2001

Addressing an Historic Preservation Dilemma: The Future of Nineteenth-Century Farmstead Archaeology in the Northeast

Terry H. Klein

Sherene Baugher

Follow this and additional works at: http://orb.binghamton.edu/nea

Recommended Citation

https://doi.org/10.22191/neha/vol31/iss1/13 Available at: http://orb.binghamton.edu/nea/vol31/iss1/13

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by The Open Repository @ Binghamton (The ORB). It has been accepted for inclusion in Northeast Historical Archaeology by an authorized editor of The Open Repository @ Binghamton (The ORB). For more information, please contact ORB@binghamton.edu.
Addressing an Historic Preservation Dilemma: The Future of Nineteenth-Century Farmstead Archaeology in the Northeast

Cover Page Footnote
We thank Mary Beaudry, Lu Ann De Cunzo, George Miller, Richard eit, and Lou Ann Wurst for their insightful comments on earlier drafts of this summary. We also thank David Landon and Ann-Eliza Lewis for their editorial suggestions, and Dena Doroszenko for taking the time to update us on how site evaluations are made in Ontario, Canada. Finally, we thank Lynne Sebastian for reminding us about William Lipe’s timeless and seminal article “A Conservation Model for American Archaeology.” It was amazing to see that Lipe’s recommendations still serve as a guide for addressing current historic preservation issues.
Addressing an Historic Preservation Dilemma: The Future of Nineteenth-Century Farmstead Archaeology in the Northeast

By Terry H. Klein and Sherene Baugher

Introduction

As noted in the Introduction to this issue of Northeast Historical Archaeology, government agencies, historical archaeologists, developers, and others involved in any facet of historic preservation often ask the questions, "Why study farmsteads?" "They are so common and so well documented, why do we need to excavate these sites?" "What are the research values of these sites?" and "Are these sites really significant?" These questions represent the historic preservation dilemma associated with 19th-century farmstead sites in the Northeast.

Based on the recommendations and approaches presented in the articles included in this volume, we offer a framework for identifying, evaluating, interpreting, and preserving farmstead sites in the region, a framework that is in keeping with the new environment in which historic preservation is being carried out today, particularly in the United States. This summary article also presents recommendations on how this framework can be made operational, including funding sources for developing and implementing this approach. We also discuss the roles of government, academia, the private sector, and the public in this effort. These recommendations and discussions will hopefully provide the tools we need to answer the questions posed above.

Goals and Objectives of this Volume

The articles presented in this issue of Northeast Historical Archaeology grew out of a workshop held at the 1997 annual meeting of the Council for Northeast Historical Archaeology (CNHEA) in Altoona, Pennsylvania. The primary goal of the workshop was to discuss the significance and treatment of 19th-century farmsteads in the Northeast in the context of federal historic preservation laws and regulations. This context was the focus of the workshop because the majority of farmstead archaeology, at least in the United States, results from compliance with local, state, and federal preservation laws, regulations, and ordinances. The purpose of the articles in this volume is to advance the dialogue on 19th-century farmstead sites begun in Altoona, and to highlight various approaches for investigating and defining the significance of these sites.

The articles present a consensus on what we all consider to be the "thing" that we are studying, interpreting, excavating, documenting, and preserving. Though the term "19th-century farmstead" masks a wide range of site types, the articles agree on the specific site types that fall under this term. There is also a consensus that we must consider these sites in their entirety, including the fields, fences, outbuildings, trash pits, dumps, outbuildings, and domestic dwellings. This mirrors the consensus of the Altoona workshop participants (see Klein et al. this volume).

The articles also demonstrate the research value of 19th-century farmstead sites in the Northeast region, and the articles' authors discuss common research domains and topics. These include:

1) taking a landscape archaeology approach that examines the entire farm as an integrated whole, examining more than just the domestic dwelling; and linking changes in this landscape to the nature of and changes in technology, innovation in farm management practices, social identity, and regional and national events (see Baugher, Beaudry, Catts, De Cunzo, and Schafenberger and Veit this volume);
2) looking at long term change within these rural places as reflections of change
within rural/agricultural society (see Beaudry, Catts, Sharfenberger and Veit, this volume);
3) examining the ethnic and class differences of farmers and farm laborers in the context of the dynamics of rural society (see DeCunzo, O'Donovan and Wurst, this volume)
4) bringing to light the historical roots and values of both local modern communities and communities of the past (see Catts, King, this volume); and
5) using these sites to create "micro-histories," "site biographies," and "ethnographies" that in turn lead to a broader understanding of rural and agricultural culture and society (see Beaudry, Catts, DeCunzo, Sharfenberger and Veit, this volume).

