

The Potential for Public Archaeology in Algonquin Park

Joanne Lea, University of Newcastle-Upon-Tyne

ABSTRACT

Public archaeology is the discipline of archaeology that links members of many publics with archaeological heritage. In National and Provincial Parks across Canada it is incorporated into the interpretation programmes to promote the understanding, conservation, and stewardship of Canada's archaeology. This paper will examine several of such models for undertaking public archaeology in a park setting and will outline avenues that have a potential to be pursued in this regard in Algonquin Park.

RÉSUMÉ

L'archéologie publique est la branche de l'archéologie qui crée un lien entre les membres de différents auditoires et le patrimoine archéologique. Dans les parcs nationaux et provinciaux du Canada, l'archéologie publique est intégrée aux programmes d'interprétation afin de favoriser la compréhension, la conservation et la gérance de l'archéologie au Canada. Ce document présente plusieurs modèles d'archéologie publique applicables dans les parcs et souligne ceux qui offrent des possibilités particulières à cet égard dans le parc Algonquin.

Public archaeology is a subdiscipline of the academic study of archaeology. It has been difficult to define because of its very broad nature, as illustrated by the following: “Virtually all professional archaeology in North America is public archaeology, funded directly or indirectly with public monies and mandated by popularly supported legislation.” (Smardz and Smith 2000:27) In more specific terms, public archaeology has been referred to as “educational archaeology and public interpretation in public areas such as schools, parks and museums” (Merriman citing Jameson 2004:4) with a view to protecting archaeological resources through stewardship education (Smith and Ehrenhard 1991; Bazely 2001). It is also the use of education about archaeology “to address the abuse of deliberate or accidental misinterpretations [about the past]” (Stone and Planel 1999:7). The goals of public archaeology to preserve archaeological heritage resources, to inculcate a stewardship ethic about those resources and to use archaeological interpretation ethically parallel closely the goals for interpretation in North American national and regional parks, with Algonquin Park presented here as a case in point for discussion in this paper.

The establishment of national parks in North America began in the USA in 1872 with the founding of Yellowstone National Park (Runte 1979: 33; Muir 1970:24). This arose as part of a Euro-centric view about preserving what were seen as monumental but vanishing American landscapes in the face of expanding settlement (Zaslowsky and Watkins 1994:109). Canada followed this development with the establishment of Canada's first National Park in Banff, Alberta in 1885 (Canadian Heritage 1994:9). Algonquin National Park was established in 1893 (Ontario Parks 1998:1). Algonquin had its name changed from a National to Provincial Park in 1913 (Ontario Parks 1998:1).

As part of the national parks movement in the USA, first, the preservation in 1906 of “objects of historic or cultural interest,” and then the interpretation of these to the public

in the 1920s, were mandated by law (Runte 1999:71, 111). In Canada, it was under the National Parks Act of 1930 that National Parks were dedicated “to the people of Canada for their benefit, education and enjoyment” (Canadian Heritage 1994:9).

In the above contexts, historic interest generally referred to Euro-American history. First Nations’ history was seen not as part of the historical mandate of parks but rather as part of the natural environment (Zaslowsky and Watkins 1994:106; Muir 1970:154). Later, First Nations’ heritage was included in the interpretation of the past, although it was cast in the context of a soon-to-be bygone tradition to be remembered and performed for the Euro-American populace, as evidenced by the “Indian Days” programs in Banff National Park in the 1930s to 1950s (Luxton 1975:118).

Algonquin Provincial Park itself was designated a National Historic Site in 1992. This dual identity for Algonquin means that while it is administered by Ontario Parks as part of the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, its status as a National Historic Site of Canada because it was the first such park in Ontario, means that it remains of interest to Parks Canada, which is the federal body for park management. Therefore, the present day interpretive foci of both these management bodies will be examined with respect to Algonquin Park.

Under Parks Canada’s *Guiding Principles* (1994:12), stewardship of heritage areas is part of the vision for the agency, to be achieved by a public made more aware by heritage education programs. These include “a variety of communication, interpretation and outreach programs” (Canadian Heritage 1994:17-18) and public involvement. In as much as public archaeology has protection of cultural resources as a goal, so Parks Canada sees interpretation and extension programs and services as “principal means of achieving its protection and presentation objectives, building constituencies...and to encourage [park visitors] in understanding, appreciating, enjoying and protecting their national parks” (Canadian Heritage 1994:37).

