals, their job titles or companies will not be referred to here. The consulting community and the Ontario archaeological

community in general, is fairly small and even if the participants remain anonymous here, it may be possible for some people to determine who provided which information, and this could have social and political repercussions in the community. Therefore maintaining confidentiality, while problematic, is a priority.

Participants

A number of factors affected the selection of participants. Some of these factors were within the control of the researcher and others were not. The participants I chose for this study were selected strategically, based on their ability to contribute to the themes being investigated. I was interested in speaking to archaeologists who were in primary positions in their firm, either the sole proprietor of the firm or a senior partner. These are the people who have been actively involved in and, in many ways, creating the situation I am examining.   The participants have an average of twenty years experience in Ontario archaeology and CRM. These are also the people who will be the most affected by any recommendations made at the end of this study. I was also interested in talking to Ministry of Culture personnel because these are the people who are closest to the bureaucratic mechanisms through which CRM is governed and structured in the province and also those people who can best speak to issues of public policy. I was interested in talking to academic archaeologists as well, to provide a different perspective on the themes being discussed, but was unable to find an academic who was willing to meet with me for an interview. Four academic archaeologists were contacted for interviews and all four either declined or did not reply. While it would have been interesting and beneficial to this study to have input from academics, given the general disconnection

observed between CRM and academia, I believe that the lack of input from academic archaeologists will not adversely impact this study. Rather, this has focused the data on responses from consultants and cultural resource managers. However, this is an important factor to consider when drawing conclusions from the information elicited.

As demonstrated by the unwillingness of the few academic archaeologists contacted, the participants were also to some degree self-selecting, in that they could agree or decline my request for an interview. However, only one consultant chose to decline. I believe this speaks to the fact that the people contacted thought that this study was something that warranted taking an hour or two out of their busy schedules.

The study was restricted to consultants in areas located in or between the major urban centers of London, Toronto and Kingston. These areas have experienced rapid urban expansion over the last ten to fifteen years and this is where a high proportion of archaeological consulting activity in the province takes place. It is no coincidence that the vast majority of consultants operate in or near urban centers. Another factor that limited the range of participants was determining who was accessible to me within the time and resources available for this study. Although it would be very interesting to know how archaeologists working north of Ontario's major urban centers perceive this issue, consultants in northern Ontario were not included so as to focus the study on practices in southern Ontario, where the bulk of archaeological consulting is located.

The collection of data was also restricted by scheduling concerns. Consultants are actively engaged in running businesses and have restrictions on their time. These restrictions increase significantly at the height of the field season between April and November. Therefore, interviews were conducted primarily between February and April

of 2005, with additional interviews talking place in October of 2005, so as to avoid

scheduling interviews when consultants were in the field

Data Collection

The primary tool for data collection was the semi-structured interview. This form

of interviewing is commonly employed in the social sciences and is a good option for

situations where there is only one chance to interview the participant (Bernard 1988:

204). A semi-structured approach to interviews allows for flexibility in topics discussed

and allows participants to direct the flow of conversation, so that they can identify issues

and concerns that are particularly important to them. This is something that could not

have been achieved by using a quantitative, survey-style study. This approach also

minimizes the degree to which the researcher manipulates the information elicited, while

directing the flow of the interview along certain important topics (Burgess 1984: 101-

103). An interview guide was employed to provide for some structure and to ensure that

topics were covered in the same order, albeit with some minor deviations. Bernard notes

that semi-structured interviewing using a written guide works very well in situations

where you are dealing with managers and elite members of a community who are

accustomed to, and demanding of, efficient use of their time: "It demonstrates that you

are prepared and competent but that you are not trying to exercise excessive control over

the informant" (1988: 205).

The interview schedule contained a set of themes and questions to be explored.

The full text of the interview schedule can be found in the Appendix. The three

overarching themes for this study were expressed to the participants at the beginning of

the interview: How do consultant archaeologists contribute to the general knowledge of the archaeological heritage of Ontario by non-archaeologists? What are the limitations and opportunities afforded by the consultant's position in the public discourse on archaeology? And what is the general attitude towards public archaeology as a component of consulting and how is this reflected in practice? During the interview, a set of questions was employed to keep the interview "on track" and these questions were directed towards obtaining information relevant to the three themes above.

The opening set of questions was designed to elicit information on the educational background of the participants, their current employment context and how they came to be there. The following questions were aimed at learning what the participant understood "public archaeology" to be, initiatives aimed at a public audience that they had personally been involved in or were aware of, communication with other archaeologists, First Nations, and museums or agencies, and perceived incentives and impediments to doing public archaeology.   These were followed by questions about the conservation ethic and how many sites they had personally seen preserved *in situ*. After these questions had been answered, there was generally some deviation from the schedule, depending on the areas about which the participant was particularly knowledgeable or subjects that the participants themselves wished to discuss further. This included possible funding sources for public archaeology, personal and professional ethics, collections management, the Ministry of Culture, municipalities, further discussion of public archaeology initiatives or programs, and issues related to the public trust. Much discussion was focused on the problems inherent in trying to do public archaeology as part of a competitive consulting business. These impediments will be discussed in detail in Chapters Six and Seven.

While notes and memos were written during the course of the interview, the primary recording method employed was digital voice recording. The full content of each interview was then transferred to CD and transcribed as soon as possible. I found that by recording the interviews and transcribing them at a later time, it was easier to actively listen to the participants, maintain eye contact, probe responses for further insights and make sure that the themes pertinent to the interview were discussed.

The Method of Analysis: Grounded Theory

The analysis of the data collected in interviews was analyzed using a grounded theory approach. Grounded theory is a method of comparative analysis in which substantive theory emerges from, and is grounded in, qualitative data (Glaser and Strauss 1967). It allows the researcher to integrate and interpret descriptive data through a systematic methodological process where data are coded and sorted into categories based on conceptual themes that emerge from the data. Categories are defined here as "conceptual elements of a theory" (Glaser and Strauss 1967: 36) and how data are categorised is based on the analytical purpose of the researcher (Dey 1999: 56; Goulding 2002). The relationship between research and analysis is very dialogic because analysis occurs simultaneously with collection (Dey 1999: 5-6). As the theory emerges, methods of observation can become more focused on those areas that are key to the analysis of the issue. Once no new categories are emerging from the data and theoretical saturation is reached, data collection is halted and the categories are integrated. Finally, a core category emerges around which all of the other categories are integrated and from which the emerging substantive theory is written (Glaser and Strauss 1967; Dey 1999: 98). A

grounded theory is then inductively derived from the phenomena it represents (Parry 1988).

In the traditional grounded theory approach it is assumed that the researcher will be able to return to each participant throughout the research process to probe for further insights that will help to develop particular categories. However, due to scheduling constraints and the fact that this study involves a set of geographically disparate practitioners, there was only one chance to interview each participant. Therefore, the interviews were guided by a schedule of questions so that there would be a high degree of uniformity of the topics discussed. However, if participants had particular experience in a particular area, i.e. running a public archaeology program or frequent media exposure, the conversation would concentrate on that subject. Consequently, while some analysis did take place during the collection of data, future interviews were not affected by the emerging concepts as much as they would have if there were opportunities to frequently re-visit participants.

The specific way that the grounded theory approach was employed for this study began with the transcription of interviews from digital recordings of the conversations that took place. The interview transcripts were then scrutinized closely and the statements and responses of participants were then coded into categories. The categories were partly developed based on the questions that were asked of participants and then responses were subdivided, based on the specific features of each response. For example, a broad category of public archaeology activities was created and then sub-divided into specific sorts of activities such as public talks, on-site activities, passive interpretation, etc. Statements were excised from the full text of interviews and placed on cue cards for

easier reference and also to facilitate the comparison of responses within a particular category. However, the full text of interview transcripts was retained and used to provide a fuller context for individual statements during the process of analysis. Towards the end of the analytical process, all of the categories were integrated around a core category, and a grounded or substantive theory was developed for the phenomena under investigation.

The core category that emerges during the analytic process conceptualises the basic problem addressed by the theory and provides an integrative framework around which the analysis and emerging theory can develop (Dey 1999: 110). For this project, the core category that has emerged is the barriers and impediments to doing public archaeology as perceived by the consultants. This is the central phenomenon of the study; however other categories must not be excluded since they also support the theory being produced. For example, statements related to the growth of the CRM industry form an important category in this project because this information helps to explain how the current climate for consulting archaeology has developed. The phenomena described in the core category of barriers and impediments to public archaeology is a direct result of these conditions, illustrating how no category in the analysis presented may exist independently.   In the following chapters I will describe and analyse the data that have been collected and develop a set of premises that attempts to explain how the current practice of consulting in Ontario affects the potential and actual amount of public archaeology being done.

Chapter Five:

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF DATA

The following chapter will discuss the data collected. Part A will present the data collected and is structured based on the themes and categories that have emerged from the data and relate directly to the objectives of this thesis. The chapter will conclude in Part B with a number of case studies of programs and organizations, past and present, which have operated in Ontario and have directly engaged the public interest in archaeology.   The reasons why these programs are so difficult to run in conjunction with consulting activities will also be discussed. The information presented in Part B is based primarily on information collected from participants in this study, with some additional information taken from selected literature, while the information presented in Part A is almost entirely drawn from the results of interviews with participants in this study.

PART A:
Results of the Survey

This chapter addresses the first two major themes of this thesis: 1) What is the general attitude towards public archaeology among consultants and; 2) how do consultants contribute to the general public's knowledge and understanding of archaeology. For most categories, I will be presenting the attitudes and comments of participants first and then discussing how I understand the data and their implications for the questions being asked in this study. Comments and quotes from participants will often be presented to illustrate the points being made.

In the following section, the expansion of the cultural resource management industry will be examined, based on responses from the participants in this survey. The education and training of participants will be discussed with particular reference to the gap that seems to separate CRM and academia both in terms of training and how the two sets of professionals relate to each other. Following this, some of the consequences of the commercialization of archaeology observed by participants will be explored. The next subsection deals with public archaeology in Ontario. The public trust and public interest in archaeology will be explored first, followed by the different subsets of the public that archaeologists reported working with. A description of each of these groups will be provided as well as the different ways that archaeologists work with each. The general attitudes towards and understanding of public archaeology among participants will be discussed and will lead into a description of the various sorts of public archaeology activities in which consultants claimed to have engaged.

Growth of the CRM Industry and the Development of Consulting Practice

It is important to consider how consulting archaeology has emerged over the past thirty years and how the current practices have been shaped by this development. This section will provide a context for the current practices of consultants with reference to the rapid emergence of the consulting industry in Ontario and how the individuals consulted were drawn into CRM. I will also present a framework for discussing the activities and practices of consultant archaeologists as they pertain to public archaeology. The material presented here comes primarily from interviews; therefore the perspective presented is

that of the participants in this study. (For a more thorough discussion of the emergence of the consulting industry in Ontario see Ferris 1998a; 2002).

Rapid Emergence

In Chapter Two I briefly described the development of cultural resource management in Ontario and how it has only been in the last fifteen to twenty years that the CRM industry has emerged. Some participants in this study described how in the early 1980s there was no formal CRM industry to speak of. There was a handful of consultants, including a few university professors who were also employed teaching full-time, and the London Museum of Archaeology which undertook some consulting activities in addition to its public programming. People were undertaking CRM projects in Southwestern Ontario before any other region. There are still more firms located in this area than any other part of Ontario. This may be due in part to the large quantity of prehistoric cultural remains in the region but also because of the early development of CRM policies in this area. Some municipalities have only come to have concern for archaeological resources in the last ten years or so, particularly municipalities in rural and northern parts of the province.

Participants that had worked in CRM for more than twenty years noted that there was very little legislation that addressed the protection of archaeological resources in the early 1980s. In-house archaeologists handled projects initiated by the provincial government. The Ministry of Transportation had its own team of archaeologists who dealt with heritage concerns on Ministry of Transportation projects, and the Ministry of Culture still had archaeologists working in the field performing salvage excavations when development activities would unintentionally expose significant archaeological deposits.

Often these salvage excavations included volunteer labour in order to get the work done as fast as possible (Ferris 2002: 59).   It was noted by participants that the Ministry of Culture has since ceased putting archaeologists into the field and is strictly concerned with bureaucratic management and reviewing reports submitted by consultants. The Ministry of Transportation also hires consultant archaeologists rather than employing its own.

Some respondents also noted that in the last twenty years, conservation provisions in the Ontario Heritage Act, the Planning Act, the Environmental Assessment Act and the Aggregate Resources Act have been strengthened.   With these laws in place, and as the pace of development grew in southern Ontario, the demand to hire archaeologists to clear these restrictions on development increased.   During the late 1980s, the archaeological bureaucracy in Ontario came to the realization that regardless of how many staff the government employed, there would always be more sites under threat from development than staff available to salvage them (Ferris 2002: 59-60). At this time, many individuals with advanced training in archaeology began to view consulting as a viable employment option in addition to traditional academic work.

How participants were drawn into CRM

One consultant describes how he "became convinced that the quickest and best way to find research was through CRM" and that he "literally couldn't believe the money that was available from the Ministry of Transport to do this small piece of work compared to the amount of work I (he) had to do to apply for grants."   Indeed, in the early days of consulting it seems that there was a positive perception among

archaeologists that the structure of CRM in Ontario had the potential to provide for the preservation of cultural resources and fund quality archaeological research without traditional sources of funding such as grants and fellowships.

The data collected indicate that many consultants entered the profession by first working for another firm and then eventually moving on and starting their own firm, or had been previously employed by the provincial government in the Ministry of Culture or the Ministry of Transportation or a municipal government planning department, and went into consulting once these departments began to scale down their archaeological activities. While there are a few larger firms operating in the province, and one very large firm, many consulting businesses are smaller, often one-person operations, supplemented by hiring temporary crew when needed for a project. In 2005, the consulting industry is still fairly small and most of the practitioners are well known to one another.

Academic Education

The education and training of current and future CRM practitioners was a recurring topic in interviews. Most of the participants in this survey have a Masters or Doctoral degree. Of the eleven participants who were actively working with a consulting license at the time of the interviews, two had Bachelors degrees in anthropology or archaeology; six have Master's degrees, three of those have Doctorates in progress; and three have PhDs. However, this grouping is not representative of the total consultant population in Ontario. Although it should be noted that more than one participant commented on the fact that many consultants and employees of consulting firms have advanced degrees, and that the profession is "top-heavy."

Not one participant said that they had received any formal training in the principles or practice of CRM before becoming actively involved in the industry. It was re-iterated by a number of participants that there are few opportunities for students interested in pursuing a career in CRM to receive adequate training. Furthermore, post-secondary education in archaeology in the province generally leaves students ill-prepared for actually pursuing a career in archaeology. Despite the dominance of consulting archaeology in the province, Ontario universities have mostly ignored CRM. Ferris notes that this gap also means that any solutions to problems arising in the current practice of CRM in Ontario will have to come from practitioners themselves, "on the fly" (2002: 76).

At the time of this study, there were three courses offered by Ontario universities that provided instruction on CRM in principle and in practice, and some of these courses are only offered sporadically. Some consultants expressed displeasure at the gap between what is taught in Ontario universities and what students who hope to find employment in CRM need to know, such as skills in surveying, clear writing, communication skills and a familiarity with the material culture of Great Lakes archaeology. One participant, when asked about the potential for training students in public archaeology, commented: "If I wanted a bonus, I'd love for them to be able to talk to the public about what they do." In fact, it would seem that many archaeology undergraduates are also ill informed about what their job options actually are and only discover how prevalent CRM employment is in Ontario after or close to graduation.

The Prestige Gap

The participants in this survey seemed well aware of the split that has occurred between consulting and academic archaeologists. Comments included: "Academics don't trust the reliability of the information consultants produce," and "academics look down their noses at consultants." One person suggested that this attitude developed in Ontario because "CRM started earlier in the US and some of those negative practices have produced negative attitudes among academics on this side of the border." There were also statements that indicated that the gulf between academic archaeologists and consultants is not getting better any time soon and it will be a while before that communication develops. Yet others indicated that they are starting to communicate more with academics. A couple of participants indicated that they have recently have been asked to come to universities and give talks on CRM.

I will hypothesize that one reason for the general disconnection between academia and cultural resource management may be that those archaeologists employed by universities may not feel comfortable teaching CRM because it is not their principal area of expertise. It may also be that perceptions of archaeology inside academia have been slow to adjust to the massive changes archaeology is undergoing in the private sector. The gap between consulting work and academic training could also be due to the perception that traditional theoretical work confers greater prestige than applied or practicing activity, as noted by Baba (1994: 182) and others (Baer 1995; Reed 1997). One participant insinuated that academics have "completely failed" in terms of finding out what their students need to know when they go out and get a job in the real world – not that he is "advocating turning universities into community colleges," but he believes

that there are aspects of contemporary archaeology not being taught in the current curriculum.

Interestingly, participants were quick to retaliate to any suggestion that consultant-based work had less legitimacy than academic archaeology. Comments that stand out in particular are: "Many people in CRM could "out academic" the academics any day of the week." "There are also academics who do shoddy work and don't publish." "Consultants are doing the vast majority of CRM work, get more funding, and academic archaeologists run the risk of becoming irrelevant." Indeed, one consulting company in Ontario has more individuals with PhDs and MAs than some academic departments in Ontario. Some participants continue to teach in and work with academic departments. These people indicated that while they do have a good relationship with academics that they are acquainted with, the elitist attitude is still there. One also remarked that it is easy for them, from their position as private consultants, to criticize the work that academics do.

In terms of public archaeology, it was pointed out by some participants that academics generally have even less of a relationship with the general public than consultants do. "Academics don't feel like they have to have any involvement with the public at all, nor are they accountable to anyone but their peers." Also, "the general awareness of archaeology amongst the public is all CRM, academics have nothing to do with it." I would add here that training in public archaeology is not generally offered as part of formal education. Field schools most likely provide students with their first opportunity to work in a context approximating public archaeology as many field school students take the course for interest, rather than from a desire to pursue a career in

archaeology, and adults will often participate in archaeology for interest or as continuing education (Smardz and Lee 2000).

Training as Employment

I have noted that students who are going to take on consulting archaeology as a profession generally receive their training in the course of summer employment while working for consultants. Indeed, many practicing consultants entered into the field as undergraduate or graduate students looking for summer employment. Some participants said that it was never their intention to get involved in consulting archaeology, but ended up there because of cutbacks in government funding or because consulting allowed them to continue to do archaeology, as opposed to seeking employment outside the discipline.

In order to receive a professional archaeological license in Ontario the applicant must possess a Master's degree in anthropology, archaeology or a related discipline, professional experience in the area, and experience both as a supervisor and being supervised in survey/excavation, lab or curatorial work, and report writing (Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Recreation 2002: sec 2.5). Participants noted that there are limited opportunities available for supervisory experience and experience in report writing. Some reasons for this, cited by participants, include consultants being too busy to mentor, small companies with no permanent supervisory positions and consultants not being able to afford to take on and train inexperienced persons. Quite often, young people working in CRM archaeology find that there is so little security of employment in this field that they abandon it as a career choice. One comment was made that once people realized that a job in archaeology was hard work and often didn't pay as well as

they hoped, they would pursue employment in other areas. Another participant commented that after some consultants have been in the industry for a long time, and not in contact with academic archaeologists or other professional archaeologists through conferences or other means, they tend to lose interest, forget the bigger picture and do not get excited about what they are excavating. A number of participants maintain links with universities, often as part-time instructors or research associates, in order to remain close to academic archaeology.