Finally, the articles present similar recommendations concerning methods for historical research and for field investigations (in particular, see Baugher, Beaudry, Doroszenko, King, this volume). These include:
1) the survey and testing of all components of the farmstead site;
2) the excavation of large areas within the entire site;
3) the use of remote sensing within areas outside of the core of the farmstead;
4) the need for giving equal attention to locations that contain large quantities of artifacts and those that do not; and
5) the use of the full range of historical sources, including literature, paintings, agricultural journals and publications, oral history, etc.

A Framework for Identifying, Evaluating, and Preserving 19th-Century Farmstead Sites

The common themes and approaches presented in these articles can serve as a framework for surveying, excavating, evaluating, interpreting, and documenting farmstead sites. The authors would, however, add some additional items to this framework in order to more fully address current historic preservation problems. Klein et al.'s article, Table 4 presents the question "Which sites should be investigated?" The 1997 Altoona workshop participants' response was "all of them." Interestingly, when discussions focused on more specific attributes of which sites should be investigated, there was no consensus. Huey's (2000: 33-34) recent article on research issues and problems for 19th-century sites in New York articulates well the view that all of these sites are important and worthy of investigation.

Every site is different, and no site is truly redundant. It is fortunate that so many 19th-century sites exist, because the larger and more nearly total the sample size, the stronger the research results will be. As every artifact at a single site is a clue in reconstructing a larger picture, so every 19th-century site is a clue in better understanding a very complex period in history (Huey 2000: 33).

However, in terms of the day-to-day world of compliance with local, state, provincial, and federal historic preservation laws and regulations, the "all of them" response is both impractical and somewhat contrary to the purpose of these laws and regulations. The laws of Canada and the United States were never written with the goal of preserving everything. Rather, historic preservation statutes and regulations provide some measure of protection to only what our societies consider to be important historic and archaeological resources. What is "important" or "significant" and therefore worthy of protection is defined in these laws and regulations by general sets of criteria and guidance. The specific application of these criteria and guidance to actual historic and archaeological properties is not defined. As a result, there is a need for clear and useful criteria to determine which farmstead sites necessitate our consideration. But, how do we determine whether or not a given farmstead site is significant and has the potential to address important research issues? Where are these specific evaluation criteria found? What are the important research topics? Are these topics appropriate for the components of farmstead sites that most often fall within the
boundaries of construction or development projects? How do we address these questions? The answer to the latter is: historic contexts (see De Cunzo, Klein et al., Miller and Klein, this volume).

An historic context, as defined in U.S. National Park Service guidance, is a body of thematically, geographically, and temporally linked information that provides for an understanding of a property's place or role in prehistory or history. For a historical archaeological property, the historic context is the analytical framework within which the property's importance can be understood and to which a historical archaeological study is likely to contribute important information (Townsend et al. 1999: 25).

Hardesty and Little (2000) present a good discussion on the development and use of historic contexts for historic period resources, including archaeological sites. They define four general steps in creating an historic context:

1) Identify the theme, time period, and geographic limits
2) Assemble existing information and synthesize the information
3) Define property types
4) Identify further information needs (Hardesty and Little 2000: 14).

"Property types" are what link the historic context to actual archaeological or historic resources. A property type is:

...a grouping of individual properties characterized by common physical and/or associative attributes. Physical attributes include ... structural type, size ... spatial arrangement or plan, materials, ... and environmental relationships ... Associative attributes include the property's ... relationship to important research topics (National Register Branch, 1991: 14).

"Property types" can be viewed as important, physical representations of an historic context, and are the "yardstick" for evaluating the significance of archaeological sites. If an archaeological site exhibits the key elements of a property type associated with a given historic context, then the site is most likely significant. For the category "19th-century farmsteads," property types could, for example, include the main farmhouse, outbuildings, tenant housing, agricultural landscape features, or the entire farm complex. Continuing with this example, for archaeological sites to be considered a good representation of an "agricultural landscape features" property type, the sites need to have intact, datable fence lines, rock walls, paths, drainage systems, definable field boundaries, tree lines, and/or other landscape elements.