The role of First Nations within the development of Parks Canada programming has evolved in large part from that of being entertainment for tourists, to consulted partners, as seen in the aboriginal consultations during the recent Historic Places Initiative development process.

The Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources likewise has embraced heritage education in Ontario parks, under NEH Policy PM 6.02 (N.D.:1) as a means so that “people will develop an awareness and appreciation of this heritage, creating a commitment to its protection for all generations.” The Natural Heritage Education Operating Standard 371 for the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources states as its objective “to provide park visitors with opportunities to learn about Ontario’s natural and cultural heritage, through interpretive programs and facilities and through outdoor recreation skills training” (N.D.:1). Following this document, as well, Natural Heritage Education plans are a requirement for Ontario Parks. It should be clarified that the term “Natural Heritage” was intended to encompass both the natural environment and cultural heritage in Ontario parks (Macpherson personal communication 2005).

The emphasis upon education programming and its relationship to stewardship of resources is reiterated in Ontario Parks' recent publication of the *Ontario Biodiversity Strategy* (2004:23-24). The same document (2004:28) also illustrates a changed role for First Nations in Ontario Parks as stakeholders, working together as partners. This change is part of the Ontario Government's larger "True North commitments" in developing new relationships with Aboriginal peoples, commitments based on such underlying principles as respectful relationships and Aboriginal participation (ONAS 2005:3).

The *Algonquin Provincial Park Management Plan* itself echoes the interpretive outlook of both Parks Canada and Ontario Parks. It states as a goal: the "protection of cultural resources"; as an objective: the "protection of provincially significant elements of the natural and cultural landscape of Algonquin Park" and also the provision of opportunities for exploration and appreciation of the outdoor natural and cultural heritage of Algonquin Park" (Ontario Parks 1998:6-8). This protection is, in part, through value identification and zoning of areas of historical significance (Ontario Parks 1998:14). This zoning was based on a 1980 study of cultural resources in Algonquin Park, and, as of 1998, included 48 historical zones and 38 known archaeological zones. Ongoing archaeological research in Algonquin Park has increased the number of known sites to date, including 44 newly registered sites during 2004 and 2005 by Bill Allen (Allen 2005). The archaeological sites in Algonquin Park are managed by allowing for: archaeological research by "recognized authorities in the field"; storage of cultural resources at the visitors' centre; protection of pre-1940 historical resources, and documentation of structures and sites (Ontario Parks 1998:35). Natural Heritage Education programs are mandated to "foster [visitor] appreciation of Park natural and cultural values" (Ontario Parks 1998:45). These programs are delivered by a seasonal team of interpretive staff, directed by a permanent interpretation staff member and in co-operation (e.g. for staff training purposes) with community and local expertise (Stronks personal communication 2005).

The bodies responsible for park management in Algonquin Park, therefore have clearly embraced mandates for protection, interpretation and education about archaeological heritage and for the inclusion of various publics, such as First Nations in the development and implementation of related programming.

The other bodies which are stakeholders, involved in archaeological heritage interpretation in Ontario, also have expressed similar goals and interests. The Canadian Archaeological Association (CAA) is the national association of professional archaeologists in Canada and has adopted Principles of Ethical Conduct which also promote public education and outreach, and inclusion of First Nations in archaeological undertakings (2000:3). The Ontario Archaeological Society (OAS), the voluntary association of professional, research and avocational archaeologists in Ontario, also has a Statement of Ethical Principles, which states belief in the dissemination of "the results of research to the archaeological community as well as to the general public in an easily accessible manner, medium and format" (OAS 2005:8). As well, the OAS respects "the right of First Nations to play a primary role in the conduct of any aboriginal archaeological investigation" (OAS 2005:8).

Therefore, archaeologists within Ontario are aware of ethical responsibilities to the public, including archaeology education and consultation, particularly of First Nations. The Algonquins of Pikwakanagan, the First Nation most closely associated with Algonquin Park have also expressed an interest in having input into archaeological heritage management in Algonquin Park (Swayze and Badgley 2004).