Consequences of the Commercialization of Archaeology

"We are in the dark ages of Ontario archaeology."

A host of problems have arisen in southern Ontario with the transformation of archaeology from a research-based discipline to a bureaucratic mechanism that is guided by the needs of various commercial interests. At the heart of these problems lies the difference between the objectives of the contracting agency or company whose interests the consultant is obliged to serve, and the objectives of the discipline of archaeology (Fowler 1984: 108). When an archaeologist is hired for the sole purpose of removing conditions on a development for a client it is implicit that the research value of the information collected will suffer at the hands of practical expediency. In addition, both the development proponent and the archaeologist stand to profit financially from this transaction. Given this, archaeologists have been accused of serving an agenda based on personal profit at the expense of the archaeological record and the cultural heritage of others (Ferris 2002: 78). Is the purpose of CRM archaeology in Ontario to employ archaeologists? It has been claimed that with the rise of CRM, archaeology has been co-opted by the capitalist agenda (Patterson 1999). Many of these problems were identified

twenty or more years ago in the literature of CRM archaeology (Fitting 1984; Fowler 1984; Schiffer and Gumerman 1977) and continue to exist today in the dominant discourses surrounding CRM and in casual discussions in back rooms at professional meetings. The following section will discuss some of the problems noted by participants with respect to the increased commercialization of archaeology in Ontario.

Busy, Busy, Busy

Participants noted that the nature of the consulting field is insecure; so that when business is good people do as much work, that is, as many projects as possible. In this sort of competitive climate there can be an over-emphasis on getting the maximum amount of fieldwork done in a year. The archaeologists are involved in fieldwork full-time from April to November, often leaving inadequate time for report writing in the winter months, and resulting in a mad rush to finish license reports before the start of the next field season. This formula leaves little time to do any supplemental research and analysis of the material encountered. This situation has been exacerbated in recent years by the real-estate boom in southern Ontario that has seen a massive amount of urban and suburban expansion and a record number of CRM projects done each year. All of the consultants indicated that they were constantly busy, often working through weekends, and one went as far as to say: "Sometimes you hope you don't find anything."

Research and Analysis

> "If we stopped digging now, we would have enough material that we
> could spend generations analysing and interpreting it. The problem
> is keeping up in some meaningful way with what we've got."

Most of the participants in this study began their careers as research-based archaeologists, mainly through their experience as graduate students. However, CRM does not cater to a focused academic interest. The commercialisation of archaeology in Ontario through CRM has resulted in a situation in which archaeologists are unable to do adequate research and analysis on the material that they excavate. They acknowledge that fieldwork has to be done as quickly as possible and that any lab work also has to be done rapidly so that the report can be submitted for clearance in a reasonable amount of time, in order to satisfy the client and fulfil the archaeologist's contractual obligation. The reports produced are mainly descriptive, with minimal analysis. While some companies are involved in or have been involved in research-oriented work, they must be selective about which sites they will investigate and analyse more thoroughly. It also seems that large firms have the resources available to do supplemental research on sites they excavate, whereas smaller firms must move quickly from contract to contract in order to keep their business viable.

Consultants have worked on some of the most important sites in Ontario archaeology, what would be viewed as "prestige" sites in academia. One would think that the information gained from these sites should be published and circulated widely, yet most of the time it is never utilized beyond the reporting stage. Many consultants complained that it was hard to know exactly what was contained in the grey literature. By word of mouth consultants keep up to a certain degree on who is working where, but it is difficult to get access to material that has been filed with the Ministry of Culture. Also, two consultants commented that they were often unable to obtain information on the subject areas that they specialize in because other consultants only rarely publish the

results of fieldwork done under contract.   This is especially true when the other

consultant has a preference for certain sites or is not especially interested in a particular

time period; for example, an archaeologist who is primarily interested in Archaic sites is

not very likely to publish material on historic farmsteads, despite excavating many of the

latter each field season.

Publication

> *"We don't publish half as much as we should, but we do what we can."*

The general attitude towards publishing the results of excavations can be summed

up with the above statement from an interview. There is one firm in particular that has a

fairly good record of publication, however the amount of information that they publish is

still a very small percentage of the sites that they excavate in any given year. Publication

can only be done after quality research, lab work and analysis are carried out and as

stated above, there is little time for these things to be done in a competitive business

climate. One participant remarked that he would not be comfortable putting his name on

an inferior publication because he did not have the time to write it up properly. There

were comments from some participants that it used to be that the winter was the time for

writing things up for publication, however today winters are used for writing license

reports from the previous field season.   Larger firms may have the staff available to do

supplemental research in the off-season, however small or independent consultants often

do not have the time to write things up to peer-review quality.

The *Annual Archaeological Report, Ontario* (AARO) is a series that was

originally published by the provincial government between 1887 and 1928. The Ontario

Heritage Foundation resurrected it in 1990 with the objective of providing a "publication

outlet for individuals wishing to publish short abstracts describing the results of

archaeological fieldwork conducted in Ontario" (Storck 1990: i). The articles in the

AAROs are not published papers *per se* but rather short descriptions of various

archaeological investigations throughout the province. A significant portion of each

edition is devoted to consulting activities. Consultants are invited to submit short reports

detailing the highlights of the field season, and some do. The AAROs have the potential

to allow practitioners to keep abreast of some of the activities of other consultants.

However, these short pieces only represent a small portion of the fieldwork activities

undertaken by some active consultants in any given year. It is not mandatory that

consultants submit a report to the AARO and many consultants do not. Two participants

in this study suggested that submitting to these volumes should be a mandatory part of an

archaeologists' license. While this may be a good idea, the Ministry of Culture is not

willing to make it a requirement. Also, the most recent AARO published is volume 12,

2001 and outlines excavations that took place six years ago, in the 2000 field season.

This delay in time makes it difficult for individuals to maintain current knowledge of

archaeological activities in Ontario.

In theory, any researcher should be able to obtain the collections, maps and

records for any site excavated by a consultant that they are interested in analysing further.

But this is not necessarily the case. The report that goes to the Ministry of Culture

contains insufficient information for a focused analysis. One participant commented that:

"Not much of the information gathered is highly useful, the field notes are poor and the

collections are not available." Consultants are obligated under the terms of their licenses

to care for collections in perpetuity, although they do try to have them placed in institutions near where the excavations took place. This means that related collections are often divided up amongst the archaeologists who excavated them. One comment was that: "If all the data was in one place it would be easier to make meaningful connections amongst it all." However I have noted that consultants may be protective of their collections, intending to write them up for publication in the future, or they may be sensitive about other archaeologists criticising their work and therefore will not be willing to make the collections or associated documentary records available to others.

Storage and Curation of Collections

The fate of archaeological collections was a theme that kept reoccurring during the interviewing process. There was one item in the schedule of questions that inquired about how artifacts were stored and the accessibility of collections to the public. All of the participants felt that storage of collections was a major problem within the CRM industry, as the following comments will illustrate: "Artifact storage is a major problem;" "This is a big issue;" "This is a huge issue;" "The storage of artifacts has been a problem for ages;" "It is an industry-wide problem." It is currently stipulated by the licensing regulations for consultant archaeologists that the archaeologist is responsible for the storage of any archaeological collections he or she excavates. The archaeologist also has the option of placing the material in an institution such as a museum or university. However, these institutions are often not willing to take collections because they do not have the space available. Participants informed me that neither the Royal Ontario Museum nor the Canadian Museum of Civilization were interested in taking collections

from consultants and that only a handful of local museums was interested in acquiring

collections of historic material.

While many of the archaeologists were interested in doing further research on

particular collections and were interested in retaining them for this reason, most preferred

to have them placed in a suitable repository or institution. One consultant remarked that

his company had no interest in being a repository and they would be happy to get rid of

the collection as soon as they finish with it. Another commented that having collections

in people's basements was "less than ideal" and more than one remarked on the

uncertainty about what was to become of collections once the archaeologists retired or

companies went out of business. Many consultants voiced the opinion that: "Artifact

storage should be the responsibility of the Ministry [of Culture]," and that the Ministry

has not taken adequate responsibility for collections management. Certainly the storage

of collections related regionally and temporally in various disparate locations, the

inaccessibility of these collections for researchers, and the fact that archaeologists find it

difficult to remain aware of what collections and records even exist does not bode well

for the state of archaeological research in Ontario. If this research is not being done, how

are we to know what the validity of that data is for forming, through careful

interpretation, those stories of the past that we can share as our collective heritage?

Quality of Fieldwork

"I don't think a lot of sites are coming out of the ground properly."

There were some comments made about the quality of the fieldwork being

performed that has definite implications for research in Ontario archaeology: "Hundreds

of small sites have been lost and not recognised by consultants – despite the fact that these sites are very important for understanding the archaeological record." Some also noted that it is easy to make errors in identification of sites and assign them to the wrong time period, and this skews the database. For example, some survey techniques would completely miss Paleo-Indian sites. These are important allegations if we are to have an accurate database developing out of CRM archaeology that will be of use for future generations of researchers.

The commercialisation of archaeology as CRM has certainly had consequences for the way that fieldwork is carried out and for the quality of the work being done. Many participants in this study voiced concerns that some consultants were doing surveys and excavations that were of a lower quality than should be acceptable. This concern has increased proportionally with the number of projects done per season as the pace of work increases. Participants also commented on low quality fieldwork being related to underbidding to win contracts, a practice that will be discussed in further detail below.

It would be useful to conduct a systematic and critical evaluation of CRM practices in Ontario. This study has indicated that most consultants lack the time and resources to undertake any sort of meaningful analysis of the information that they generate which not only impedes their ability to effectively communicate with the public, but also prevents them from evaluating the relative merits of the data they are generating. If these sites were being investigated, both during and post-excavation, in a more theoretically and methodologically sensitive manner, rather than with pragmatically driven methods, would we find that we are losing information at observational, interpretive and descriptive levels?

There is currently no system in place to ensure accountability and that the archaeology being done is of a high quality, save the report review process. However, a new set of guidelines for fieldwork, being prepared by the Ministry of Culture under advisement from a technical advisory group composed of professional archaeologists, do take steps in this direction. The Ministry does not have the staff available to police sites and monitor the consultants because their personnel are completely tied up reviewing license reports. The consulting industry in Ontario is largely self-regulating. Many archaeologists hold themselves to high quality standards of work, and hire experienced fieldworkers to help ensure that the resource is adequately controlled for. However, the numbers of comments from respondents that suggest otherwise indicate that this is a problem within the CRM industry that requires further investigation and intervention. There is no provision that says that the consultant has to do 'good' archaeology or that they have to 'promote' archaeology. There is the license review process, but in the words of one participant – "Some of the worst archaeologists write the best reports." Likewise, there is no provision that states that archaeologists must make their work available to the public, other than the obligatory filing of a report that is put into the public record.

Underbidding

> *"In my view, consulting archaeology in Ontario started on a bad footing,*
> *with firms underbidding one another, and that mentality has survived."*

As many Ontario archaeologists made the transition from being academically based researchers or public servants into independent consultants, factionalism developed between practitioners, who now found themselves as the managers of competing commercial business ventures. One of the biggest factors that have influenced this

factionalism is underbidding or low-bidding in order to win contracts over competitors.

Many participants were quick to point out that developers were interested in paying the

least amount possible to hire consultants and get their clearance to build. It is a common

tactic for firms to low-bid or under-bid on a contract in order to generate business, often

when they are a new company or as a way to a large amount of business. This may mean

that the consultant takes a financial loss on the project and employees are paid a lower

wage than should be adequate, and that work may not be done to an acceptable standard.

It is difficult to keep experienced people working in the industry if they are not being

paid adequately. Underbidding may mean low-quality archaeology will be carried out in

the absence of adequate financial resources, which undermines any potential conservation

benefits to the resource.

One participant pointed out that when his company is placed on a team with other

consultants, the other consultants ask them to charge more. The reason that they have to

charge so little is that other consultants are charging low rates and driving down industry

median prices. Clearly, if there is barely enough money coming into a firm to get the

work required by a contract done, there is little chance that any further resources will be

put towards making the results of the investigation known to the public.

The Conservation Ethic

As discussed in Chapter Two, the conservation ethic holds that salvage

excavations should only occur after all possible avenues for conserving the resource *in

situ* have been exhausted. This is one of the principles that CRM archaeology was

founded upon (Lipe 1974: 214, 229). Each consulting archaeologist in this study was

asked what percentages of the sites that they had encountered were mitigated by conservation *in situ.* Their answers ranged from "less than one percent" to "fifteen to twenty percent." It is interesting to note that archaeologists working in the eastern half of southern Ontario reported significantly higher numbers of sites conserved *in situ*, ranging from ten to twenty percent, than their counterparts in the Greater Toronto Area and Southwestern Ontario, who reported conservation levels ranging from "less than one percent" to "less than ten percent."

It is not surprising that the vast majority of sites discovered by consultants are mitigated through excavation. Archaeology in principle requires that sites be destroyed in order to 'preserve' the cultural remains there through excavation and documentation. The archaeological record is just that - a record of what has been destroyed as well as those artifacts and samples selected for preservation and retained in collections. The Provincial Policy Statement related to the Planning Act first identifies excavation as a means of conservation, and preservation *in situ* as a second choice, if necessary:

> Development and site alteration shall only be permitted on lands containing archaeological resources or areas of archaeological potential if the significant archaeological resources have been conserved by removal and documentation, or by preservation on site. Where significant archaeological resources must be preserved on site, only development and site alteration which maintain the heritage integrity of the site will be permitted (Ontario Provincial Policy Statement, Section 2.6, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology 2005).

Participants noted that developers will sometimes opt to avoid a site by leaving that portion of the property undeveloped or planning to put a greenbelt or park space over the area. Golf courses may alter the design of fairways so that areas containing archaeological sites are avoided, which is problematic because golf courses are constantly being redesigned. It was noted by some participants that the reason a site might be left

unexcavated is because the developer does not want to pay for the cost of excavation. It often comes down to a cost-benefit analysis for the developer: Is it more advantageous to pay to dig the site, or to avoid it? Because the cost of salvaging a site is relatively low for most sites, it is generally in the developer's best interests to have the site excavated and absorb the costs. One proponent commented that the cost of an average excavation is $10,000 to $15,000 for an historic homestead or an Archaic scatter, but that Iroquoian villages can cost significantly more depending on the size of the settlement. The profit to be made from putting in a residential development almost always outweighs the cost of excavation, so in this case it is not the CRM industry *per se* that is to blame for the lack of site conservation but the economic power of commercial growth in southern Ontario.

It would seem that theoretically avoiding sites by disguising them as green spaces and parks in development plans does not actually provide for their preservation. One participant commented: "Preserved? That is always an interesting term because it doesn't work that way." Another remarked: "Memories are short. You can go back in two years and people are digging there without permission." Many archaeologists do not want to leave sites *in situ.* Some participants expressed concern for the long-term stability and protection for sites that had been "preserved" *in situ*, declaring that the risk of destruction and looting increases exponentially when development and housing is introduced close by. One participant remarked that when a community is aware of a site in its midst, they can become protective of it and monitor the site for potentially destructive activities. But the situation that was referred to where the community became involved in the protection of a site was one where the subdivision and its residents have been there for a more than a

decade, and one has to wonder if a community living in a new development would have the same sense of responsibility.

Capping

The final issue that will be discussed here with respect to conservation is that of "capping." Capping sites is a mitigative strategy that involves sealing sites under a deposit of soil *in situ.* Capping is most often used when working on the development of a park or golf course. Theoretically, this is supposed to preserve the site although many archaeologists are mistrustful of capping. Some of the participants commented that it is better to conserve sites passively rather than putting a ton of dirt on top if it. Chief Kris Nahrgang, of the Kawartha Nishnawbe First Nation has this to say about capping:

> In the eyes of First Nations, capping a site to allow for construction of
> a golf course is not preserving our cultural past. In fact, it is the
> destruction of our past, as chemical fertilizers, golf carts and pedestrian
> traffic walk over our ancestral remains on a daily basis. These sites are
> said to be preserved for the future. It is said that archaeologists may have better
> technology at their disposal in the future. This scenario, in our
> opinion, is just making developers' problems "go away" (2002: 2).

The new draft guidelines for fieldwork by consulting archaeologists being prepared by the Ministry of Culture will make it clear that capping is not an option, "as it can increase the risk of damage from compaction, accelerated artifact deterioration and unintentional impacts during cap construction" (Ontario Ministry of Culture 2004: 45).

Future Direction of the Industry

Despite the range of negative comments about the practice of consulting in Ontario, many participants seemed optimistic about the future direction of the industry.

CRM in Ontario has been developing for about twenty-five years and is reaching a point where it is has achieved a certain amount of maturity. However, a number of participants expressed the need for greater professionalization and accountability within the consulting industry. It was suggested that this change needs to come from the practitioners themselves, but may end up being forced by external pressures such as the demands of First Nations or by the Ministry of Culture.

In many ways the rise and current dominance of the archaeological consulting industry has impeded the ability of archaeologists to make their work relevant for the public at large. As far as public archaeology is concerned, consultants are simply too busy being consultants. Despite the increase in the volume of projects there is relatively little public archaeology being done. In many ways archaeology in this province is done simply as a way to make a living. When this is the case, in the words of one participant in this study, "we are simply exploiting another resource and are no different than those people cutting down trees and pulling the fish out of the sea."

Public Archaeology as a Component of Consulting Practice

The Public Trust

At this point I would like to turn away from general trends in the consulting industry in southern Ontario and return to the relationship between consultants and the public. At this point I think it will be beneficial to re-iterate the importance and place of the public trust in archaeology. The "public trust" is understood as the responsibility the public places on government to care for their interests. It is my understanding that the goal of CRM programs is the conservation of cultural values and the maximum effective

conservation and utilization of these resources for the public good (McGimsey and Davis 1977: 110). One of the aims of this exercise is to determine how the public trust and the public good are being served under the current heritage protection strategy in Ontario.

As it stands now, the public trust appears to be served in Ontario primarily by the archiving of descriptive site reports that may be utilized in the future for research, publication or public presentation. Technically, these reports are available to the public and a provincial site database is maintained that can assist in finding information about specific sites. One Ministry of Culture spokesperson informed me that by maintaining the report archive and database, their obligation to the public is fulfilled. However, license reports are not intended for or interesting to the public (Lea and Smardz 2000: 143) and the current system in no way provides for cultural resources to be *utilized for the public good,* as McGimsey and Davis (1977: 110) required in their goals for CRM.