Very few states in the Northeast region, unfortunately, have usable historic contexts for 19th-century agricultural sites; that is, historic contexts that provide a detailed framework for determining both the significance of a farmstead site and evaluating the state of current knowledge on these resources within a state. Delaware's historic context for New Castle and Kent Counties (De Cunzo and Garcia 1992) is a rare exception. The New Castle and Kent Counties historic context, which covers the period 1830-1940, presents an historical overview and historic context narrative of the two counties, a description of archaeological property types associated with the narrative, a range of archaeological research questions linked to both the historical narrative and property types, and criteria for evaluation of archaeological resources, which again references back to the narrative and property types. The context also includes an evaluation of previously inventoried sites associated with the historic context. This evaluation looks at the property types represented by the inventoried sites, the types of archaeological investigations conducted within these sites, and their documented physical conditions. This evaluation is used to identify data gaps and biases in knowledge about the counties' agricultural sites.

In the authors' experience, one of the more difficult aspects of developing historic contexts is the definition of appropriate research objectives. It would be hoped that the selected
research issues would truly provide "information important in history," and not lead us to conclusions that are trivial, already known through other sources, or are more appropriately studied through historical evidence.

Vermont is one of the few states in the United States that presents, in its state archaeological guidelines, a detailed list of priority research issues that are to be applied to historic archaeological site significance evaluations. Further, these research issues were selected because they were seen as providing information that was truly "important to history."

The Vermont State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) recently released (2002) working guidelines for compliance archaeology in the state; and these guidelines present somewhat rigorous directions on how to evaluate historic archaeological sites. The Vermont guidelines note that a historic archaeological site will be studied archaeologically in the regulatory process if:

1) It addresses or is likely to address in a significant way the priority research topics listed in these guidelines.

2) It has the potential to add important information to the written and archival record.

3) It addresses research questions significant to a broad audience (2002: 23).

These priority research topics were developed initially by a task force of senior Vermont archaeologists and further defined by small working groups.

The research topics listed are to be used as guides in evaluating site significance, and that "[c]ompelling sites that don't fall into these categories may still be considered by the [Vermont SHPO] if they demonstrate the likelihood of providing important information to a community or to the state" (Vermont SHPO 2002: 24).

The guidelines also state that

...archaeological sites relating to a detailed historic context that meet the property type's registration requirements may be considered significant by the SHPO even though they are not associated with the priority topics (Vermont SHPO, 2002: 23-24).

What makes the Vermont approach unique is the inclusion of language such as "research questions significant to a broad audience." This is rarely seen in guidance from either SHPOs or other state or federal agencies.

Vermont, however, currently does not have historic contexts that deal with historic period archaeological sites (Giovanna Peebles, Vermont Division of Historic Preservation, personal communication, 2002). The priority research questions included in the guidelines, therefore, are not based on a synthesis of past work evaluated within the framework of statewide or regional historic contexts, but on the personal experience and knowledge of Vermont archaeologists. As noted in a recent paper critiquing the new Vermont guidelines and how they are being applied (Manning-Sterling 2002), the research value of 19th-century farmsteads is not included in the priority research questions. Rather, the focus is on the pre-1800 period farmstead sites. Manning-Sterling notes

One of the main contentions presented by state agencies in challenging archaeological investigations [in Vermont] is the abundance of historic buildings and sites. This argument presents several problems. First, there is the flawed equation of standing structures with archaeological sites: the existence of numerous extant farmstead should not preclude investigation of a potentially significant farmstead site (Manning-Sterling 2002: 6–7).

Manning is correct in arguing against the use of existing standing historic properties as a criterion in evaluating the importance of archaeological sites, as what remains standing today is not a representation of the universe of properties that once existed in the past. Catts (this volume) in his discussion of the work of Dell Upton, reminds us that the investigation of past historic landscapes is a study of the material culture of the "winners."
The buildings that architectural historians study are examples of the “successful” buildings, the best, most substantial, and most adaptable to their present surroundings (Catts, this volume).

Despite these concerns, the authors do, nevertheless, view the Vermont guidelines as a step in the right direction, focusing on explicit criteria and arguments in evaluating site significance, and linking these evaluations to the interests of the public. What is missing, however, are the appropriate tools to implement the guidelines, as far as 19th-century farmstead sites are concerned, i.e., historic contexts. The need for such contexts in Vermont is recognized by the SHPO staff (Manning-Sterling 2002: 9), and these historic contexts will hopefully be developed soon (Giovanna Peebles, Vermont Division of Historic Preservation, personal communication, 2002).

Interestingly, in Canada, the Ontario Ministry of Culture also uses explicit guidelines in evaluating significance on 19th-century sites. The general approach is that if an historic site pre-dates 1870 it is deemed as having “heritage value,” but if it post-dates 1870 then there must be a rationale for why this site has heritage value before any further work can be conducted on the site. Cultural groups that are under-represented in the archaeological record are deemed to have heritage value even if the site is post-1870. Currently, however, historic contexts are not used as a tool to evaluate site significance (Dena Doroszenko, personal communication, 2002).