The Canadian public, in large part the visitor base for Algonquin Park, was surveyed by David Pokotylo about attitudes regarding archaeological heritage. The survey indicated that Canadians:

- believed archaeology is important to better understand Canadian Society (2003:103);
- strongly supported the preservation of archaeological heritage (2003:110);
- strongly supported the involvement of Aboriginal people in the archaeological record (2003:112); and
- considered visitation to actual archaeological sites as...the most effective way of learning about archaeology (2003:103).

All major stakeholders concerned with archaeological heritage and cultural resources programming in Algonquin Park have in common an expressed interest in the preservation and interpretation of the resource for the public.

Various models of public archaeology programs applicable in Algonquin Park will therefore be examined to inform the expressed mandates and interests of stakeholders in this regard. As shown in Table 1, below, public programming about cultural resources is typical in provincial parks across Canada. What is not common is programming specifically mandated for interpretation of archaeological heritage resources. Programming outside of Canada serves as the example for this.

In England, historic sites are frequently owned on behalf of the public by the National Trust and programming is managed by English Heritage. Many sites do not have interpretive staff to deliver programming on site. Rather, (as in the case of trail guide books in Algonquin Park) written program guides and resources are developed for visitors, schools and groups to use on site. There are also training sessions for group and school leaders in the use of these program packages and sites (English Heritage 2004-2005). In Scotland, the National Trust offers volunteer opportunities on archaeological projects for adults through its popular “Thistle Camp” program (National Trust 2003). Volunteers receive accommodation, meals and sometimes transportation in return for their labour at National Trust properties.

For mandated, on-site, interpretive programming about archaeological resources on public lands, the most immediately applicable examples are those from the U.S.A. The U.S. Department of the Interior has managed unpatented lands through the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) since the 1860s (Zaslowsky 1994:106). To protect and preserve the over 5 million archaeological sites it manages, an education outreach

Table 1. Public Programming about Cultural Resources as Legislated for Provincial Parks in Canada

Province	Legislation	Mandate	Program example
Newfoundland and Labrador	NLR 91 97 Provincial Parks Act O.C. 97-5101997		
Nova Scotia	Provincial Parks Act c.367 RSNS 1989	Promote education programs with regard to provincial parks	Natural Resources Education Centre
New Brunswick	Parks Act P-2.1 1982	Preserve historical significance of sites	
Prince Edward Island	Tourism PEI Act RSPEI Cap. Q-1 1988		Rediscovery Day at Jacques Cartier
Ontario	Provincial Parks Act RSO c. P. 34 1990	Parks may be classified and zoned as historical	Murphy's Point Provincial Park program
Quebec	La Loi Sur les Parcs LRQ c.P-9 1977 La Politique sur les Parcs	Protect cultural resources, Contract with First Nations	"Les Aventures du Patrimoine" Interpretive Programs
Manitoba	The Provincial Parks Act CCSM c.P20	Preserve unique and representative cultural resources, Designate land use for heritage	Manitoba Conservation program
Saskatchewan	Parks Act P-1.1 1986 Historic Sites Regulation 1	Protect and preserve areas used for prehistoric or historic resources of interest or significance, Regulate land use for heritage	Interpretive programs for visitors, schools and groups in Provincial and Historic parks
Alberta	Provincial Parks Act P-35 RSA 2000	Preservation of areas and objects of...cultural... interest	Fish Creek Provincial Park archaeological program
British Columbia	Parks Act chapter 344	Preservation and presentation to the public of specific features on historical interest, Limit development to preserve historical features for the public	

mandate was created and staff hired to consult educators and First Nations and then to develop and implement archaeology education resources under the name “Project Archaeology” (Smith et. al. 1993:v). This project provides printed and on-line educational resources about the process of archaeology and about regional heritage on local BLM territory, as well as training for teachers and facilitators to use the resources in each state. Both BLM permanent staff and a network of Project Archaeology volunteer co-ordinators from the professional archaeological community in each state contribute to the ongoing success of this program (Moe personal communication 2003).