Comments from participants in this study also indicated a general acknowledgement that the information being collected by CRM processes is not being used to serve the public trust: "It (the public trust) ends at handing in a report and a catalogue and telling them where the artifacts are. There is no regulation to publish, there is nothing that says that it has to be published or it has to be disseminated;" "There is no public good right now;" "The information is not at all serving the public trust…the people should be allowed to see the information. Especially First Nations."

In CRM it is the public who are actually paying for most of the archaeology being done. The cost of archaeology is now built into housing prices, the cost of building roads and other infrastructure, higher hydro prices, etc. One participant in this study suggested that archaeology might account for one percent of development costs, a negligible sum in

terms of the overall cost of development. But if the public is paying in any way for the work to be done, should they not receive something for that investment? It is difficult to justify the millions of public dollars that go into CRM archaeology and the bureaucracy that supports it if the materials and knowledge produced are destined to go into a file in a private office, a government archive or under a plastic sheet in a basement, where no one will likely see it again.

One participant commented that the under-utilization of CRM-derived information might be due to the fact that in the past the archaeological community has not been held accountable to anyone but itself. Archaeologists do not have sole control over the archaeological record, although they are those people who are most likely to be doing the translation of the technical material that aids in our understanding of the past. In the last fifteen years many other public stakeholders, notably First Nations, have begun to actively lobby governments and archaeologists to have a say in the management and interpretation of cultural materials. The archaeologists that were surveyed demonstrated that they were aware of competing claims to the archaeological record and what is to be done with it, and their obligation as archaeologists to contribute to the public good.

This is promising, but also to be expected, since most professional organizations, including the Canadian Archaeological Association and the Ontario Archaeological Society have statements in their principles of ethical conduct and code of ethics that speak to a responsibility to share archaeological knowledge with the public in the interests of promoting interest in and knowledge of our archaeological past. Although most archaeologists acknowledge the obligation to disseminate to the non-archaeological community, the actual practice of this ideal leaves much to be desired.

Legitimacy

> *"It is difficult to justify doing something if you do not have general*
> *support from a broad audience. That is why public archaeology is*
> *just so important, even in terms of what is required legislatively."*

More than one participant commented on the fact that public education provided

legitimacy to what archaeologists do. In the past, arguments have been made that it is the

perception of archaeology as a scientific endeavor that justifies its existence. This

position views archaeological sites and artifacts primarily as irreplaceable resources for

understanding the human past (Wylie 2002: 229). However, there have always been

many people who perceive archaeology more as a source of national, cultural or personal

heritage rather than a scientific venture. Knowledge gained from archaeological

investigations can provide individuals or groups with a sense of continuity with the past

and encounters with archaeological objects and narratives become meaningful parts of

our collective heritage (Lipe 1984: 4). While the archaeologists surveyed seemed to

acknowledge that public education about archaeology was important in its own right,

they also seemed aware that communication with the public also serves to legitimize their

use of archaeological resources for employment.

Public Interest

Comments related to the perceived public interest in archaeology were collected

from participants in the course of this survey, although in order to gain further insight

into levels of interest in archaeology among the public a number of more general surveys

of public interest in archaeology will have to be considered. It may be naively optimistic

to assume that the public is interested in archaeology at all. Carman notes that the usual

argument that "the past belongs to all" (Merriman 1991: 1) "does not lead logically to the conclusion that all humans have an interest in the preservation of archaeological remains." He suggests that the perceived need to create an interest among the public raises the question of where the public interest in preserving archaeological material derives from and resides (Carman 2000b: 9).

There is a certain degree of apathy towards archaeology in general in Ontario, or if apathy is too strong a word, it is safe to say that archaeology does not have a high profile in this province. Some reasons for this, as cited by participants, included the dearth of information about Ontario archaeology that is written in a way that the public can find interesting and exciting: "The public doesn't want to know about the length of flint flakes or the thickness of potsherds. The public wants to know who lived where and when." People generally expect that archaeology will be exciting and romantic (Fagan 1977: 120), when often it is simply not. A few participants noted that much of CRM archaeology, such as pedestrian surveys, digging test pits, and excavating artifact-poor sites is not interesting for a general audience and therefore not appropriate for public education. One respondent noted that primarily, people are interested in narratives about the past and that one mistake that archaeologists often make is discussing archaeological material in terms of what it means to the archaeologist. "You can't expect people to pick up a technical report and get much out of it."

Despite some misgivings it would seem that there is a demonstrated public interest in learning more about archaeology and heritage in general (Pokotylo 2002; Ramos and Duganne 2000). Superficially, one need only look at the number of local historical societies and popular media such as television shows and magazines devoted to

history and the past in general to see that there is an interest in many parts of the general public. As mentioned briefly in Chapter Three, David Pokotylo's national survey (2002) has provided an empirical evaluation of how Canadians perceive archaeology. In ranking the importance of archaeology in today's society on a scale of one to ten Canadians averaged a mean score of seven and a half, which assigns a relatively high level of importance to archaeological heritage. Ninety-eight percent of respondents indicated that archaeological sites should be protected. Eighty-four percent of respondents stated that they had visited museums exhibiting archaeological material, and yet thirty-eight percent of those who had visited an archaeological site provided an inaccurate or confused image of archaeology (Pokotylo 2002: 122-123). Pokotylo's conclusion was that:

> Canadians have a reasonably accurate idea of what archaeology is about, are quite interested in the subject, and think that it is important to learn about Canada's archaeological past (2002: 123).

Some comments from participants tended to corroborate Pokotylo's findings. On a local level, participants described how people could become very interested in and protective of archaeological sites near where they live and can become effective stewards of those sites. In fact, some people can be so interested in excavations going on near where they live that they can become a bit disruptive to the work going on. Before discussing the different ways that consultants engage with the public, it will be beneficial to discuss the various subsets of the public as identified by consultants during the course of this study. Interestingly, and perhaps predictably, these subsets correspond to various types of publics identified in the literature on public archaeology (McManamon 1991), and briefly described in Chapter Three.

The Publics for Archaeology in Ontario

Of course, the interest in and benefits of archaeology vary depending on the subset of the public involved. In addition to the public in general, there were five distinct public entities that emerged: these were teachers and students; descendant communities, particularly First Nations but also Euro-Canadians; developers; government personnel or politicians and avocational archaeologists. While these subsets do not cover the entire range of the population, each is an important audience for public archaeology. All of the participants in this study identified having been or being involved in activities that engaged one or more of these groups. The nature and extent of these activities will be described in the remainder of this chapter.

Teachers and Students

Engagement with school-aged children was one of the most common public archaeology activities reported by participants. There seemed to be two primary ways in which this engagement occurred: Organized programs where school groups would be brought to a site for day programs and classroom talks where the archaeologists is brought into the classroom. Many consultant archaeologists said that they gave talks to classroom groups at least a few times a year. Some have pre-existing relationships with schools or teachers; others were "roped into it" by their children's teachers. A few participants also mentioned using the Ontario Archaeological Society speaker's kit when they give talks to school groups.

Many organized public archaeology programs are aimed at school-aged children. Dealing with children provides a strong base for educating the general public. One

participant commented that most public archaeology for the general public should be aimed at an audience of children because that is the level of understanding that most people were at. Further, by educating children you get the broadest opportunity to engage with the public in general because the children will educate their parents and grandparents to some degree. One participant also noted that by making young people and students at a pre-university level more knowledgeable about archaeology it "builds a solid foundation in support of archaeology" both within academic institutions and amongst the electorate who will eventually support legislation.

However, some participants commented that younger students were not getting much out of the programs, so they decided to limit their school programs to grade seven and up. Many of the concepts used in archaeology can be tied to the provincial educational curriculum. Archaeology can be used to teach math, social studies, biology and a number of other curriculum-related subjects. In this way, it can be an excellent educational tool for teachers. One of the most successful public archaeology programs run in Ontario, The Archaeological Resource Centre (Smardz 1997; 2000) was run in partnership with the Toronto School Board and will be described in greater detail below as an excellent example of a public archaeology program aimed at students.

First Nations

> *We must remember that when the work of developers and archaeologists*
> *is finished, the record of our past is gone forever. We are not dealing*
> *with a renewable resource or a dead culture (Nahrgang 2002: 92).*

It has been said that the single most important issue facing American archaeologists today is their evolving relationship with Native Peoples (Burley 1994: 94;

Rosenwig 1998; Yellowhorn 1998). Ideally, the subject of the relationship between First Nations and consultant archaeologists in Ontario should be given a more thorough treatment in this thesis. Recent work on the relationship between archaeologists and First Nations in Ontario addresses this issue more completely (Ferris 2003; Kapryka 2005; Nahrgang 2002). An in-depth appraisal of public archaeology initiatives that specifically target First Nations could comprise a dissertation on its own, and such an endeavour would further narrow the focus of this project and provide some very interesting insights. However, I would wonder if there is enough activity occurring in this area to comprise such a study.

Clearly, First Nations have a markedly different role to play in Ontario archaeology than many of the publics discussed here. It is their cultural patrimony that consultants derive their living from. Of the 400 to 600 sites excavated each year as part of the CRM compliance process eighty percent are Aboriginal (Ferris 2003: 167). Comments from participants in this study indicated that while everyone agrees that consultation with First Nations groups and individuals is not happening as often as it should, there is very little effort actually being made to ameliorate this situation. Many people in First Nations communities know nothing about the processes that manage the material remains of their past because they have not been permitted a meaningful role to play (Nahrgang 2002: 89).

One participant noted that the level of interest in archaeology among First Nations, both as a cultural resource and as an item of political action, varied widely from community to community. First Nations are often only brought in at times of confrontation, and in particular when burials are discovered and the Cemeteries Act

requires that they be brought in as representatives of the deceased. Another participant noted that this creates the impression among First Nations that archaeologists are only interested in the bones of their ancestors and in these situations people can become, understandably, quite upset. A few participants indicated that they have taken steps to involve First Nations earlier in the planning process so that communication is occurring before a burial is discovered. However, it is important to remember that of the 100-200 sites that are fully excavated by consultants each year only a few will contain human remains and then only rarely will these involve more than one or two burials (Ferris 2003: 167). It would appear that there need to be greater efforts focused on involving First Nations in non-burial archaeology.

Beyond ethical and moral obligations to consult with First Nations, one participant believed that "there should be a legal obligation to consult with First Nations." Certainly there should be some sort of representative or body of representatives formed that consultants can go to for consultation and communication with First Nations. One participant noted that this process is currently underway, and a panel is being set up to deal with First Nations consultation on the Seaton Lands north of Pickering, Ontario. Hopefully in time this panel, or a similar model, will be expanded to address archaeological concerns for First Nations throughout the province. In the past, there have been issues with people coming forward as self-styled First Nations representatives although they have not been formally sanctioned or elected by the wider community or communities. Having a formal process and system for consultation would resolve these sorts of contentious attempts at representation.

There was only one negative comment about involving First Nations further in the CRM process. That was: "Adding that layer of complexity to just trying to get the work done…it would really be a nightmare." While this comment could be construed as being in opposition to the rights of First Nations to having a say in the treatment of their cultural heritage, I think it speaks more to the fact that consultants are already struggling to complete the work that they take on in a season and another layer of consultation would further complicate things and result in expensive delays for the developer. However, archaeologists do have a moral obligation to involve First Nations through formal consultation in the process of managing cultural resources. It is after all their past from which consultants derive the bulk of their livelihood.

In terms of public archaeology initiatives aimed specifically at First Nations, one participant discussed how they have worked to cultivate a positive relationship with one community close to where they do a lot of their work. They have had an open house where people from that community were invited and it was well received by the people who came from that First Nation community. This consultant also makes an effort to get copies of reports to local culturally affiliated groups. Two participants said that they consciously try to hire First Nations people locally when working near or for First Nation communities. A few participants mentioned inviting students from First Nations communities out to assist in excavations on public archaeology days on a handful of occasions. None of the consultants surveyed said that they had public outreach initiatives directed specifically at First Nations communities. One comment was that the approach to public archaeology directed at First Nations peoples should not be any different than in any other context. While this may be true, First Nations people deserve to be educated

about what the concept of archaeology entails and how we go about it in Ontario. The dominant perception of archaeologists among First Nations is still a negative one. Only by opening up avenues for communication and education about archaeology will First Nations be allowed to play a meaningful role in the cultural resource management process. An important point noted by one participant is that if archaeologists are truly interested in conserving and preserving sites they should be able to go to First Nations to help in justifying why more work should be done on a site, or to stop bulldozers in the process of destroying sites. If they can justify their reasons, they should be able to ask for help from First Nations to achieve this. "First Nations have that kind of power, archaeologists do not."

Euro-Canadian Descendant Communities

The Euro-Canadian descendants of people who once occupied historic sites are a public that may sometimes be overlooked in Ontario. Two consultants reported involvement with the families of early settlers in southern Ontario. One family was invited out to dig at the site of their ancestors' homestead near Uxbridge. Another family interested in genealogy invited a consultant to speak at a family reunion and detail the results of an excavation of the homestead of a family founder a few years previously. The people present wanted to acquire the artifacts from that site to keep as "family treasures" and this request was not accommodated. One participant noted that, quite often, individuals of European decent are more interested in Euro-Canadian history, such as the burials of soldiers from the War of 1812 discovered in Fort Erie in the late 1980s, rather than in Aboriginal archaeology.

Avocational Archaeologists

One public group that appears to have fallen by the wayside in the rise of the consulting industry in Ontario are the amateur or avocational archaeologists. This is unfortunate considering that avocational archaeologists are those persons among the general public with the most interest in promoting the stewardship of and interest in Ontario archaeology. When the role of avocational archaeologists was brought up with participants some noted that these individuals would often engage with the archaeological community through organizations such as the Ontario Archaeological Society. One participant reported hiring avocational archaeologists to work on projects from time to time and avocational archaeologists will often present work they have done with archaeological sites and collections at conferences and other venues. In my experience, they make a very real and often under-valued contribution to Ontario archaeology. In the late 1970s and early 1980s the Ministry of Culture operated a Conservation Officer program that utilized the interest and expertise of these people for policing sites under threat. Unfortunately this program ended in 1985, but it will be discussed in further detail, as a case study, later in the chapter.

As of 2006, there is a new licensing system in place for avocational archaeologists that require that they work with a professional mentor. However, one participant commented that there had not been adequate thought given to who was to do the mentoring. "Not many consultants have time to be mentors." "If you put up too many barriers to these people doing archaeology legitimately they will continue to do it under the table." Some avocational archaeologists have become angry when they see consultants survey properties and not find anything when they know there are sites there.

Avocational archaeologists should be allies in the conservation and stewardship of archaeological sites and we would do well to extend more initiatives in their direction.

Developers

Developers are a public that may not have been identified by more traditional forms of public archaeology. However they are a subset of the public that consultants engage with on a daily basis. Developers are also the ones paying to have archaeology done because by causing the destruction of cultural resources in order to pursue commercial ventures they are deemed to be the ultimate consumers of the resource and must shoulder the financial burden of mitigation. Some participants commented on how they always take the time to explain to developers why doing archaeology on properties that are about to be significantly altered is an important and necessary step in the development process. It is imperative that archaeologists communicate to developers why it is important that they have quality assessments and mitigations done on properties they are building on, beyond the fact that it is required by legislation. It is often the smaller development operations or individuals selling property that may not plan for archaeology and find it to be difficult financially. Consultants often have to explain to smaller developers why this is important and why they have to pay for it. Bigger companies don't care why it needs to be done, just that it does and that they need to do it. The majority of proponents are in the middle – they understand that it has value, and that it must be done, so they just do it and do not complain. The participants in this study indicated that they now have few developers who say archaeology is a waste of time because they now realize it is part of the process – which is a complete reversal from

when the consulting industry started. Now that archaeology is a part of the development

process, and mandatory, it is a cost that they figure on in advance. Also, many clients are

engineering firms and are used to this process. Generally, attitudes are moving towards

acceptance.

There are also some developers who are very interested in archaeology. They

might view it as added value or as a selling point on properties they own. In addition,

introducing developers to public presentations of archaeology can have a very positive

effect as one participant indicated:

> Public interpretation is one way to make the developers see that
> archaeology is worthwhile, that something is going to come from the
> results of the work that they are paying for. Also, when developers are
> shown some of the things they have done in terms of public interpretation,
> they see that the public really cares about it, and that is why we do this,
> because the public values the information and it should be protected.

Some developers will ask to keep the materials that are collected from the properties they

own, either because they believe the material has monetary value or because they think

that it is "cool." In these cases it must be explained to them that the material belongs to

the people of Ontario and is held in trust by the province despite the fact that consultants

are required to care for the material as a part of their license obligations. Some

consultants have used material from sites on particular properties to make an interpretive

display for the developer. Some consultants surveyed spoke of putting together posters

on the history of sites on the property, and exhibits or displays for developer's

showrooms or in malls. In one case, a consultant put together a traveling display for a

large client based on material from a number of projects done on their properties and this

display traveled all over Ontario. This sort of initiative makes clients feel that they are

getting something back from the money they are putting into archaeology. However,

some developers want to suppress public knowledge of sites on properties that they own: "Sometimes developers don't want people to know what was on the land -- they think people won't buy the lots if they knew there was an "Indian Village" on them."

Government

The final subset of the public that is an important audience for public archaeology is the government. Government personnel, bureaucrats, policy makers and politicians are crucial audiences for messages about the importance and relevance of archaeology in today's society as they administer the legislative and bureaucratic mechanisms that control CRM in the province. The archaeologists surveyed spoke to what they felt were shortcomings in the way the Ministry of Culture operated, this will be discussed further in the next chapter. However, by sharing their concerns about the state of archaeology in Ontario with government personnel through informal and formal channels, positive change might result over time. Also, by exposing government personnel to successful public archaeology programs, they might come to see the value of funding and otherwise supporting public education programs about Ontario's cultural heritage.

Whether or not consultants engage with these groups and how they go about it is highly variable. The next section of this chapter will examine understandings of and support for public archaeology among consultants and how these factors affect the types of activities consultants will or will not become involved in.

General Attitudes Towards Public Archaeology

Understanding of and Support for Public Archaeology

One of the major themes investigated in this study was the general attitude towards consulting and how that attitude was reflected in practice. All of the people involved in this study acknowledged that communication with the public is important and that some effort should be directed towards it. Some comments included: "There is definitely a place for public archaeology in CRM;" "Education is a constant priority;" "We have an obligation to educate the public;" and from more than one participant: "Ultimately what we do is for the public." Most participants also belonged to either the Ontario Archaeological Society or the Canadian Archaeological Association, or both. These groups have codes of ethics that explicitly encourage public education and outreach among members.

Some participants immediately identified public archaeology as something involving having the public on site participating in fieldwork. Yet as the discussions progressed it became clear that increasing the general awareness about archaeology in Ontario was something that naturally extends beyond participatory programs. Other participants were very aware that there were many ways of contributing to public knowledge of archaeology: "it offers different levels of involvement." One participant who identified public education as a core value of their business commented that: "there can be many ways to satisfy that core value. It may be publishing an accessible volume, it may be writing a newspaper column, it may be public lecturing." These different levels and ways consultants do get involved in public archaeology will be discussed in further detail below.