The National Park Service (NPS) in the U.S. bases its interpretation program on the principles developed by Freeman Tilden (1957). Following his lead, it “identified education to be a primary purpose of the national parks “ (NPS 2005:2). Interpreters receive specific training in archaeology in order to provide public programming at archaeological sites within the National Parks (NPS 2005:1). It is understood that park interpreters will work co-operatively with NPS archaeologists in the development of programs, with a view to stewardship of archaeological resources through education. Indeed, several NPS archaeologists are international leaders in the field of public archaeology through their development of programs for the public and for professional training, as well as for their publications (Jameson 1997; Little 2002; McManamon 1991, 1998, 2000; Shackel 2004; Smith 1993).

The public archaeology program on publicly managed lands in the U.S. that perhaps most closely parallels the situation in Algonquin Park is that of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Forest Service. The Passport in Time (PIT) program is offered on Forest Service lands with the stated objective of providing “opportunities for the public to work with professional archaeologists and historians on national forests across the country” (Gifford Pinchot National Forest 2005:1). There is no registration fee, and there is free camping for adult volunteer participants, of whom there have been 329 since 1992. They have donated 13,939 volunteer hours to archaeological work, under the supervision of Forest Service archaeologists, in U.S. national forests (Gifford Pinchot National Forest 2005:1.3). Archaeological projects in national forests across the U.S. are advertised annually in a free newsletter entitled *PIT Traveller*, which attracts volunteers of all ages, and groups such as RV associations (Bamberg 2003:2).

Within Canada, there are successful public archaeology programs in operation, some in park settings. A confidential survey of directors of a selection of successful programs was conducted as part of research at the International Centre for Cultural and Heritage Studies at Newcastle University in the U.K. Elements which each program had in common and which contributed to program success are outlined below in Table 2. Parks Canada has offered successful public archaeology programming across Canada, such as that at the Cochrane Ranch, in Alberta; at Fort St. Joseph and at Georgian Bay Islands National Park, in Ontario; and at Ile aux Noix, in Quebec. Examples of provincial programs that do not receive federal funding and so are comparable to Algonquin Park’s situation, are also presented. Elements which these successful programs share include:

- not for profit status;
- stable funding to cover capital and operating costs, including liability;
- permanent staffing by professional archaeologists;
- partnerships with and inclusion of community groups and agencies;
- sites near a large population base;
- sites with recognizable but not deep stratigraphy;
- sites with recognizable and rich artifact deposits, usually from post-contact;
- duration of one week or more usually;
- focus on children and
- on site facilities for: office space, phone and emergency equipment, space for group instruction and lab work, electrical equipment such as AV and computers, washrooms and equipment and artifact storage.

The public archaeology program that most closely relates to potential programming in Algonquin Park was that conducted at the Lafleur Site in Ontario's Bonnechere Provincial Park in 2001. This program is described below, based on information from the project archaeologist (Blaubergs personal communication 2005). It was the precursor for a similar program offered in 2002 and 2003 at Murphy's Point Provincial Park.

The Bonnechere Park program was offered as a partnership among the Provincial Park, the Friends of Bonnechere Provincial Park, and the Ontario Archaeological Society. The Friends of Bonnechere Provincial Park raised the funds to pay for two weeks of salary for the consulting archaeologists (one week on site and one week of report writing). As well, these funds paid for printed resources for school groups in the program. Bonnechere Provincial Park provided accommodation and food for archaeologists as well as interpretive staff to run related programming. OAS volunteers visited local classes which took part in the programming and prepared the classes for their participation through the use of OAS educational kits. Participants gained an understanding of the whole process of archaeological research (i.e. not just excavation), the licencing requirements for archaeological work and so an understanding of the need to preserve the resource. Bonnechere Provincial Park gained information with which it enhanced its interpretive programming, and the involvement of the local community in Park programming. The above program shares the key elements of successful programs described in Table 2.

In light of the above recommendations, a program of public archaeology in Algonquin Park should follow similar foci to be successful. While the Park is not in a populated area, it does draw on a large annual tourist visitorship base. A successful program would best be available to this population by being accessible from the Highway 60 corridor, near the Visitor Centre, but at an actual archaeological site, with nearby visitor and project facilities. Numerous sites have been identified in Algonquin Park, primarily in publications by Hurley from the 1970s (Allen personal communication 2005). Most of these, however, are in the Park interior and are inaccessible both by distance and because Park policy protects locations of interior archaeological sites (Ontario Parks 1998: 45). There is, however, a published site (Kidd 1948, Noble 1968) along the Highway 60 corridor, near the Visitor Centre, with on-site public facilities and accessibility. This is

Table 2. Attributes of a Selection of Successful Public Archaeology Programs in Canada, based on a 2005 survey

Program location	Site period	Audience	Program duration	Site facilities	Staffing	Funding	Program strengths
Fish Creek Provincial Park, Calgary, Alberta	Post-contact	K-12 students	3 Days (one on site)	Visitors' Centre (washrooms, classroom, storage, office, phone, AV)	1 permanent program staff; 1 contracted program staff, 1 university professor	U of Calgary for permanent salaries, Annual grants for contracted salary, Provincial Park for facilities	-recognizable but not deep stratigraphy -recognizable and rich artifact deposits -large site -on public transit
	Pre-contact	University students	6 weeks				
London Museum of Archaeology London, Ontario	Pre-contact	Age 12+ Adults	1 week weekend or week	Visitors' Centre and museum (washrooms, storage, office, phone, AV)	1 permanent museum staff person, 1 university professor	London Museum of Archaeology, University of Western Ontario, Participant fees	-recognizable but not deep stratigraphy -rich artifact deposits -large site -on public transit
		University students	4-6 weeks				
Manitoba Healing Centre Winnipeg, Manitoba	Post-contact, First Nations	Age 12-65	2 weeks	Historic house (washrooms, classroom/lab, storage, office, phone, AV)	1 contracted archaeologist	Provincial and community funding	-recognizable but not deep stratigraphy -rich artifact deposit -near large centre -(First Nation) community involvement
Royal Military College, Kingston, Ontario	Post-contact	Age 8-12	1 week	1. public school building, 2. Fort museum and washroom building	1 permanent archaeologist, 2 part-time archaeologists and one student	Cataraqui Archaeological Research Foundation contract funding, grant funding for student	-recognizable but not deep stratigraphy, -recognizable and rich artifact deposits -near large centre
Spadina House Toronto, Ontario	Post-contact	Age 8-12	1 week	Historic garage (office, classroom, storage), Washrooms and phone nearby	1 permanent archaeologist, 1 student, 1 volunteer	Ontario Heritage Foundation, Grant for student	-recognizable but not deep stratigraphy, -recognizable and rich artifact deposits -near public transit
Wanuskewin Heritage Park	Pre-contact	K-12 students University students Adults	1 week 6 weeks day programs	Visitors' Centre (office, classroom, washroom, AV, phone, storage)	1 permanent staff person 1 university professor	Wanuskewin Heritage Park, University of Saskatchewan	-recognizable site areas and stratigraphy -rich artifact deposits -participation of elders and First Nation community

the Rock Lake Campground Site, which would provide a suitable area for programming (Allen 2007 this volume). At whichever location is deemed most appropriate, public archaeology programming in Algonquin Park can be realized with the published mandates and support of major stakeholders, with the will of Park staff and with the expertise available in public archaeology in Ontario. Public archaeology in Algonquin Park would be a valuable contribution to the interpretive programming about the Park's cultural resources and would serve as a vehicle for educating the public to act as stewards of Algonquin's archaeological heritage.

Acknowledgements

The author wishes to acknowledge gratefully W.A. Allen for contributions to the development of this paper and also the Park officials and program directors who gave generously of their time during interviews for this paper.

References Cited

Allen, W.A.

2005 2004 Conservation Report for Ontario under Licence A070. Ms. On file, Ministry of Culture, Toronto.

Bamburg, Glen

2003 Dig this Vacation In *Trailer Life*

http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3707/is_200305/ai_n9193151

Bazely, S.J.

2001 *How Does Public Archaeology Teach About and Preserve the Past?* Unpublished M.A. dissertation. School of Archaeology and Ancient History. Leicester University, Leicester, U.K.

Canadian Archaeological Association

2000 Principles of Ethical Conduct Relating to Aboriginal Peoples. In *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* (24) p. 3.

Canadian Heritage

1994 *Parks Canada Guiding Principles and Operational Policies*. Minister of Supply and Services Canada, Ottawa.