There was also a general awareness that there need to be greater efforts put towards public communication and education. The participants in this study are very aware that there is a massive volume of grey literature being accumulated and that very little is being done to get that information back to their peers in archaeology, let alone to get that information out to the public. The lack of public outreach is true of academic archaeology as well: "As a discipline we don't do much in terms of getting information out." One participant noted that: "People need to get back to the idea that archaeology does not belong to the archaeologists, it belongs to everyone." Another participant wanted to make it perfectly clear that he considered public archaeology to be something that is distinct from communication to the archaeological community. This is also the concept that is advocated in this study, although there is no rule that says that other archaeologists cannot learn from and enjoy materials prepared for a general audience. There is a wide variety of ways that archaeologists can and do contribute to a more visible profile for archaeology among the public at large.

Public Archaeology Activities Undertaken by Consultants

Another of the major research questions posed in this study was: How do archaeologists employed primarily as consultants contribute to the general public's knowledge of Ontario's archaeological heritage? While there are significant problems that exist in trying to reconcile CRM and public archaeology, the consultants surveyed for this study reported being and having been involved in a wide range of public archaeology activities. I have sorted these activities into representative categories: on-site programs, public talks, publications aimed at a general audience; incidental public

archaeology and passive interpretation. The nature and scope of these activities will be discussed below. The use of the media and the Internet to reach a broad audience is also addressed in this section.

On-Site Programs

For many people archaeology is primarily perceived as being about discovery. A hands-on experience participating in an excavation may be the best way to teach people about the basics of archaeology, and increase enthusiasm about the subject. However, there are many problems associated with involving the public in fieldwork undertaken as part of a consulting contract. These include the ethical problem of using unpaid volunteers to excavate and then billing the client for the labour, the time-consuming nature of teaching volunteers how to excavate properly, the high supervisor to student/volunteer ratio required when using untrained labour to excavate, issues of insurance and liability, and the fact that much CRM archaeology is unsuitable for public education. "When you have people out doing archaeology for the first time, the object is not to make things go faster the object is to teach them what they are supposed to be learning." All of these factors will be discussed in detail further on. However, some consultants surveyed had been hired to work on or run public digs in the past. Of thirteen participants that were actively practicing consultants at the time of interviewing, eight of these had worked in some sort of on-site public archaeology program at some point in the last twenty years. However, it was only in rare instances that these activities occurred as part of consulting work. More often, they were employed by a non-profit organization or program with a specific mandate for public education. However, a number of consultants reported having worked on CRM projects where the proponent was a municipality and

where the city or town wanted them to provide a public component as part of the contract. These sorts of projects have occurred specifically in the cities of Brantford and Hamilton. One participant reported that this was because the municipalities "see the potential to do some public good and provide a learning opportunity for minimal cost."

There have been a number of successful programs run by non-profit organizations. The Cataraqui Archaeological Research Foundation in Kingston continues to provide excavation opportunities for students and volunteers. In the past, programs were run by the now-defunct Foundation for Public Archaeology and the Archaeological Research Centre. The Ontario Archaeological Society also ran successful on-site programs. It would seem that to be successful, public programs must be run by an organization, or in some sort of organised format in part because they involve a lot of planning and labour as well as insurance. This suggestion will be explored further below with reference to a number of public programs that have operated in Ontario over the last twenty years.

Public Talks

Public talks were the activities that consultants claimed to have most frequently engaged in. They seem to regard this as an integral part of their role as archaeologists. The type of talk and the venue can vary widely. Many give talks to classroom groups, at universities, at local museums, meetings of historical societies, and at Ontario Archaeological Society chapter meetings. One participant claimed to like giving these talks because it gave him the opportunity to really think about the material he was working with. I would also suggest that once someone has a talk prepared they can give

it to a number of different audiences on different occasions, thereby cutting down on the time they must take out of their schedules to prepare. People who come to talks are often very keen. One participant noted that he liked to give talks with a regional perspective in mind and talk about how one particular site he has worked on is related to other sites in the area, so that people can see how each site is important to the bigger picture.

However, some participants shied away from giving talks because, as one put it "once you start the demands become exponential, like a black hole" and there is simply not time to meet that demand while also trying to run a business. Further, some people are just simply not fond of public speaking. Despite a few negative comments, consultants generally seem to regard giving public talks as important part of their role as archaeologists, give at least a few every year, and receive no income for doing them.

Publications Aimed at a General Audience

The technical reports produced in the compliance process are made part of the public record. However, participants in this study noted that they are at best "boring" for the public and at worst "completely undecipherable." Consultants must also sign a waiver making the reports available to the general public. If they do not do so, the Ministry of Culture holds the reports in confidence. One way to make archaeology more accessible to a general audience is to produce print material aimed at non-specialists. One firm in particular has had an excellent record of producing publications aimed at the general public. These publications are mostly books based on sites that already had a high profile and a large amount of public interest surrounding them. This particular firm has also demonstrated a commitment to publish as much as possible.

In the consulting industry as a whole there is very little publication done. This includes publication directed towards the archaeological community, with publication aimed at the general public coming in as a second priority in most cases. One participant commented that he thinks there has been a shift away from wanting to write things up for publication and that this is a product of the commercialisation of the industry and all the attendant constraints that come with that. Yet, the Internet has opened up a new venue for online publication that seems to be garnering interest among consultants. This will be discussed further on in the section on the potential of the Internet for public archaeology.

Incidental Public Archaeology

There is a significant amount of unplanned interaction between archaeologists and the general public that occurs on a daily basis. There are archaeological crews working in every municipality in the province every weekday during the field season. This naturally involves interacting with farmers in their fields, eating in restaurants, staying in hotels and interacting with curious locals and passers-by. This is an aspect of public archaeology that I have termed "incidental." One participant also referred to this sort of interpretation as "unscheduled." "It doesn't matter where you are. People will stop and ask what you are doing." "The very nature of CRM work brings you in contact with people for whom archaeology is a complete mystery – developers, people over the fence."

Some participants noted that projects in highly public locations, such as the market square in Kingston or at the Parliament buildings in Ottawa, might have a paid spokesperson on site simply to handle passers-by with questions. They also noted that

while unscheduled interpretation is an excellent opportunity to educate the public about

what is happening, it can be very distracting for the archaeologists who are trying to do

their jobs and field questions from onlookers at the same time.

One participant commented that when they are working in a very public place,

they know that they will have to spend time talking to the public and that this will have to

be a component of the project. Sometimes the client will want it to be a formal

component and they will be allotted and compensated for a certain amount of time for

talking with the public. "If you have the support, the digging and talking to the public

can go hand-in-hand." Yet, there is also the fear that people will return to the unprotected

site at another time and disturb or loot it. People need to be made aware that disturbing a

site is illegal, but they also need to be made aware of why the work is being done and the

importance of collecting this information.

Passive Interpretation

Another form of public archaeology that was mentioned by participants was what

I have termed "passive interpretation" where signs or other markers are placed at

archaeological sites and tell people what is or used to be there. Four participants stated

that they had made recommendations to clients and municipalities for markers and signs

that would commemorate archaeological sites that had been removed through mitigation

or were still partially preserved *in situ.* One suggestion was that a series of signs be

placed along a light-rail transportation corridor that one archaeologist was surveying that

commemorated the history of transportation in the area. Another participant discussed a

Middle Woodland site that was excavated in what will be a storm management area.

They have thought about creating low mounds of dirt where the longhouses were,

surrounding them with low wooden posts, and planting sumac on the mounds that would grow together and create a canopy where the longhouses once stood, providing a "visual cue" to passers by.

I have recognized an issue with passive interpretation that arises when sites have been preserved *in situ,* such as capped sites. These sites should not be signed, as they may be prone to looting, especially sites with metal artifacts that could be detected. When the archaeological remains present are architectural in nature this is not as much of a concern, such as the signed remains of British military buildings in London's Victoria Park. The only maintenance involved is updating signs from time to time to prevent the transmission of inaccurate or out-of-date information. Using these sorts of passive techniques to inform the public about archaeological sites and the cultural heritage of the area is a low-cost and effective way to raise the profile of archaeology in Ontario.

The Media

Popular media such as television, newspapers, radio and magazines seem like obvious outlets for informing the public about archaeology and archaeological concerns. Every consultant interviewed said that they had been contacted by a reporter interested in writing a story about a project they were working on. No one said that they independently contacted any sort of media outlet, but they would sometimes speak to reporters when they were contacted. Yet, the prevailing attitude among participants in this study was that the media were something to be wary of.

There were some positive comments regarding using the media to get information about the archaeology out to the public. For example, one participant described a project

carried out at the Peace Bridge site in Fort Erie in the late 1980s. It involved the burials of a number of soldiers from the War of 1812. There were broadcasts on the local news "almost every night" and a PBS series was created about the site. I have noticed that CBC radio also carries pieces about archaeology about once a month, usually when a significant or rare find is made. One participant who writes a column for the Toronto Heritage Newsletter that addresses the first 11,000 years of Ontario Prehistory demonstrates another good example of the use of print media.

The main reasons for not wanting to become the subject of media attention were the fact that many reporters tend to report information inaccurately and that many clients frown on media attention as it has a tendency to become negative publicity for developments. One participant noted that the media have a tendency to write "big, bad developer stories " and bad press has the potential to cause expensive delays in development plans. Generally, an archaeologist will be required to get permission from the client before discussing with the media any aspect of a site or project they are working on. Clients generally prefer to keep a low profile and frown on divulging any information in the media. Some clients will go as far as to include non-disclosure agreements into the contract that forbids all discussion of the project with the media or otherwise.

A number of participants also noted that reporters would often inaccurately report what they had been told by the archaeologists, get key terms wrong in their article or report or take information out of context. Being misquoted was a reason archaeologists did not want to talk to the media. Reporters also tend to sensationalize stories and are primarily interested in reporting on sites where burials or cemeteries are found. Not only

can this be a sensitive issue for the developer, but also for culturally affiliated persons

and descendants of the deceased individuals. One participant said that they tried to get

fieldwork done before it gets into the press and that they have dug some big, impressive

sites and the press has no idea that it is even going on. For these reasons, while the press

and popular media can be excellent vehicles for informing the public about

archaeological sites and activities, there are significant perceived risks associated with it

for consultants and their clients.

The Internet

The Internet is a venue for public archaeology with unprecedented potential to

reach a huge cross-section of the general public. Many consulting firms already have

websites that they use to advertise their services and post additional information related

to archaeology. While some websites are fairly simple, others have multiple components

that target different audiences among the general public. For example, one consultant's

website includes recorded narratives about Ontario prehistory that are suitable for

teaching children as well as recently published academic articles about archaeology and

current political issues in the discipline. Other websites have detailed breakdowns of the

legislation that governs CRM in the province, which would be useful for developers or

municipal personnel.

One participant in this study described a project on which she is collaborating

with a client and a local First Nation to produce a website that will serve as an

educational tool. The First Nation wanted to know more about what archaeology could

tell them about the prehistory of their area and wanted others to know as well. The

developer provided funding for the consultant and some people from the First Nations community to design content and artwork for a prototype of a website. The project is ongoing and the hope is to encourage other developers to add to the website over time. Many participants also discussed the potential of posting technical reports on websites for the public to access if they wish to do so, although no formal steps have been taken in this direction.

The information presented above demonstrates that there are many ways that consultants can and do engage with the non-archaeological community. The type of activity undertaken can depend very much on the individual involved, on the nature of the projects that a consultant undertakes, available resources such as extra overhead or time to devote to these initiatives. With so many different ways to reach the public, there should be a way to make every project accessible in some way to a wider audience than just the archaeologist, the developer and the Ministry reviewer. One need only find the best option for interpretation and the wherewithal to do so. Overwhelmingly, it seems that consultants are well aware of how they might make the work that they do relevant to a wider audience. The problem lies in how to find the time and resources to put the information to work for the public good.

PART B:
Case Studies: Examples of Public Archaeology Initiatives in Ontario

Ontario has been the staging ground for a number of successful public archaeology programs. Some of these programs will be described here, based on information obtained from participants. A number of participants were involved in the operation of programs and others mentioned them as examples of successful initiatives and emphasised their concern for the demise of such programs. As we have seen from discussions with participants in this study, public archaeology can range from something as simple as an archaeologist volunteering to take some slides and artifacts to a school and give a talk to a class, to highly organised, well funded public excavations. Some of these programs – The Foundation for Public Archaeology, The Archaeological Research Centre and the McGaw Archaeology Education Program – will be outlined below. They represent some of the most well known programs from the last twenty years and each was mentioned frequently in interviews with participants. However, it is difficult to reconcile organised public archaeology programs with consulting activities, and some of the reasons for this will be discussed below, although a fuller discussion of the disconnect between public archaeology and consulting will be presented in Chapter Six. There are also examples of public archaeology activities that bridge the gap between public education and consulting. The now-defunct Conservation Officer program of the Ministry of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation (now Ministry of Culture), the Cataraqui Archaeological Research Foundation in Kingston and interpretation with signage in Victoria Park in London will be discussed with reference to how these initiatives manage to derive some public benefit from consulting activities, while subverting some of the problems associated with trying to do public archaeology in a CRM context.

The Foundation for Public Archaeology

The Foundation for Public Archaeology (FPA) was established in 1982 as a non-profit, charitable organization that provided programs in public archaeology. The founders saw an opportunity to fund their graduate research and supplement early consulting activities by offering public archaeology programs on sites they were researching. The charitable status of the organization allowed it to receive government grants and at that time there were many grants available from the Ontario government for community-based programs. In addition to this, volunteers and school groups would be charged a fee to participate. The founders of the FPA made it very clear that these sorts of programs could not be run on the funds obtained from participants, that additional subsidization was necessary to make programs work, and that the production of the report was often done on their own time.

The programs they ran were mostly day or half-day programs for grade seven and high-school students, but they also ran weekend and weeklong sessions. The programs attempted to give students a well-rounded knowledge of all the steps involved in an archaeological investigation as well as the experience of excavating. Some programs included Woodland period sites: The Longwood Experience at the Longwood Conservation Area near London and The Dundee Experience at New Dundee near Waterloo. Historic sites were also investigated and included the Raymond Burr House in Richmond Hill and the Schneider House near Waterloo. The FPA began excavations at the site of Upper Canada's first parliament buildings. This site was eventually turned over to the Toronto District School Board and the Archaeological Research Centre, and

information about the site was turned into a website, a popular publication and received a great amount of media attention.

The FPA has not run any programs since the late 1980s, although it has not been formally disbanded. As legislation regarding the management of cultural resources increased, the staff of the FPA became more and more involved in consulting and switched all of their efforts over to running a consulting business. With the growing dominance of consulting in the province in the 1980s the individuals running the FPA turned most of their efforts towards doing CRM. This shift, combined with the knowledge that programs could never be self-supporting and that government grants were increasingly less available, resulted in the end of public archaeology programs run by the FPA.

The Archaeological Resource Centre

With support from the Ministry of Culture, The Toronto Board of Education created the Archaeological Resource Centre in 1985. Karolyn Smardz-Frost (Smardz 1997; 2000; Smardz-Frost 2004) has published a number of articles on the Archaeological Resource Centre (ARC) that describe the program, its mandate and philosophy, its activities, and ultimately, its fate. The ARC employed seven professional archaeologists as full-time educators and conducted six months of excavations per year in Toronto's downtown core (Smardz 1997: 105-106). The program was immensely successful. It sought to turn the goals of public archaeology around: to ask not what education could do to further the aims of archaeology, but what archaeology could do for the sake of education (Smardz 2000: 2). The ARC programs employed archaeological techniques to teach children about science, to teach recent immigrants about the

experiences of nineteenth century immigrants to Toronto, and even ran programs for children who were very sick (Merriman 2002: 551). It also produced archaeology-related media that were used for teaching throughout the Toronto school system (Smardz 2000:6).

The ARC employed a number of archaeologists that took part in this survey. One individual was employed directly by the centre when he was an undergraduate student and others worked for a consulting company hired by the centre to complete excavations. Every participant who mentioned the ARC had a positive impression of it. Unfortunately, and with much protest, the Archaeological Resource Centre fell victim to the mid-1990s decline in funding in Ontario, as did many other culturally oriented programs dependant on "government funding and political goodwill" (Smardz-Frost 2004: 62). It has been closed, its programs cancelled and its absence has left a very large gap in public archaeology programming in central Ontario.

The McGaw Site

> *"A classic example of a really good idea being accepted and bought*
> *wholesale by the town…and then developing the facilities and the*
> *wherewithal to expedite it."*

The McGaw site was the focus of a public archaeology program operated in partnership between the Ontario Archaeological Society (OAS) and the Town of Richmond Hill Parks, Recreation and Culture Department. The program provided for the professionally monitored excavation of the McGaw site and the provision for Richmond Hill residents and the York District School Board to participate in the excavations. The program formally began in 2001 after many years of development. The McGaw site is a relatively undisturbed Iroquoian village occupied ca. 1400 – 1500 A.D. that was

discovered in 1988 during a routine archaeological assessment. The developer gave the land to the Town of Richmond Hill in exchange for other concessions, and the OAS won the contract to develop the site. It took place at the A.J. Clark Interpretive Centre, a teaching and laboratory facility adjacent to the site at the Elgin West Community Centre. There was a great deal of political support at the municipal level, allowing the plans to develop and having the facilities incorporated into the community centre. The program was directed by a professional archaeologist whose primary employment context was as a consultant and a crew of student archaeologists who also served as interpreters. The program mostly catered to school groups and included day programs and week-long programs in the summer months. The programs offered generally included a half-day of excavation and a half-day in the classroom and lab facility where students would learn about dating techniques, mapping, stratigraphy, describing artifacts and the ethics of archaeological research. A team of archaeologists and educators designed the educational and interpretive programming.

One participant in this study called the McGaw Program "hugely successful." One way to gauge the success of a program is to see how well in which it is being participated. After a year of operation the programs were full and teachers were booking six months in advance, although interest lagged somewhat in the summer months. Even after the program was shut down, program personnel would receive calls from teachers looking to book spots in the program. Other calls were from people volunteering to re-instate the program. The demise of the McGaw Archaeology Education Program was an unfortunate occurrence and came for a variety of reasons. There were administrative changes in the Ontario Archaeological Society and problems securing the funding to

continue the program. There were also significant problems related to liability and the cost of insurance. One participant's estimate was that insurance companies wanted fifteen to twenty thousand dollars for each student session and that the program and its organizer, the OAS, were unable to afford the insurance rates and to keep programs running. All material related to the McGaw site has since been removed from the Elgin West Community Centre. Yet, the McGaw site is still owned by the City of Richmond Hill and protected as part of its parks system. There is still a large portion of the site that remains unexcavated and has the potential to be the focus of future research projects or public education initiatives.

Difficulties in Combining CRM and On-Site Programming

"You can't do these programs in a CRM context"

None of the projects described above were conducted directly by a consulting firm, but rather were initiated for the purposes of research and/or public education. Although individuals who also worked as consultants ran the Foundation for Public Archaeology and the McGaw project they were not consulting projects. Likewise, the Archaeological Resource Centre employed people who also worked as consultants, but the primary goal of the projects was education, not cultural resource management, although the Front St. site excavated by the ARC now lies beneath the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation's Toronto broadcast center.

Each of these programs can tie its demise to the withdrawal of stable funding, often coupled with a rise in operation costs. Stable funding is often the key factor in whether or not programs can continue to operate. No program can be run solely on funds

collected from participants. There are the additional costs of lab work, report writing, storage facilities, etc. that increase the cost. The ARC and McGaw programs had the benefit of operating in the largest market area in Ontario, where the potential for full enrolments was greater and helped to support the programs. One could argue that they would not have been able to fully book their programs in a smaller town or region.

Many participants in this study were quick to point out the difficulties that arise in trying to combine consulting projects being done under contract to public or private development proponents with public archaeology programs of the sort described above. The major problems lie in trying to reconcile the main goals of public archaeology, which are to educate the public about archaeological resources and concerns, and the goals of consulting archaeology, which are to serve the needs of the client. CRM archaeology is in many ways dictated by development schedules. Sites are not chosen because they contribute to a broader program of research or because they might provide an excellent opportunity for public education. Sites are excavated because they are in the way of some form of development. The individual or corporation paying for the development is usually operating on a schedule that does not leave additional weeks or months to allow for the interpretation of the sites on their property. The expectation is that any archaeological concerns will be addressed and removed in the most time- and cost-effective manner as possible. Using unskilled volunteer labour is very time consuming. Actually having people, including children, have a meaningful and informative experience as part of the exercise takes even more time. One participant noted that: "When you have people out doing archaeology for the first time, the object is not to make things go faster, the object is to teach them what they are supposed to be learning." It is

also necessary to have a high ratio of supervisors to students/volunteers, usually at least four to one, in order to educate effectively and control for potential damage to the resource. This adds cost and time to excavations not only because it takes more time to prepare and excavate, but also to clean up and record or map and to process artifacts afterwards. Volunteers are not proficient enough to be cost-effective.

Consultants may undertake a consulting project as a commercial venture and be paid as a professional archaeologist to run a public education program, or they might have the chance to include a public archaeology component into a cultural resource management project if the proponent requests that it be done. A number of participants cited occasions where municipalities sought out and hired consultants to run public programs or specifically requested that an opportunity be provided for students in the community. When this was the case, if the consultant possessed previous experience operating public programs, it was quite easy for them to design and get them into operation.

It is possible to create opportunities for public archaeology in a context where archaeology is being done as CRM. One example of this is the Passport to the Past program. The Ontario Archaeological Society created the Passport to the Past program. It was an arrangement in which volunteers could come and dig at an archaeological site for a day or two and they would get a "passport" stamped with the name of that site. In this program, some CRM sites were opened up to the public, but only when the developer and the development schedule permitted. While the program operated for some time, it did not often run in the same location and only for a day or a few days. It operated at the mercy of the development schedule.

Other attempts to reconcile CRM or consulting archaeology in southern Ontario have occurred and some are still ongoing. Examples of this cited by participants will be discussed below and particular attention will be paid to how these programs have used innovative thinking to allow the public some measure of participation and engagement with the archaeological record.

Combining Conservation and Education: Other Examples of Public Archaeology in Ontario

The Archaeological Conservation Officer Program

> *"I would say in the last fifteen years the worst thing that has gone by the wayside is the Archaeological Conservation Officer program."*

The Archaeological Conservation Officer Program was an initiative of an individual member of the Ministry of Culture and was carried largely by that individual's efforts. It was initiated in 1978 and lasted until approximately 1985. The aim of the program was to enlist amateur or avocational archaeologists to serve as conservation officers for particular districts or townships. These individuals were provided with topographical maps and equipment, and were supposed to be the most knowledgeable persons in the area with respect to archaeological sites and resources. The program was in operation before legislation was in place that required municipalities to have regard for archaeological concerns. The intention was that the conservation officers would watch over archaeological sites and bring them to attention if needed, particularly if the site was threatened by development. Conservation officers also worked with local landowners to document collections and gave public talks, which made them vehicles for public archaeology in their own right. The program was quite effective and allowed for the

inclusion of members of the public who had an existing interest in Ontario archaeology and the protection of cultural resources.

The program eventually ended in 1985 for a variety of reasons. The cost of the program was becoming too great and the individual, on whose initiative the program operated, was no longer able to support it. In addition, the strengthening of legislation and the birth of a full-fledged consulting industry in the province meant that consultants were now being hired to deal with sites that conservation officers had been monitoring. One issue that was noted by a participant was that the program created increased expectation among conservation officers about what could be done to protect sites. The officers would report sites being destroyed to the Ministry and there would be no resources available to deal with it. It also was reported in an interview that some officers would tell the Ministry that they were aware of sites on properties that consultants had surveyed and cleared for development. To the great frustration of the conservation officers the Ministry was unable or unwilling to look into these cases, which resulted in much resentment between conservation officers and consultants.

The Archaeological Conservation Officer program served an important purpose in a time before CRM legislation made archaeology mandatory on developments. It not only provided an extra measure of protection for archaeological sites, but also actively involved avocational archaeologists in the stewardship of cultural resources, creating a whole segment of the public that were archaeological experts in their communities. It is a shame that no version of this program exists today to provide opportunities for the many active and dedicated amateur archaeologists in Ontario.

Victoria Park

Victoria Park is located in downtown London, Ontario. Dedicated in 1874, it is the oldest public park in the city. The park is located on the site of a mid-nineteenth century British military barracks that was constructed in 1839 and intended to house 700 men. The barracks was in use until 1869 and the buildings were torn down in 1870. It has been a public park ever since, resulting in excellent preservation. The city of London was interested in running some pipelines through the park, widening paths, etc. and it was determined that these projects would impact portions of the site. A consultant was hired to conduct excavations of the affected areas and fieldwork was carried out in Victoria Park from 1999-2004.

The consultant highlighted the potential for public archaeology and tourism in their first report. The public has been able to see this process as the project evolved and from the outset of excavations people were always leaning over the fence and asking the archaeologists what they were doing. They regularly had to designate someone to answer questions and kept washed artifacts and historic photographs on hand to assist in interpretation. After the first season of excavation the consultant was contacted and made aware of a gallery space in a local mall and a local artist helped and encouraged them to mount an exhibit about archaeology in Victoria Park. The exhibit was very successful and closed down after three months in the gallery. The city, at the suggestion of the consultant, adjusted the new path system to incorporate the footprints of some of the historic buildings. Also, signage has been erected that highlights the presence of the archaeological site and some notable features of the site. However, the consultant reports that the city has been "dragging its feet" on the public side of things. Some signs are now

out of date and refer to features that are no longer visible due to the new path system, or have labeled features incorrectly. The consultant has suggested that the site be used for educational tourism and be nominated as a National Historic Site. However the City of London has said that they are concerned that such a designation would be a development constraint and have not done so.

Despite a few problems at the municipal level, Victoria Park provides an excellent example of how the public interest can be served on a CRM project. The consultant involved made a point of allowing for incidental public archaeology by engaging with passers-by, set up an exhibit in a mall, which is a location that reaches a section of the public that may not independently go to see museum exhibits, and has advocated that signage be placed at the site so that visitors to the park are made aware of the history and archaeology present in that space.

The Cataraqui Archaeological Research Foundation

"If we weren't doing contracts, we wouldn't be able to run this place at all."

The Cataraqui Archaeological Research Foundation (CARF) is an innovative organization based in Kingston, Ontario that offers public archaeology programs, has an in-house interpretive centre and provides private consulting services. The foundation was created in 1986 to oversee the excavations of Fort Frontenac, also known as Fort Cataraqui, and has been operating ever since, despite some years of financial vulnerability. According to the foundation profile:

> The Foundation has come to occupy a position that is unique in Eastern
> Ontario, and possibly in Ontario as a whole. As a publicly-chartered
> organization it has the responsibility to achieve and preserve a professional
> level of archaeological expertise, and to carry out archaeological research

into the historical heritage of Kingston and Eastern Ontario through excavation and the maintenance of appropriate archival functions (CARF 2005: iii).

Its mandate "is to create, foster, and maintain interest in the recognition, investigation, and preservation of Ontario's pre-historic and historic archaeological resources" (CARF 2005: 1). CARF offers a wide variety of programs and activities including programs with excavation opportunities for students and volunteers, interactive displays, public presentations, workshops, teacher resource kits, collections management services, research and library/archive facilities, publications aimed at a general audience as well as academic reports, and a host of other services (CARF 2005: 4). The foundation operates in a market area with a significant interest in heritage tourism. They have a fairly high profile in the community and often collaborate with local museums and historical societies on a variety of initiatives.

What is interesting for the purposes of this project is that CARF also offers cultural resource management services and employs licensed consultant archaeologists to conduct all manner of consulting activities. The foundation receives some funding from registrations for their summer programs and receives grants for two or three students to run that program, but the vast majority of their funding comes from consulting work. The London Museum of Archaeology is the only other institution in Ontario that fulfils this sort of hybrid public archaeology and consulting function, but it receives additional support from the University of Western Ontario.

CARF undertakes consulting projects for clients who are generally aware of their mandate to provide public education in archaeology and they have worked for clients who hired them with the intention of incorporating community involvement into the project. When the client is only interested in having the work done as expediently as

possible, the CARF archaeologists will not include the public in the project being conducted. Overall, the model set by CARF is a good example of how public archaeology and consulting archaeology can be brought together.

There are many limitations and barriers that exist when trying to reconcile public archaeology with consulting archaeology. Despite the small amount of communication that occurs between consultants and the general public, there is a massive amount of archaeological information that simply does not make it beyond the reporting stage of CRM, let alone into the general public. The next chapter will discuss the limitations and barriers that lie between CRM and public archaeology, based largely on information collected from participants based on their personal experiences in dealing with this issue.

Chapter Six:

ISSUES IN LINKING PUBLIC ARCHAEOLOGY WITH CULTURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

This chapter will explore the impediments to doing public archaeology in the context of consulting and expand on some of the reasons for this disconnection discussed in the preceding chapters. In Chapter Five, two of the three main questions being posed in this thesis were discussed: the general attitude towards consulting and how consultants get involved in public archaeology activities. It was demonstrated that while consultants generally had a fairly positive attitude towards public archaeology and contributed to the public awareness of archaeology where and when they could, they were often unable to get involved in public archaeology activities for a variety of reasons. Those reasons make up the third theme investigated by this study: the impediments faced by consultants in trying to make the work they do meaningful to the public. Issues regarding these impediments will be discussed here in the final chapter.

One of the main purposes of this study is to determine if consultant archaeologists make a meaningful contribution to public awareness of archaeology. The results of the study seem to indicate that the answer is both "yes" and "no." "Yes," because consultants do make some contributions to public archaeology. Many consultants do what they can manage given the time and resource constraints they are under, and given that their primary job is *not* doing public archaeology. But the answer to the question above can also be an overwhelming "no." Relative to the approximately 700 sites discovered and investigated each year in this province as a result of development related activities there is very little public archaeology being done. What is required of

consultants in the course of their day-to-day practice simply does not include making a meaningful contribution to the public interest. The current system of cultural resource management in Ontario makes no provision for the public to benefit from either the fieldwork side of archaeology or engagement with the *ex situ* resource. The findings of this study support the position that development-led archaeology at present does not allow opportunities or innovations with regard to public involvement and presentation (Merriman 2003; Start 1999).

The Nature of the Beast: Clients, Contracts and CRM

It has been established that cultural resource management is primarily concerned with the conservation of archaeological materials when these materials are threatened with destruction because the landscape is about to be significantly altered by plans for construction or development. Consultants are employed by development proponents to facilitate the conservation of culturally significant materials through excavation and careful documentation. They have a professional and contractual obligation to serve the needs of their client. The client is primarily interested in removing conditions required to go forward with their development as quickly and as cost-effectively as possible. At the same time, the archaeologist has an obligation to the discipline of archaeology and is trying to preserve the maximum amount of information possible from the archaeological record. Archaeological research should be an extremely meticulous and time-consuming activity, however in CRM archaeology, the fieldwork and reporting will often have to be done very rapidly. The archaeologists surveyed described how they are often struggling to complete excavations in the time that they have allotted for in their budgets, and the

developer is counting on them adhering to the schedule that they have provided as part of their contract. These consultants are running businesses where they have been hired to clear archaeological conditions on development and their priority is to clear those conditions for their client. The primary function of a consultant archaeologist is to be a consultant archaeologist, not a researcher and not an educator. According to one participant:

> "There needs to be good cultural resource management done and doing that involves people putting time and effort into doing things other than communicating with the public. And publication is secondary to a lot of that work."

Many consultants noted how important it is that public education activities are kept separate from consulting activities. This was touched upon in Chapter Five in describing why it is difficult to run a public archaeology program in the context of consulting. The objective of a consultant is to serve the interests of their client by getting the work done as rapidly and expediently and possible. The objective of public archaeology is to teach people about archaeology. These two objectives are clearly in conflict. Lack of time and lack of resources were cited frequently by the participants in this study as barriers to doing public archaeology. These will be discussed next, followed by a discussion of the lack of institutional and governmental support, a significant factor in defining barriers to doing more public archaeology as a part of CRM.

Lack of Time

> *"...the new breed of commercial archaeologists is generally far too busy just staying alive to get involved in promotional work"* (Start 1999: 54).

Time, or lack of it, is a crucial dynamic in the day-to-day practice of running a consulting business and was cited by participants as the principal reason they did not do as much interaction with the general public, or other archaeologists, as they should. When consultants find it hard to get the required fieldwork and reporting done with the time they have allotted for it, chances are they will not be able to devote time to research, publication or public archaeology. A number of participants indicated that they would like to have more time to sit down and really think about the sites and materials that they are finding, and would also like to have time to familiarise themselves with the massive amount of grey literature that has been accumulating. A certain amount of research must precede any sort of dissemination and there is no time for this either. This situation is exacerbated in smaller firms where there is only one or two people to handle the workload from consulting. Many small practitioners claim that they are always jumping from project to project to generate enough revenue to stay in business. Some consultants have indicated that they have had to take time off from work in order to finish research and writing papers.

The Foundation for Public Archaeology, discussed in the preceding chapter, ran public programs at a time before consulting became a major and full-time activity. Today, all of the people who ran the program are employed full-time in consulting. One of the consequences of the commercialisation of archaeology is that the time and effort of many Ontario archaeologists is now spent doing CRM projects. People are simply inundated by development-led projects and have no time left over to consider doing anything else. When these consultants finally catch up with their workload they often want to enjoy the life they lead outside of work. One participant said that the last thing

he wanted to do after a week of doing archaeology was more archaeology. It would seem that unless opportunities are created for consultants to have time to engage with the public other concerns will continue to dominate their schedules.

Lack of Funding

The lack of time for doing public archaeology goes hand-in-hand with the lack of funding. If archaeologists were being paid the same amount of money to do public archaeology that they are being paid by developers to do assessments and mitigations there would not be a lack of public archaeology. Clearly, the amount of money to be made from commercial development far outweighs the financial profit to be made from public archaeology.

Public archaeology programs cannot be run solely on the money obtained from participants. On-site programs are very expensive to run because of high insurance and operating costs, and the high supervisor to student ratio required. The participants in this study indicated that there were currently no grants available to fund public archaeology of any sort, let alone on-site programs. The federal Access to Archaeology Program ended in 1993 and provincially the Ontario Heritage Foundation and the Ministry of Culture are not providing grants. One participant noted that in the early to mid-1980s there was money available for public archaeology because there were more government officials who thought that these programs were important. There was also federal funding being put into archaeology as part of job creation during the recession at that time. The Ontario Heritage Foundation (now the Ontario Heritage Trust) used to provide grants for publication; however these have not been available for more than a decade. It

may or may not be intentional that the government cut funding to archaeology at about the same time that the development of the consulting industry accelerated. However, since 1990 there has definitely been a decline in government-subsidized programs and a greater emphasis being placed on funding for archaeology coming from the private sector as part of the cost of development.

Since there is no money available to compensate consultants for time spent doing research or public archaeology, when a consulting company undertakes public archaeology activities of any sort, the cost comes out of the company's profits or out of the time and resources of the archaeologists themselves. Larger companies may have additional overhead to devote to publicly oriented initiatives, but smaller firms may not. One participant suggested that the solution to funding public dissemination was to extract more money from developers. When some others in this study were asked about the possibility of making developers pay for dissemination, they said that developers would not do this willingly because their clients are simply interested in profit margins. This is understandable since developers are in the business of constructing commercial developments for profit, not funding archaeology. Developers are generally interested in minimizing costs and want to pay as little as possible to have restrictions cleared. In order for a consultant to stay in business they need to charge a competitive rate, which does not allow them to build the cost of research and dissemination into their bid independently.

Some participants said that they felt that a long road had been traveled on the way to the current provisions for heritage protection and that if they asked developers to fund things like public archaeology that they run the risk of losing some of the ground they

have gained. However, others were confident that there is now an accepted standard for having archaeological resources assessed and protected and that there is no threat of losing that protection. Is it then possible to hope that there could be some sort of mechanism worked into the current legislative framework for CRM that would provide for a certain small percentage (perhaps one to five percent) of each contract to be set aside for public interpretation? The Ministry of Culture has stated that it is unwilling to impose such a regulation. If they are not prepared do this, then where should the direction come from? One possibility is having consultants raise their rates by one to five percent on an industry-wide level with the understanding that this money would be used to fund public interpretation and dissemination of sites they are excavating in the course of their consulting work. It may be that the impetus for more funding for public archaeology will have to come from the industry itself. Likewise, there may need to be greater organization of how the massive amounts of grey literature that comprise the *ex situ* resource could best be utilized to serve the public interest.

Lack of Structure

One of the participants in this study raised an interesting point: "There is a massive amount of data being collected in a CRM context, so I guess the question is: What should be the public experience?" This is a very important question for the goals of this thesis and for the enterprise of cultural resource management as a whole. What exactly should the public experience of all of this information be and how do we provide that experience?

There need to be more incentives and organized opportunities to allow archaeologists to facilitate interaction with the general public, however they choose to go about it. This study has revealed that the ways that practitioners might try to get involved with initiatives beyond their day-to-day work varies widely from individual to individual. Some people get involved by volunteering for the Ontario Archaeological Society either by giving talks at chapter meetings, serving on committees or on the board of directors, or by participating in the annual OAS symposium (although it may be argued that since the OAS is largely made up of archaeologists it does not qualify as 'public' archaeology). Others become involved with the public in ways that they negotiate themselves, by establishing a relationship with a school and allowing students out to dig for the day, or returning to give talks at that school on a number of occasions. One participant in particular maintains an excellent website. While he rarely physically involves himself in public archaeology activities he is able to reach a wide audience through that website. One consultant advocated allowing the public more opportunities to work with existing collections. For example, having an artifact washing night at a local museum or community centre and present the context for the artifacts people are washing simultaneously. All of this indicates that archaeologists negotiate how they wish to make a contribution to the public's knowledge of archaeology on an individual level.