English Heritage

2004 Education Pack, London U.K.

Gifford Pinchot National Forest

2004 Volunteer Opportunities Passport in Time.

<http://www.fs.fed.us/gpnf/forest-research/heritage/passport.html>

Jameson, J. (editor)

1997 Presenting archaeology to the Public: Digging for Truths. Alta Mira Press, Walnut Creek, CA.

Kidd, K.E.

1948 A Prehistoric Camp Site at Rock Lake, Algonquin Park, Ontario In *Southwest Journal of Anthropology* 4(1): 98-106, University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.

Little, B.

2002 *Public Benefits of Archaeology*. University of Florida Press, Tallahassee FLA.

Luxton, Eleanor G.

1975 *Banff: Canada's First National Park*. Hunter Rose Company, Toronto.

McManamon, F.P.

1991 The Many Publics for Archaeology. In *American Antiquity* 56(1): 121-130.

1998 Public Archaeology as a Professional Obligation. In *Archaeology and Public Education* 8(3): 3.

2000 Archaeological Messages and Messengers. In *Public Archaeology* 1(1): 50.

Muir, John

1970 *Our National Parks*. AMS Press, New York.

National Park Service

N.D. NPS Archeology Program: Interpretation for Archeologists.
<http://www.cr.nps.gov/archeology/IforA/WhatIs_2.htm>

The National Trust for Scotland

2003 *Thistle Camps 2003*. Wallingford, Oxford U.K..

Noble, W.C.

1968 "Vision Pits", Cairns and Petroglyphs at Rock Lake, Algonquin Provincial Park, Ontario. In *Ontario Archaeology* 11 edited by C. E. Heidenreich pp. 47-64, Ontario Archaeological Society, Toronto.

ONAS (Ontario Native Affairs Secretariate)

2004 Ontario's New Approach to Aboriginal Affairs. Toronto.
<http://www.aboriginalaffairs.osaa.gov.on.ca/english/news/aboriginalaffairs.pdf>

Ontario Archaeological Society

2005 Corporate Constitution and Statement of Ethical Principles<<http://www.ontarioarchaeology.on.ca/oas/Pages/constitution.htm>>

Ontario Parks

- N.D. Natural Heritage Education In *Operating Standard 371*. On file, Ministry of Natural Resources, Peterborough.
- 1998a *Algonquin Provincial Park Management Plan*. Queen's Printer for Ontario, Toronto.
- 1998b Natural Heritage Education in Ontario Parks. In *Policy PM6.02*. on file Ministry of Natural Resources, Peterborough.
- 2005 *Protecting What Sustains Us: Ontario's Biodiversity Strategy*.
- Pokotylo, D.
2002 Public Opinion and Canadian Archaeological Heritage. In *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* (26) pp.88-129.
- Runte, Alfred
1979 *National Parks, the American Experience*. University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln NB.
- Shackel, P.A.
2000 *Archaeology and Created Memory: Public History in a National Park*. Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishing, New York.
- Smardz, K. and S. Smith (editors)
2000 *The Archaeology Education Handbook*. Alta Mira Press, Walnut Creek CA.
- Smith, George S. and John Ehrenhard (editors)
1993 *Protecting the Past*. CRC Press, Boca Raton FLA.
- Smith, Shelley J. et. al.
1993 *Intrigue of the Past*. U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Land Management, Delores CO.
- Stone, Peter G. and Phillipe Planel (editors)
1999 *The Constructed Past*. One World Archaeology Series no. 36. Routledge, London.
- Swayze, K. and I. Badgley
2004 *Umbrella Protocol of the Algonquins of Pikwakanagan for the Management of Archaeological Resources in Unceded Algonquin Territory*. Unpublished MS. on file with authors, Cobden, Ont. and with Pikwakanagan Council.
<http://www.algonquinsopikwakanagan.com/Umbrella%20Protocol%20for%20>
- Tilden, Freeman
1957 *Interpreting Our Heritage*. University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, N.C.

Wirth, Conrad L.

1962 *The State Parks: Their Meaning in American Life*. Alfred A. Knopf, New York.

Zaslowsky, Dyan and T.H. Watkins

1994 *These American Lands*. The Wilderness Society, Washington D.C.