Another participant commented on the lack of forums for collaboration between consultants in general, but also specifically with respect to public archaeology. Currently, the only avenues for communication are through the Ontario Archaeological Society or through the more informal social network of archaeologists in southern Ontario. This participant noted that there needs to be a more organized, concerted effort among

practitioners to develop programs in which they could all participate. This could take the

form of monthly activities or monthly talks that consultants could sign up for. In Quebec

there is a program called Archéo-dimanche that organizes public excavations, talks, and

tours on Sundays throughout the province during the summer months. Academic,

museum, and consultant archaeologists take part in this program by signing up to host

activities. On any given Sunday, there is a variety of archaeology-related activities

taking place in different regions of Quebec. A consultant need only sign up for a few

hours on one Sunday once a year in order to make a project like Archéo-dimanche a

success.

However, there is still the issue of having the time and resources to become

involved beyond the day-to-day requirements of consulting. Some participants noted that

they had no time to do any sort of research and publication, let alone think about public

archaeology. This brings us to the problem of doing enough research and analysis on the

material being uncovered in development-led excavations to have a story to tell the

public.

Lack of Research

We have agreed that the general public cannot get much out of technical reports

or the two-dimensional, descriptive information they contain. The participants in this

study agreed that archaeological data must be interpreted and turned into a story about the

past that the public can understand and appreciate. I would personally add that other

archaeologists might not be able to get much out of a technical report because they

simply do not contain enough detailed information to perform scholarly analysis. In

order for sites excavated in the context of CRM to make a meaningful contribution to

knowledge in general those sites must have adequate analysis done on the recovered

material and documentation, possibly be incorporated into a larger regional analysis, and

be made accessible to other scholars through publication. I am not advocating here that

reports produced by consultants include any sort of analysis or synthesis, but that the

work of interpretation and publication must be done at some point in the process. As

discussed in Chapter Five, most consultants do not have the time or resources to

undertake this sort of meaningful analysis. The legislative framework for CRM as

carried out in Ontario does not make any effort to facilitate further research of salvaged

materials and as one participant put it: "The process isn't being driven by good

archaeology, its being driven by bureaucratic management." There is simply no

provision for research or for bringing forth any understanding of Ontario's past from

CRM data in the current legislated process. The material is simply being banked for

future researchers. But will those researchers be able to construct meaningful insights

from this information? The archaeological record in Ontario is increasingly composed of

the 'grey literature' of CRM compliance reports which are almost always divorced from

the field notes and collections required for a thorough analysis to be undertaken. It may

be a very difficult task to access and bring together the collections and documentation

required for a research project that utilizes data from a variety of temporally or regionally

related sites if these sites have been investigated by a variety of practitioners. I have

heard through the grapevine of the archaeological community that access to collections

and documentation is very difficult. It would be a very useful exercise to attempt this

sort of study and document the ease of access to material and information that is collected

by publicly mandated laws and held, supposedly, in the public trust.

During the interview process I was struck by the concern that participants had for the lack of adequate storage and curation for collections derived from CRM excavations. As noted in previous chapters, the current licensing conditions require that consultants provide for the storage of collections excavated under their license if an adequate public repository cannot be located. Consultants almost invariably end up storing collections that they have no time or resources to analyze, and as they move from project to project these collections accumulate. Most people in this study indicated that they would like nothing better than to be rid of the collections, while others indicated that they were willing to maintain those collections because they planned to work with them in the future.   It may be argued that consultants are not happy with the current situation because they resent being made to pay for the storage of what can often be many thousands of artifacts. However, having collections of archaeological materials that are part of our collective heritage held by private consultants seems categorically irresponsible. It also compounds the problem of not performing adequate analysis of archaeological material because it is not in a place where researchers can easily access it.

One participant commented that: "The government has been remiss in taking financial responsibility – especially for collections." The Ministry of Culture does operate regional repositories in London and Toronto, but there is very limited space available in these repositories and consultants are often turned away when trying to find places for collections there. Technically, artifacts are being held in trust for the people of Ontario. The provincial government has indicated that they are concerned for the preservation of Ontario's archaeological heritage. Why then are they so slipshod in

providing adequate long-term care for the collections and documentary records from which that heritage can be understood?

Lack of Institutional Support

Financial and political support from provincial and municipal authorities can make many activities directed at the general public possible. Likewise, a lack of support makes many activities impossible. In terms of municipal support, the McGaw program was a success in part because the municipality was enthusiastic about the project. Likewise, the Archaeological Resource Centre had municipal support for the excavations they held in downtown Toronto. However, this support is not easily obtained. The participants in this survey were very critical of the role that the provincial Ministry of Culture has come to play in the management of archaeological resources. The main function of the Ministry is to issue licenses to conduct archaeology, to review reports and to archive them into the sites database and the growing body of grey literature. The Ministry of Culture does not currently have a policy for making information collected through CRM available to the public at large. It has been suggested that consultants be required to submit a summary of their field season to the Annual Archaeological Report, Ontario, but the Ministry indicated that they were not willing to impose such a requirement. One Ministry spokesperson noted that once the reports become part of the 'public record' their obligation to serve the public is now complete. However, these reports are not necessarily in the public record because consultants must sign a release allowing their report to be viewed by the public, including other consultants. In the past some archaeologists have refused to sign releases regarding access to their reports,

effectively sealing the information away and having it labeled confidential. This

completely eradicates the benefits of having that information extracted, since it can not be

used to make a contribution to knowledge, public or otherwise. Some consultants

reported that requests they have made to the Ministry for information about sites in their

database and archive of grey literature would often go unfulfilled.

As part of its "Archaeology Customer Service Project" the Ministry of Culture is

currently working with an advisory panel of archaeologists to develop new "Standards

and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists" for archaeological fieldwork and also for

artifact documentation, analysis and reporting (Ontario Ministry of Culture 2004, 2005).

These "standards" are meant to illustrate to consultants the lowest acceptable baseline for

archaeological work and the "guidelines" are suggestions for good practice. Some

participants in this study were hopeful that the new standards and guidelines will resolve

some problems in how consulting is practiced in the province and others were

"completely dissatisfied" with them. While a critical analysis of the new guidelines is

beyond the scope of this study, it is important to note that nowhere in the new guidelines

is there mention made of how archaeological information might be disseminated or

utilized in any way. In the guidelines for a Stage Four Excavation Report, item number 9

requires the consultant to make "Recommendations" (Ontario Ministry of Culture 2005).

They suggest including in this section a "statement confirming that the archaeological site

has been completely excavated and documented" and that "it should be cleared of

archaeological concerns" (Ontario Ministry of Culture 2005). Regardless of whether or

not the site actually has been excavated in its entirety, there is no suggestion for a

recommendation on how the investigation of this site could proceed or for future

directions for research on the material collected. Importantly, there is also no suggestion that a recommendation be made for public or academic dissemination of the information gathered. It is a shame that the interests of the citizens of Ontario and of local communities have not been represented in the New Draft Standards and Guidelines, but not surprising given that the name of this initiative is the "Archaeology Customer Service Project" and not the "Archaeology Public Service Project."

To their credit, the Ministry of Culture does support the Ontario Heritage Trust and contributes to the operation of the Ontario Archaeological Society. However, as the primary public authority in matters related to culture and heritage, one can wonder if they should be ensuring that the interests of the people of Ontario are being represented by the current system. The information received from participants in this study indicates that the Ministry of Culture is understaffed and the personnel they do have are so busy reviewing license reports that they have little time left over to attend to anything else. It seems that if public dissemination is going to become a mandatory part of CRM archaeology, it will have to be written into law by the Ministry of Culture. If the Ministry is not even interested in requiring that consultants share information amongst themselves, it is even less likely that they will advocate sharing this information with the general public. Nonetheless, a lack of institutional support from the Ministry of Culture seems to be a major impediment to having consultants make a consistent contribution to public archaeology.

The Effects of Professional and Personal Ethics

In many ways the questions at the heart of this thesis implicate ethics. Do consultants have an ethical obligation to make their work accessible to the public or to teach the public about archaeology? The bureaucratic mechanisms that govern CRM have not entrenched an obligation to serve the public, beyond the ideal that the archaeological record – the 'resource' – will somehow be utilized to benefit the scientific community and therefore the public in a vaguely defined future. Therefore, when consultants do engage with the public interest they do so because of some other moral or ethical obligation. Sometimes this moral obligation is one that is personal, arising from personal experiences and a personal sense of what doing archaeology is all about. On another level, and perhaps deriving from a sense of personal obligation on the part of senior management, is a professional or corporate obligation to make the work that they do relevant to an audience wider than their client and the Ministry of Culture. While some individuals or some companies do no public archaeology whatsoever, it may be useful to examine why others do feel that public outreach is important.

Each consultant was asked if they thought that the size of a consulting firm affected the potential of that firm, or its employees and principal investigators, to undertake public archaeology activities. The answers fell equally between yes and no. Those who answered "no" to that question indicated that: "If you're going to do it, you're going to do it," and that "It has to do with the desire of the people…to do something more than just create a catalogue and be descriptive in a report." These responses indicated that when people become involved in public archaeology, in whatever form, they are doing it because they have made a personal or corporate commitment to making

their work publicly accessible. However, the other half of responses indicated that the size of a company had a lot to do with whether or not the archaeologists working there would become involved in public archaeology. Since consulting contracts make no formal provision for research, analysis or public interpretation, larger firms have a better chance of having the available resources to undertake supplemental research and interpretation. Bigger firms are also more likely to have a greater volume of projects, which allows them to generate the surplus revenue that they can devote to public interpretation, both in terms of material and human resources. Firms that have a large volume of projects also see more sites and are more likely to work on sites that have the potential to be of value for public archaeology or for writing up to publication. The 'catch 22' here is that the volume of work that larger firms do can also leave them with little time left to devote to research and interpretation, much like the situation that those running smaller firms find themselves in. When the economy is strong, as it has been for the last few years in Ontario, both large and small firms will find themselves so inundated with work that they feel it is difficult to find the time to do anything else.

Some participants in this survey indicated that the company they work for holds public education to be an important component of "what they do." This company in particular claimed to have a 'core value' that the results of their work be disseminated. If a company has a particular mandate to do public education and outreach, it is almost certain that the people running that company do as well. Many people interviewed recognized that there was an obligation to bring the results of their work to the attention of a wider audience. However, acknowledgement of this obligation does not necessarily mean that they were able or willing to take action. Some people feel a personal

commitment to bring archaeology to a wider audience and take initiatives in that direction.

Those people who do get involved with the public said that they receive a "sense of satisfaction" from it or that "it reminds us why we do this in the first place." However, some people just simply seem more predisposed to doing public archaeology than others. One participant with significant experience in public archaeology commented that he was relieved to get out of public archaeology because it takes a special person to do it on a continuous basis, "to be up and enthusiastic all day, answering the same questions over and over again, hour after hour." Public education is not a traditional component of archaeological practice. It may be that people originally became involved in archaeology because they felt more comfortable in a two meter deep pit or spending their time measuring hundreds of chert flakes, than they did talking with people, especially those people that do not intuitively understand the importance of measuring and categorizing those hundreds of flakes. However, given the social and political context of cultural resource management and indeed of archaeology as a whole, no archaeologist can claim to be completely disengaged from the people whose history, whose heritage they are studying.

One participant noted that she gets the feeling that consultant archaeologists still very much carry their academic training around on their sleeves and they still feel a responsibility to fulfill their obligations to the archaeological community, the wider community and the aboriginal community. Given this, the question then becomes when to decide that they have fulfilled all of the obligations to these stakeholders. It would seem that the current practice of CRM in Ontario does not take into account all of these

stakeholders and what we have ended up with is a mechanism that is driven by bureaucratic management rather than high quality, socially responsible archaeological practice.

The Chain of Dissemination

With some exceptions, there seems to be a chain of events that leads to the public presentation of archaeological material. First, quality fieldwork needs to be done, then the required report written. This is what the archaeologist actually gets paid for by the proponent and is generally the only analytic treatment that a site will receive under the current CRM framework. However, if archaeologists are personally inclined, there should be quality analysis and supplemental research done on a particular site or regional network of sites, and these need to be written up to some sort of professional, if not publishable, standard. This only happens rarely and generally only for very significant or 'prestige' sites. Finally, if all of these other steps are taken, the information may be presented to the general public, after being translated from the highly technical language that archaeologists use amongst themselves into a story about the past that can be understood and appreciated by the general public. If the public is already interested in a site, or if a municipality is supportive of including some sort of community benefit into a project, this public presentation may be more likely to occur. This chain of events generally leads to a presentation of archaeological material and knowledge that is secondary to the actual experience of doing archaeology, such as a public talk or a popular publication. There are of course many exceptions to this chain of dissemination, but it demonstrates fairly accurately where the priorities of many consultants lie, and how

public archaeology is often only considered once knowledge about a particular site is fairly well developed.

Theorizing a Field of Practice II: Results of the Study

In Chapter Four, I discussed how John Carman has urged students of heritage management to develop a body of knowledge from which we can effectively critique the current structures and practices that make up CRM (2000b: 7-8). This study has produced a substantial amount of data about the practice of consulting archaeology in southern Ontario. From this data substantive theoretical statements can be formed about what 'doing' cultural resource management 'does,' and specifically how that practice contributes to the understanding and knowledge of archaeology among the public. What are the effects of 'doing' cultural resource management in southern Ontario in terms of the potential and actual amount of public archaeology being done?

I have found that CRM archaeology in Ontario provides almost no direct benefit to the general public. While contract archaeologists are generally aware that they have an obligation to public dissemination, there are not enough opportunities, not enough time, and not enough resources available to do public archaeology on a regular basis. In Chapter Three, I discussed Merriman's consideration of how the growth of a professional CRM industry has shifted our definition of 'public archaeology.' I will return to these definitions here to make some statements about what consulting archaeology does or does not do with respect to public archaeology.

CRM archaeology has professionalized the field and in doing so has reduced the number of opportunities available for the public to become involved in archaeology.

'Public archaeology' is most often understood as having the public participate in excavations. This happened quite frequently during the 1950s – 70s, when the public was often mobilized as volunteer labour to help to salvage sites threatened by development. Today, these same excavations are carried out under contract by consulting firms and must be done by experienced, efficient professionals in order to meet the terms of those contracts. The participants in this study concur that there is very little opportunity for the public to become involved in CRM excavations, and that in practice they try to keep their consulting work separate from any work they do with the public. Therefore, very little public archaeology happens on sites where CRM excavations are taking place, although some participants described bringing volunteers or students out for a 'day on the dig.' However, these cases are by far the exception rather than the rule when one considers that there were upwards of 700 sites investigated in 2005 and only a small handful of volunteer opportunities were provided.

It has been thought that the implementation of cultural resource management strategies serves the public interest by preserving cultural resources, or the records of destroyed resources, so that these records can be consulted in the future (Merriman 2004: 3). This definition of public archaeology assumes that the contribution that archaeology can make to general scholarly knowledge is in the public's interest. However, while CRM archaeology produces massive amounts of raw data - collections of artifacts, soil samples, maps of settlement patterns, plans of features, photographs, etc. – very little research is being done on these banked data, which calls into question not only their utility but also their validity and usefulness for scholarly research. For example, it may be that the current surveying and assessment methods are not identifying many small

sites – campsites, Archaic and Paleo-Indian sites. Are large sites, such as large Woodland-period settlements, then being over-represented in the archaeological record and skewing our perception of Ontario's history of occupation? If the cultural resources gathered by consultants are not being systematically tested and used to clarify our understanding of the past, then we cannot guarantee that they can be used to make a contribution to knowledge. While some research is done on CRM data, the vast majority of it remains unanalyzed. Williamson (1986: 86) has claimed that CRM does make a significant contribution to knowledge. However, while I admit that there are notable exceptions, I also believe it is fair to generalize that consulting archaeology, at present, is not making a significant contribution to current archaeological research and therefore the banking of data for 'posterity' does not currently translate into a public benefit.

The definition of public archaeology employed in this project has been: "any area of archaeological activity that interacted or had the potential to interact with the public" (Schadla-Hall 1999: 4), or any way professional archaeologists "relate their discipline to the public at large" (Williamson 1986: 85). The participants in this study have demonstrated that they do at times use a variety of presentations, media and interpretive techniques to interact with the public. Since there is no formal structure for public dissemination in place, the way that archaeologists disseminate to various communities is based on personal strengths and preferences. Currently, public archaeology deriving from CRM archaeology in Ontario is completely dependent on the goodwill of those CRM practitioners who believe that communication with the public is important. These individuals volunteer their own time and initiative to share the results of their work with the public. How they do this is negotiated individually; some consultants might give

public talks, others might maintain websites, and others may do nothing at all. Involvement in public archaeology is highly contingent on the archaeologist having available time, resources and skills to become involved with public presentations of archaeology. Since there is no requirement that the information derived from consulting projects be disseminated to the archaeological community or to the public at large, it often simply doesn't happen.

The current framework for CRM in Ontario functions as a bureaucratic exercise that has become divorced from the values that it was founded upon. The purpose of consulting archaeology is to clear archaeological concerns from properties that are about to be developed. In the current system, consultants are not encouraged to ensure that the work that they do makes a contribution to archaeological research and they are not encouraged to make their work meaningful or relevant for the public. There needs to be a complete re-evaluation of what the purpose of consulting archaeology should be in Ontario. I believe that the Ministry of Culture and the practitioners in the consulting industry need to consider what the goals of CRM archaeology are. If the point of CRM is to employ archaeologists, that is being fulfilled. However, if the point of CRM is to make a contribution to archaeological research and knowledge about the human past, then opportunities for research, analysis and publication have to be created. If the objective of CRM is to preserve knowledge about the past for the benefit of the public, then opportunities for public interaction with CRM archaeology and its products need to be created.

At the beginning of this thesis I suggested that legislative acts and regulations intended to protect archaeological resources are in place to preserve knowledge of the

past for the benefit of the public, and inquired if cultural resource management

archaeology in Ontario, as it is currently practiced, fulfils this aim? The results of the

study indicate that the laws that have given rise to CRM archaeology do not directly

serve the public interest. They provide for scientific and cultural information about the

past to be retained, but do not provide adequately for archaeologists to do anything with

the information gathered that might translate into a benefit for the general public. If

archaeologists do use their own resources to make information available to the public,

they do so with no encouragement or direction from the provincial authorities that require

the work to be done.   Furthermore, the practice of cultural resource management in

Ontario overwhelmingly does not benefit the public in any direct way. The information

that the public – whether they be taxpayers, developers, home buyers – pays to have

extracted is usually doomed to become part of the growing 'grey literature,' the *ex situ*

resource, never analyzed and synthesized into a meaningful academic or popular

narrative, because no resources have been allocated to making the information

meaningful under the current system. While many archaeologists do make attempts to

engage with the public in many ways, mostly they do so independently, with their own

time and resources. These individual efforts should be applauded. However, even if all

these attempts to reach the public were combined they still do not provide an adequate

response to the problem of a lack of public accountably in the CRM industry in southern

Ontario. There are still too many projects operating outside any public visibility. While

there are many problems associated with the CRM industry in southern Ontario that have

been discussed in this thesis, many arising from the commercialization of archaeological

investigations, the lack of public knowledge about what archaeology in Ontario is, and

how it works, is paramount. The laws that ensure that cultural resources are preserved in advance of development are dependent on public support. Without opportunities for the public to see the positive results of these laws, public support may dwindle, and if a crisis should arise for CRM legislation then we may find ourselves without a constituency that will support these activities. Consultants are not able to independently undertake public archaeology activities on a scale that would facilitate this kind of support. In order for public archaeology to thrive in Ontario, there should be an mandate introduced either from within the industry or imposed by the province, that facilitates the financial support necessary for archaeologists to devote more resources and time to increasing public awareness and understanding about Ontario archaeology. Otherwise there will continue to be only marginal and inadequate public knowledge of, and support for, archaeology in this province. If this situation is allowed to continue we may well find Fritz and Plog's (1970: 412) prediction to be true and modern society, at least in southern Ontario, will indeed find itself increasingly capable of getting along without archaeologists and without any knowledge of the history of this land that so many of us have come to inhabit only so very recently.

Chapter Seven:

CONCLUSIONS, RECCOMENDATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This study began with three main themes or questions that I hope have been resolved here to some degree: First, what is the general attitude towards public archaeology as a component of consulting? The participants in this study took a positive position on the merits of public archaeology and all agreed that we have an obligation to educate the public about archeology. Clearly, many people believe that public dissemination is important enough to occasionally volunteer their own time and resources to doing public archaeology. However, they also recognized that not enough action was being taken to facilitate communication with the public. The second component to this question was: how are these attitudes reflected in practice? It is significant that there was a general consensus that public archaeology had to be separated from the business side of consulting archaeology. CRM practitioners are not able to combine public archaeology with their consulting work and remain competitive in the current economic climate and under the current framework for CRM. Volunteer labour is not efficient enough to use on consulting projects and there are issues of liability and business ethics that can further complicate public participation. Moreover, consultants are unable to charge clients specifically for the cost of research, analysis, publication or interpretation. If they do so, they run the risk of pricing themselves out of competition with other consultants. Any funds for public archaeology and dissemination must come out of the company's profits. While some companies claim to have a mandate for public education, they are the exception since many smaller firms simply do not have the time, resources or volume of projects that would allow them to do more publicly oriented dissemination. In general,

there is a major disconnection between current consulting practice and the potential for public archaeology.

The third theme that this thesis sought to investigate was the impediments to public archaeology as a component of consulting practice. Simply put, the current system for cultural resource management in southern Ontario does not encourage consultants to make a meaningful contribution to the public's understanding and knowledge of archaeology. Consultants lack the time, resources, and institutional support to do public archaeology. Further, there is not enough research being done on the archaeological material resulting from CRM investigations to make it meaningful either to academics or to the public. The current system for CRM in Ontario is designed to clear archaeological concerns from new developments, not to utilize cultural resources in the public interest. Basically, the result of this study can be summed up in saying that the current system of cultural resource management in this province is seriously deficient in policies and practices that permit meaningful communication with the public.

Where Do We Go From Here?

While the main focus of this study has been on identifying the links or lack of links between CRM and public archaeology in Ontario, it has also revealed a variety of other problems that could warrant further research. Paramount among these, in my opinion, is the fact that most CRM data are not being analyzed, which not only prevents archaeologists from evaluating the relative merits of the data they are generating, but also impedes their ability to effectively communicate with the public. There needs to be more analysis and synthesis of the *ex situ* cultural resources being produced so that we can

determine if all of this information is more a function of the observer or of practical expediency than of actual cultural events. These are the data from which all stories of the past in Ontario will be interpreted; we must not only ensure that the data can tell these stories, but also begin writing them.

Another issue that this thesis has raised is a concern for where the public interest in archeology lies. As stated in Chapter Five, the argument that the past belongs to everyone does not lead logically to all people having an interest in the preservation of archaeological remains (Carman 2000b: 9). It would be useful to conduct a survey that expands on Pokotylo's (2002) survey that would help archaeologists in Ontario determine where the public interest in archaeology lies. This would allow us to construct in a more informed manner what the public experience of archaeology should be and how we can best share archaeology with non-archaeologists.

Further, the number of individuals consulted in this survey was somewhat small, totaling 17 practitioners. It would be useful to expand on this survey and include not only many more consultants and government personnel, but also academic archaeologists and members of the public among those consulted. Academics might have a unique perspective on the issues discussed here. Also, it would be interesting to investigate how academic archaeologists disseminate the results of their research to the consulting community and also to the public at large. Some of the participants in this survey indicated that public dissemination occurred even less among academic archaeologists than it does among consultants, and it would be interesting to see if that really is the case.

In Chapter Six I suggested that if CRM archaeology is going to become relevant and beneficial to the public at large, then opportunities for these sorts of initiatives have to be created. I predict that if the practitioners do not create these opportunities in the consulting community itself then parties external to the industry will impose them. First Nations in particular are in a position to demand better dissemination of and collaboration with the investigations of sites that relate to their cultural heritage. The Ministry of Culture is in perhaps the best position to demand better dissemination of CRM investigations. However, they have indicated that they are not interested in imposing such a regulation. Indeed, if they were interested in requiring consultants to contribute to the AAROs or communicate better with local communities, then the new Standards and Guidelines being developed for reporting would be the best place to include such a regulation, but this has not been done, despite suggestions along these lines from the technical group advising the Ministry.

Since there is little to no opportunity to involve the public in the fieldwork side of consulting archaeology, opportunities need to be created for consultants to make archaeology available to the public by other means. The Internet seems to be a logical place to begin this sort of initiative. Something as simple as a list of sites organized by municipality or by Borden block, the standard system for identifying the location of archaeological sites in Canada, would at least allow people to see if archaeological excavations had been done in their area, so that they could approach the Ministry of Culture for more information. The Ministry of Culture claims that site reports are available for the public to view at any time, except in those cases where the archaeologist has not consented to allow the report to be publicly available, however, if the public is

unaware that there is archaeology taking place in the province, or that the reports are available for them to view, then they will never ask to see them. There were suggestions made in the course of this study that some reports could be turned into PDF files and posted on the websites of consultants or on one central website. While there may be sensitivity issues around maps of sites that are still *in situ,* many sites have been fully excavated and completely developed. Surely there can be no harm in posting online the reports and maps of sites that are now destroyed and/or lying beneath suburban asphalt.

However, making the results of archaeological investigations available to the public online or in print is only one small part of a potential solution. One thing that has always attracted people to archaeology is the thought of actually reaching out and touching a piece of the past. One of archaeology's great strengths is its authenticity and allowing people to interact with the real remains of the past, either through opportunities to participate in excavations or to handle artifacts, is an important aspect of public archaeology. However, as stated above, opportunities need to be created to have the public engage with archaeology done in the context of CRM. These opportunities will require some funding and institutional support in order to be brought to fruition. Perhaps by bringing together consultants, Ministry of Culture personnel, academic archaeologists and members of the public in a forum where they could discuss the best way to make CRM archaeology more accessible to the public, potential solutions could be raised and a plan to act upon them developed.

Concluding Impressions: Saving the Past for the Future

During the course of this study, people have asked me if it would really be such a bad thing if we put an end to cultural resource management in this province. If the archaeological record being produced is of questionable quality, limited utility and if it is being used neither to further our knowledge of the past nor to benefit the public, then why not just put an end to the whole thing? My answer to this is that I genuinely believe that if archaeology and the recognition of heritage are cultural constructs, then how we treat that heritage is a reflection of how we perceive ourselves and our culture as a whole. People commonly express a concern for a connection with the past, for a sense of continuity. The parent of a student in a public archaeology program in Britain once commented: "I like roots. Plants don't grow well without them. People are the same" (Emmott 1989: 28). If we lose sight of the past, we risk losing sight of the future. Archaeologists are those people who have been charged with interpreting the all too ephemeral traces of the past beneath the modern landscape for those people to whom these traces are mostly invisible. If archaeologists, including consultants, do not make an effort to turn this material record into stories about the past that the general public can understand and derive meaning from, we stand to lose that vital link between the past and the present. Preserving that link is what archaeology "does" in society; we should never lose sight of that. There are many questions here that need to be resolved. In the meantime, the bulldozers will keep rolling, and sites will continue to be ripped from the ground. We would do well to convince the people of Ontario that the past is something that is worth saving for the future, while there is still something to be saved.

Appendix:

SCHEDULE OF QUESTIONS FOR INTERVIEWS

Note: This schedule of questions was used to direct the flow of the conversation during the interview process. However, in many instances the participants themselves guided the conversation towards some themes and away from others. Therefore, some participants did not answer some questions and likewise, some themes discussed were only identified during analysis and are not well represented by the questions asked.

Major Themes to be discussed in the Interview:

1. How do consultant archaeologists contribute to the general knowledge of the archaeological heritage of Ontario by non-archaeologists?

2. What are the limitations and opportunities afforded by the consultant's position in the public discourse on archaeology?

3. What is the general attitude towards public archaeology as a component of consulting and how is this reflected in practice?

General Questions that May Be Used with Any Participant:

Career Path

What is your level of education? Specialization?

What is your primary area of work? How long have you been in your current position?

Do you currently hold a license to conduct fieldwork in Ontario?

Are you a member of any professional or avocational organizations?

Have you ever been employed as (or by) a consultant?

Have you ever been employed in an academic setting?

Have you even been employed by in a government setting?

What do you feel are the major differences between academic archaeologists and cultural resource managers? (Not that this need be mutually exclusive.)

Public Archaeology

What is your understanding of "public archaeology"? What sorts of things do you think make up "public archaeology"?

Have you, personally, been involved with any "public archaeology" initiatives recently or in the past?

Do you consider "public archaeology" to be a part of what you do?

Have you volunteered your time outside of work to participate in publicly oriented archaeology initiatives? Is this common, meaning you do not receive compensation

Do you what kinds of connections do you have with other consultants on publicly oriented initiatives?

Do you communicate with government departments or museums on publicly oriented initiatives?

Do you have any connections with archaeology organizations or societies on publicly oriented initiatives?

Have you worked on any sites that would lend themselves particularly well to public interpretation?

Do you perceive any specific challenges to public interpretation due to the nature of the types of sites that make up the archaeological record in Ontario?

Do you think public interpretation should be addressed in the legislative framework?

Do you think that mandating public interpretation at the cost of the proponent is a good idea? Why/why not?

Do you think that the conservation of sites *in situ* would be more beneficial to public archaeology, as opposed to 'mitigation' by excavation and documentation?

Do you think that the size of a consulting company affects the potential of that company, its employees, or owners to undertake public archaeology activities?

The Conservation Ethic

Lipe's 'conservation ethic' is one of the foundations of cultural resource management. It advises to conserve sites *in situ* where at all possible. How does this relate to the current framework of resource management?

In your experience, if sites are left *in situ* as opposed to being excavated, does this affect the potential for public interpretation?

As a rough percentage, how many sites are mitigated by excavation as opposed to conservation *in situ?*

In what ways has your company worked with the media? Have you ever contacted or been contacted by a newspaper, TV news crew, radio stations? Are there certain kinds of projects that receive more of a media response?

Business Practice

What sorts of clients do you generally work for? No specific names required.

How do you communicate the benefits of having 'good' archaeology done to the developer? How do they respond?

Funding

Have you been involved in any discussions about how public interpretation could be funded?

Does the possibility of Public Interpretation have any bearing on bidding for contracts?

Do you think potential clients would be interested in paying for interpretation?

Where do you think funding for public archaeology should come from?
If the contract is for a publicly funded development project (i.e. infrastructure, roads and transport) is public interpretation discussed at all?

Conservation

How are artifacts stored? Are they available for anyone to look at? Are there regional repositories?

How could the material culture be better served in terms of storage and public access?

What are the barriers to optimum conservation and research potential for the archaeological remains collected?

Do you feel that artifacts are held in the "public trust"?

Who could be contacted to help solve this problem? Government? What about Museums? Local Museums? First Nations?

Challenges

Some literature coming out of the consulting community in Ontario has made reference to 'factionalism' among practitioners. Is this true? What affect do you think this has on research and interpretation?

What are some of the things that might encourage you to publish or otherwise interpret your work to a wider audience? What are some of the things that might discourage these same initiatives?

Who legally "owns" the information contained in an assessment report? The client? The archaeologist? The public?

Does legal ownership of archaeological remains differ from moral ownership?

How is the 'public trust' served in contract archaeology?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

APA – The Ontario Association of Professional Archaeologists
1990   "Code of Ethics." Accessed May 17, 2005.
          http://www.apaontario.org/history.htm

Archaeological Services Inc.
n.d.   "Legislation" (Accessed March 21, 2005)
          www.archaeologicalservices.on.ca/pages/legislation.htm

Baba, Marietta L.
1994   "The Fifth Subdiscipline: Anthropological Practice and the Future of
          Anthropology." *Human Organization* 53(2): 174-186.

Baer, Hans A.
1995   "Commentary: Elitism and Discrimination Within Anthropology." *Practicing
          Anthropology* 17(1-2): 42-43.

Bernard, H. Russell
1988   *Research Methods in Cultural Anthropology*. SAGE Publications: Newbury
          Park.

Burgess, Robert G.
1984   *In the Field: An Introduction to Field Research*. Allen and Unwin: London.

Burley, David V.
1994   "A Never Ending Story: Historical Developments in Canadian Archaeology
          and the Quest for Federal Heritage Legislation." and "Solicited Dialogue."
          Canadian Journal of Archaeology 18: 77-133.

CAA – Canadian Archaeological Association
2004a "Principles of Ethical Conduct." Accessed May 17, 2005.
          http://www.canadianarchaeology.com/conduct.lasso

2004b "Statement of Principles for Ethical Conduct Pertaining to Aboriginal Peoples."
          Accessed May 17, 2005. http://www.canadianarchaeology.com/ethical.lasso

1996   "Statement of Principles for Ethical Conduct Pertaining to Aboriginal
          Peoples" Canadian Archaeological Association. Accessed March 21, 2005
          www.canadianarchaeology.com/publications/ethical.lasso

CARF – The Cataraqui Archaeological Research Foundation
2005   "Draft Foundation Profile." Accessed February 19, 2006.
          http://www.carf.info/pdf/CARF%20Profile.doc

Carman, John
2002   *Archaeology and Heritage: An Introduction.* Continuum: London.

2000a   "'Theorising a Realm of Practice': Introducing Archaeological Heritage
        Management as a Research Field." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 6(4):
        303-308.

2000b   "Theorising the Practice of Archaeological Heritage Management." *Archaeologia
        Polona* 38: 5-21.

Carruthers, Peter, ed.
1997   "Forum: From Priority to Practice." *Home is Where the Hearth is: The
        Contribution of Small Sites to our Understanding of Ontario's Past.* Eds. Jean-
        Luc Pilon and Rachel Perkins. The Ottawa Chapter of the Ontario Archaeological
        Society. (Accessed March 21, 2005). http://collection.nlc-
        bnc.ca/100/200/300/ont_archaeol_soc/home/downe.htm

Cleland, Charles E.
2001   "Comments on the CAA Plenary Session Papers." In "*Warning –
        Steep Grade Ahead: Current Directions in Canadian Archaeology,*" Ed. Neal
        Ferris. (Accessed March 22, 2005)
        www.canadianarchaeology.com/1998plenary/1998plenary.lasso#index2

Clifford, James
1988   *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth Century Ethnography, Literature and Art.*
        Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA.

Coleman, Derek and Ron Williamson
1994   "Landscapes Past to Landscapes Future: Planning for Archaeological
        Resources." In: *Great Lakes Archaeology and Paleoecology: Exploring
        Interdisciplinary Initiatives for the Nineties*. ed. Robert I. MacDonald, 61-80.
        Proceedings of a symposium presented by the Quaternary Sciences Institute,
        University of Waterloo, September 21-22, 1991.

Davis, Hester A.
2000   "Avocational Archaeology Groups: A Secret Weapon for Site Protection." In
        Protecting the Past. Eds. George S. Smith and John E. Ehrenhard. Southeast
        Archaeology Centre, National Parks Service. Accessed May 17, 2005.
        http://www.cr.nps.gov/seac/protecting/html/4k-davis.ht

1972   "The Crisis in American Archaeology." *Science* 175:257-272.

Davis, Karen Lee
1997   "Sites Without Sights: Interpreting Closed Excavations." In *Presenting
        Archaeology to the Public: Digging for Truths*. Ed. John H. Jameson, 84-98.
        Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press.

Dey, Ian
1999   *Grounding Grounded Theory: Guidelines for Qualitative Inquiry.* Academic
        Press: San Diego.

Downum, Christian E. and Laurie J. Price
1999   "Applied Archaeology." *Human Organization* 58(3): 226-239.

Dreyfus, Hubert L. and Paul Rabinow
1983   *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics.* University of
        Chicago Press: Chicago.

Dunnell, Robert C.
1984   "The Ethics of Archaeological Significance Decisions." In *Ethics and Values
         in Archaeology*. Ed. Ernstine L. Greene, 108-116. New York: Free Press.

Emmott, Kathy
1989   "A Child's Perspective on the Past: Influences of Home, Media and School."
        In *Who Needs the Past?: Indigenous Values and Archaeology.* Ed R. Layton, 21-
        44. London: Unwin Hyman.

Ervin, Alexander M.
2000   *Applied Anthropology: Tools and Perspectives for Contemporary Practices.*
        Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Fagan, Brian
2002   "Epilogue." In *Public Benefits of Archaeology*. Ed. Barbara J. Little, 253-260.
         Gainesville: University Press of Florida.

1977   "Genesis 1.1: Or, Teaching Archaeology to the Great Archaeology-Loving
         Public." *American Antiquity* 42(1): 119-125.

Ferris, Neal
2003   "Between Colonial and Indigenous Archaeologies: Legal and Extra-Legal
         Ownership of Archaeological Resources in North America." *Canadian Journal of
         Archaeology* 27(2): 154-190.

2002   "When the Air Thins: The Rapid Rise of the Archaeological Consulting Industry
         in Ontario." *Journal of American Archaeology* 21: 53-88.

1998a "I Don't Think We're in Kansas Anymore…" The Rise of the Archaeological
        Consulting Industry in Ontario." In *Bringing Back the Past: Historical
        Perspectives on Canadian Archaeology.* eds. P. Smith and D. Mitchell, 225-247.
        Museum of Civilization, Archaeological Survey of Canada, Mercury Series, Paper
        158.

1998b "Current Issues in the Governance of Archaeology in Canada." In "*Warning –*

Steep Grade Ahead: Current Directions in Canadian Archaeology," Ed. Neal Ferris. (Accessed March 22, 2005) www.canadianarchaeology.com/1998plenary/1998plenary.lasso#index2

Fitting, James E.
1984   "Economics and Archaeology." In *Ethics and Values in Archaeology.* Ed. Ernstine L. Greene, 108-116. New York: Free Press.

1978   "Client-Oriented Archaeology: A Comment on Kinsey's Dilemma." *Pennsylvania Archaeologist* 48: 12-15.

Fritz, John M. and Fred T. Plog
1970   "The Nature of Archaeological Explanation." *American Antiquity* 35(4): 405-412.

Fowler, Don D.
1984   "Ethics in Contract Archaeology." In *Ethics and Values in Archaeology.* Ed. Ernstine Green, 108-115. New York: The Free Press.

Fox, William A., ed.
1986   *Archaeological Consulting in Ontario: Papers of the London Conference 1985.* Occasional Publication of the London Chapter, Ontario Archaeological Society Inc. London, ON.

General, Paul and Gary Warrick
2004   "The Haudenosaunee (Six Nations) and Archaeology." *The SAA Archaeological Record* 4(5) (Nov 2004): 29-32.

Gero, Joan
1985   "Socio-Politics and the Woman-at-Home Ideology." *American Antiquity* 50(2): 342-350.

Glaser, Barney G and Anselm L. Strauss
1967   *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research.* Aldine Publishing Company: Chicago.

Goulding, Christina
2002   *Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide for Management, Business and Market Researchers.* SAGE Publications: London.

Green, Ernstine, ed.
1984   *Ethics and Values in Archaeology.* New York: The Free Press.

Green, William and John F. Doershuk
1998   "Cultural Resource Management and American Archaeology." *Journal of Archaeological Research* 6(2): 121-167.

Heath, Margaret A.
1997   "Successfully Integrating the Public into Research: The Crow Canyon
        Archaeological Center." In *Presenting Archaeology to the Public: Digging for
        Truths*. Ed. John H. Jameson, 65-72. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press.

Herscher, Ellen and Francis P. McManamon

1995   "Public Education and Outreach: The Obligation to Educate." In: *Ethics in
        American Archaeology: Challenges for the 1990s*, Eds. Mark Lynott and Alison
        Wylie, 42-44. Society for American Archaeology.

Hodder, Ian
2000   *The Archaeological Process: An Introduction*. Blackwell Publishers: Oxford.

1991   "Interpretive Archaeology and Its Role." *American Antiquity* 56: 7-18.

Hodder, Ian and Scott Hutson
2003   *Reading the Past: Current Approaches to Interpretation in Archaeology.*
        Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Jameson, John H., Ed.
1997a   *Presenting Archaeology to the Public: Digging for Truths.* Walnut Creek:
        AltaMira Press.

Jameson, John H.
2003   "Purveyors of the Past: Education and Outreach as Ethical Imperatives in
        Archaeology" In *Ethical Issues in Archaeology*. Eds. Larry J. Zimmerman, Karen
        D. Vitelli and Julie Hollowell-Zimmer, 153-162. Walnut Creek: Alta Mira Press.

1997b   "Introduction: What this Book is About." In *Presenting Archaeology to the
        Public: Digging for Truths*. Ed. John H. Jameson Jr., 11-20. Walnut Creek:
        AltaMira Press.

Jennings, Jesse D.
1985   "River Basin Surveys: Origins, Operations and Results, 1945-1969."*American
        Antiquity* 50(2): 281-296.

1963   "Administration of Contract Emergency Archaeological Programs." *American
        Antiquity* 28(3): 282-285.

Kapyrka, Juile C.
2005   *Archaeology and First Nations: Examining the Attitudes of Ontario
        Archaeologists.* Unpublished Master's Thesis: Trent University, Peterborough,
        Ontario.

Kelley, Jane H. and Ronald F. Williamson
1996   "The Positioning of Archaeology within Anthropology: A Canadian Historical Perspective." *American Antiquity* 61(1): 5-20.

King, Thomas F.
2002   *Thinking about Cultural Resource Management: Essays From the Edge.* Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press.

1979   "Preservation and Rescue." *Journal of Field Archaeology* 6(3): 351-366.

Lea, Joanne and Karolyn E. Smardz
2000   "Public Archaeology in Canada." *Antiquity* 74: 141-6.

Leone, Mark P. and Parker B. Potter, Jr.
1992   "Legitimation and the Classification of Archaeological Sites." *American Antiquity* 57(1): 137-145.

Leone, Mark, Parker B. Potter and Paul A. Shackel
1987   "Toward a Critical Archaeology." *Current Anthropology* 28(3): 283-302.

Little, Barbara J., ed.
2002   *Public Benefits of Archaeology.* Gainesville: University Press of Florida.

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

1977   "A Conservation Model for American Archaeology." In *Conservation Archaeology: A Guide for Cultural Resource Management Studies.* Eds. Michael B. Schiffer and George J. Gummerman, 19-42. New York: Academic Press.

1974   "A Conservation Model for American Archaeology." *The Kiva* 3-4: 213-245.

Lowenthal, David
1998   "The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History." Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lynott, Mark and Alison Wylie
1995   "Stewardship: The Central Principle of Archaeological Ethics." In *Ethics in American Archaeology: Challenges for the 1990s*. Special Publication of the Society for American Archaeology.

McCarthy, Amanda
2002   *Preservation of Native American Cultural Property under Us Federal Law: A Discursive Analysis of NAGPRA.* MA Thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa.

McDavid, Carol
2004   "Towards a More Democratic Archaeology? The Internet and Public
        Archaeological Practice." In *Public Archaeology*. Ed. Nick Merriman 59-84.
        New York: Routledge.

McGimsey, Charles R.
1984   "The Value of Archaeology." In *Ethics and Values in Archaeology*. Ed. Ernestine
        L. Greene, 171-174. New York: The Free Press.

1972   *Public Archaeology*. New York: Seminar Press.

McGimsey, Charles R. and Davis, Hester A.
1977   *The Management of Archaeological Resources. The Arlie House Report.*
        Special Publication of the Society for American Archaeology.

McManamon, Francis P.
2002   "Heritage, History and Archaeological Educators." In *Presenting Archaeology to
        the Public: Digging for Truths*. Ed. John H. Jameson Jr., 31-45. Walnut Creek:
        AltaMira Press.

2000a   "The Protection of Archaeological Resources in the United States: Reconciling
        Preservation with Contemporary Society" in *Cultural Resource Management in
        Contemporary Society: Perspectives on Managing and Presenting the Past,* 40-
        54. Eds. Francis P. McManamon and Alf Hatton. New York: Routledge.

2000b   "Public Education: A Part of Archaeological Professionalsim." In
        The Archaeology Education Handbook: Sharing the Past with Kids. Eds. Karolyn
        Smardz and Shelley J. Smith, 17-24. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press.

1991   "The Many Publics for Archaeology." *American Antiquity* 56(1): 121-130.

McManamon, Francis P. and Alf Hatton
2000   "Introduction: Considering Cultural Resource Management in Modern Society."
        In: *Cultural Resource Management in Contemporary Society.* Eds. Francis P.
        McManamon and Alf Hatton, 1-19. New York: Routledge.

Merriman, Nick
2004   "Introduction: Diversity and Dissonance in Public Archaeology." In *Public
        Archaeology*. Ed. Nick Merriman, 1-17. New York: Routledge.

2003   "Archaeology, Heritage and Interpretation." In *Archaeology: The Widening
        Debate.* Eds. Barry Cunliffe, Wendy Davies, and Colin Renfrew, 541-566. The
        British Academy, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

1991   *Beyond the Glass Case: The Past, the Heritage and the Public in Britain.*
        Leicester: Leicester University Press.

Messenger, Phyllis Mauch
1995   "Public Education and Outreach." In: *Ethics in American Archaeology: Challenges for the 1990s*, eds. Mark Lynott and Alison Wylie, 68-70. Society for American Archaeology.

Miller, James J.
1990   "Comment on "Professional Problem Domains of Consulting Archaeologists: Responsibility without Authority." by Harry M. Piper" in "Public Archaeology Forum." *Journal of Field Archaeology* 17(2): 214-216.

Nahrgang, R. Kris
2002   "The State of Archaeology and First Nations." *Ontario Archaeology* 73: 1-9.

Neumann, Thomas W. and Robert M. Sanford
2001   *Practicing Archaeology: A Training Manual for Cultural Resources Archaeology*. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press.

Nicholas, George P. and Thomas D. Andrews, eds.
1997   *At a Crossroads: Archaeology and First Peoples in Canada.* Burnaby: Archaeology Press, Publication No. 24.

NRCS – Natural Resources Conservation Service
n.d.   "25 Simple Things You Can Do to Promote the Public Benefits of Archaeology." United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Cultural Resources. Accessed April 27, 2005. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/technical/ECS/culture/25things.pdf

OAS – Ontario Archaeological Society
2003a   "Changes to the Ontario Heritage Act." *Arch Notes* 8(1): 14-16.

2003b   "Statement of Ethical Principles." Accessed May 17, 2005. http://www.ontarioarchaeology.on.ca/oas/Pages/constitution.htm

Ontario Ministry of Culture
2005   "Draft Standards and Guidelines for Consulting Archaeologists: Standards and Guidelines for Artifact Documentation and Analysis." Archaeology Customer Service Project. Accessed February 29, 2006. http://www.culture.gov.on.ca/english/culdiv/heritage/Reporting_standards_guidelines_draft.pdf

2004   "Draft Standards and Guidelines for Consulting Archaeologists: Archaeological Fieldwork." Archaeology Customer Service Project. Accessed February 29, 2006. http://www.culture.gov.on.ca/english/culdiv/heritage/discussion_draft_fieldwork-e.pdf

Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Recreation
2002   "Draft New Licensing Framework for Archaeology." Archaeology Customer
        Service Project. Accessed February 19, 2006.
        http://www.culture.gov.on.ca/english/culdiv/heritage/arch_framework.pdf

Ontario Provincial Policy Statement - Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
2005   "Provincial Policy Statement: Draft Policies." Accessed February 19, 2006.
        http://www.mah.gov.on.ca/userfiles/page_attachments/Library/1/1591355_PPS_d
        raft_policies_e.pdf

Orser, Charles E., Jr.
2001   "Review of *Public Benefits of Archaeology.*" *Journal of Field Archaeology*
        28(3/4): 464-466.

Parry, K.W.
1998   "Grounded Theory and Social Process: A New Direction for Leadership
        Research." *Leadership Quarterly* 9(1): 85-105.

Patterson, Thomas C.
1999   "The Political Economy of Archaeology in the United States." *Annual Review of
        Anthropology* 28: 155-174.

Paynter, Robert
1990   "Afro-Americans in the Massachusetts Historical Landscape." In: *The Politics of
        the Past.* Eds. P. Gathercole and D. Lowenthal, 49-62. London: Unwin Hyman.

Pihl, Robert H.
2001   "Uncovering Richmond Hill's 15th Century Past: Archaeology at the McGaw
        Site (Al Gu:88)." *Arch Notes* (6)5: 16-19. Ontario Archaeological Society.

Pokotylo, David
2002   "Public Opinion and Canadian Archaeological Heritage: A National Perspective."
        Canadian Journal of Archaeology 26: 88-129.

Raab, L. Mark
1984   "Achieving Professionalism through Ethical Fragmentation: Warnings from
        Client-Oriented Archaeology." In: *Ethics and Values in Archaeology.* ed. Ernstine
        Green, 51-61. New York: The Free Press.

Raab, Mark L., Timothy C. Klinger, Michael B. Schiffer, and Albert C. Goodyear
1980   "Clients, Contracts and Conflicts in Public Archaeology." *American
        Anthropologist* 82(3): 539-551.

Ramos, Maria and David Duganne
2000   "Exploring Public Perceptions and Attitudes about Archaeology." Harris
        Interactive, Inc. for the Society for American Archaeology. Accessed May 3,
        2005. http://www.cr.nps.gov/aad/pubs/harris/index.htm

Reed, Michael C.
1997   "Practicing Anthropology in a Postmodern World: Lessons and Insights from
        Federal Contract Research." *NAPA Bulletin 17*. National Association for the
        Practice of Anthropology, American Anthropological Association.

Rosenswig, Robert M.
1998   "Ethics, Archaeological Resource Management and Federal Legislation: A
        Few Thoughts for the Direction of Canadian Archaeology" in *Warning –
        Steep Grade Ahead: Current Directions in Canadian Archaeology*. Ed. Neal
        Ferris. (Accessed March 21, 2005)
        www.canadianarchaeology.com/1998plenary/1998plenary.lasso#index2

SAA - Society for American Archaeology - Ethics in Archaeology Committee
1995   "Principles of Archaeological Ethics."
        Ethics in American Archaeology: Challenges for the 1990s. Eds. Mark J. Lynott
        and Alison Wylie. Special Publication. The Society for American Archaeology.

SfAA - Society for Applied Anthropology
2005   "Mission, Vision, Values, Goals: About SFAA."   Accessed June 14, 2005.
        http://www.sfaa.net/sfaagoal.html

Schadla-Hall, Tim
1999   "Editorial: Public Archaeology." *European Journal of Archaeology,* 2(2): 147-58.

Schiffer, Michael B. and George J. Gumerman, eds.
1977   *Conservation Archaeology: A Guide for Cultural Resource Management
        Studies.* New York: Academic Press.

Shackel, Paul A.
2004 "Working with Communities: Heritage Development and Applied
        Archaeology." In *Places in Mind: Public Archaeology as Applied Archaeology,* 1-
        16. Eds. Paul A Shackel and Erve J. Chambers. New York: Routledge.

Shackel, Paul A. and Erve J. Chambers
2004   *Places in Mind: Public Archaeology as Applied Archaeology.* New York:
        Routledge.

Shanks, Michael and Christopher Tilley
1988   *Social Theory and Archaeology*. University of New Mexico Press: Albuquerque.

Smardz, Karolyn E.
2000   "Teaching People to Touch the Past: Archaeology in the Toronto School
        System." In: *Protecting the Past,* eds. George S. Smith and John E. Ehrenhard.
        Southwest Archaeological Centre. Accessed Dec 16, 2004.
        http://www.cr.nps.gov/seac/protecting/ptp-index.htm.

1997   "The Past Through Tomorrow: Interpreting Toronto's Heritage to a Multicultural
        Public." In *Presenting Archaeology to the Public: Digging for Truths*. Ed. John
        H. Jameson Jr., 102-113. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press.

Smardz, Karolyn and Shelley J. Smith
2000   "The Archaeology Education Handbook: Sharing the Past with Kids." In *The
        Archaeology Education Handbook: Sharing the Past with Kids*. Eds. Karolyn
        Smardz and Shelley J. Smith, 25-38. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press.

Smardz-Frost, Karolyn E.
2004   "Archaeology and Public Education in North America: View from the
        Beginning of the Millennium." In *Public Archaeology*. Ed. Nick Merriman 59-84.
        New York: Routledge.

Smith, George S. and John E. Ehrenhard, Eds.
2000   *Protecting the Past*. Southeast Archaeological Centre. Accessed May 8, 2005.
        http://www.cr.nps.gov/seac/protectg.htm

Smith, George S. and Dorothy Schlotthauer Krass
2000   "SAA Surveys Regarding Public Archaeology/Cultural Resource Management
        and Teaching." In: *Teaching Archaeology in the Twenty-First Century,* eds. Susan
        J. Bender and George S. Smith. Washington D.C.: Society for American
        Archaeology.

Smith, Laurajane
2004   *Archaeological Theory and the Politics of Cultural Heritage.* Routledge: London.

2000   "'Doing Archaeology': Cultural Heritage Management and its Role in Identifying
        the Link Between Archaeological Practice and Theory." *International Journal of
        Heritage Studies* 6(4): 309-316.

1994   "Heritage Management as Postprocessual Archaeology?" *Antiquity* 68: 300-
        309.

Start, David
1999   "Community Archaeology: Bringing it Back to Local Communties." In
        *Managing Historic Sites and Buildings: Reconciling Presentation and
        Preservation*. Eds. Gill Chitty and David Baker, 49-59. New York: Routledge.

Storck, Peter
1990   Introduction to the *Annual Archaeological Report, Ontario*. Volume 1 (New
        Series): i.

Swidler, Nina, Kurt Dongoske, Roger Anyon and Alan Downer
1997   *Native Americans and Archaeologists: Stepping Stones to Common Ground.*
        Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press.

Trigger, Bruce
1990   "The 1990s: North American Archaeology with a Human Face?" *Antiquity*
        64: 778-787. Reproduced in *Artifacts and Ideas: Essays in Archaeology*. 195-
        208. New Brunswich, N.J.: Transaction Publishers, 2003.

1989   *A History of Archaeological Thought*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

van Willigen, John
2002   *Applied Anthropology: An Introduction*. Bergin and Garvey: Westport CT.

Watkins, Joe
2003   "Archaeological Ethics and American Indians." In In *Ethical Issues in
        Archaeology*. Eds. Larry J. Zimmerman, Karen D. Vitelli and Julie Hollowell-
        Zimmer,129-141. Walnut Creek: Alta Mira Press.

Watkins, J., L. Goldstein, K. Vitelli, and L. Jenkins
1995   "Accountability: Responsibilities of Archaeologists to Other Interest Groups.
        In *Ethics in American Archaeology: Challenges for the 1990s*, edited by M. J.
        Lynott and A. Wylie, pp. 33-37. Special Report. Society for American
        Archaeology, Washington, D.C.

Willey, Gordon R. and Jeremy A. Sabloff
1980   *A History of American Archaeology, 2nd ed.* San Francisco: W.H. Freeman.

Williamson, Ronald F.
1999   "Toward a Grounded Archaeology." In: *Taming the Taxonomy: Toward a
        New Understanding of Great Lakes Archaeology*. Eds. Ronald F. Williamson and
        Christopher M. Watts, 3-23. Toronto: Eastend Books.

1998   "Trends and Issues in Consulting Archaeology." In *Warning –
        Steep Grade Ahead: Current Directions in Canadian Archaeology,* Ed. Neal
        Ferris. (Accessed March 21, 2005)
        www.canadianarchaeology.com/1998plenary/1998plenary.lasso#index2

1986   "The Public: A Dynamic Force in Contemporary Archaeology." In
        Archaeological Consulting in Ontario: Papers of the London Conference 1985.
        Ed. W.A. Fox, 85-88. Occasional Publication of the London Chapter, Ontario
        Archaeological Society Inc.

Wylie, Alison
2002 "Ethical Dilemmas in Archaeological Practice: The (Trans)formation of Disciplinary Identity." In *Thinking Through Things: Essays in the Philosophy of Archaeology,* 229-246. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Yellowhorn, Eldon
1998 "The Evolving Relationship Between Archaeologists and First Nations" in *Warning – Steep Grade Ahead: Current Directions in Canadian Archaeology,* Ed. Neal Ferris. (Accessed March 21, 2005). www.canadianarchaeology.com/1998plenary/1998plenary.lasso#index2

Zimmerman, Larry J., Karen D. Vitelli and Julie Hollowell-Zimmer, eds.
2003 *Ethical Issues in Archaeology*. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press.

Zeder, Melinda A.
1997 *The American Archaeologist: A Profile.* Walnut Creek: The Society for American Archaeology and Alta Mira Press.