Whether in the United States or Canada, when historical archaeologists are developing the research objectives for an historic context, it is the authors’ opinion that it is also important to ask: “Can the research issues posed be applied to compliance-related archaeological investigations?” Many projects, such as roadway or some utility improvements involve only portions of a farmstead site, most often the front yards. Based on the authors’ most recent experience within the region, projects that require the consideration of the entire farmstead site, including the fields, walls, paths, remote outbuildings, and the like, are becoming more and more infrequent, as projects now tend to involve the improvement of existing infrastructure (e.g., roadway widenings) or modest-scale development, rather than new development or construction encompassing large contiguous areas of land, such as for power plants, new highway construction, new sewage treatment plants, and large scale residential or commercial development.

McCann and Ewing note (this volume) that:

It has been our experience that when archaeological survey is restricted to the road frontage very little is contributed to our understanding of the history of mid-to-late 19th-century rural lifeways. It is this type of archaeological fieldwork that most concerns us, because these projects raise doubts about the value of financing archaeological research.

Historic contexts must deal with this reality, otherwise, their utility as a tool for preservation compliance is considerably lessened.

**Impediments to Historic Context Development and Use**

Both the 1997 Altoona workshop and articles in this volume point to the need for and value of historic contexts in addressing the above issues. This need for usable historic contexts as a tool for evaluating historic and archaeological resources was also recognized at the national level during the Transportation Research Board’s (TRB) 1999 forum on assessing historic significance (see Introduction, this volume). Unfortunately, the development of usable historic contexts is not easy. As noted in both Klein et al. and Miller and Klein (this volume), there are several hurdles that need to be overcome, such as determining who will develop these contexts and
how to define the important research issues that will be included in these contexts. As demonstrated by a recent nationwide study in the United States, even when historic contexts exist, these contexts are generally not used by agency staffs or Cultural Resource Management (CRM) consultants as part of their significance evaluations of farmstead sites and other archeological resources.

In November 2001, the TRB and the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) funded a nationwide study of the use of information technology in evaluating cultural resource significance in association with transportation projects (Klein et al. 2002). The first phase of the study involved the collection of information on how state Departments of Transportation (DOTs) and SHPOs use (or do not use) information technology in making decisions on resource significance. This was accomplished through extensive literature research and a survey questionnaire sent to all DOTs and SHPOs. Both the survey and literature search examined whether or not these agencies maintained cultural resource inventories and historic contexts in electronic formats, and if these inventories and historic contexts were used in significance evaluations.

Key findings of the NCHRP study (Klein et al. 2002) were as follows:

1) Only 17% of SHPOs and 24% of the DOTs maintain or update their historic contexts, and most exist only on paper.

2) DOT and SHPO staffs use their historic contexts 25% of the time or less to evaluate cultural resources. They rely, instead, on their own personal experiences and knowledge, and those of their cultural resource consultants.

3) DOT and SHPO staff are generally not satisfied with the tools that they have to make and justify their decisions on resource significance, and would like to see increased sharing of information and approaches among agencies and states.

In developing the survey instrument, Klein et al. did not anticipate the infrequent use of historic contexts in resource significance decision making, so they did not include a question in the survey that asked why these tools were not used by the agencies. In reading the NCHRP report, however, one can surmise that the reasons why historic contexts are not being used: they are out of date; do not contain useful information or guidance; or are not readily accessible. Also, in the day-to-day decision making that takes place in CRM firms and agency offices, it is always easier and quicker to rely on one's own knowledge and experience than to consult a document sitting on a shelf.

So, given all of these issues, problems and constraints, what can be done? One option is to use the approach presented by Miller and Klein (this volume), and not attempt to develop these historic contexts. The focus of Miller and Klein's strategy is on site integrity as the primary measure of a site's importance, without reference to specific research issues; and, as DeCunzo notes in her article:

all 19th and early 20th-century agrarian sites with archaeological integrity and clear temporal contexts offer the potential to help delineate the “culture of agriculture” (DeCunzo, this volume).

The value of Miller and Klein's approach is that sites with high visibility and intact deposits and/or features will not be eliminated simply because they do not fit within a narrow research framework. Data can be gathered by historical archaeologists working within the time and financial constraints of compliance-driven fieldwork, and a few preliminary research questions could be addressed, while other potential questions and research domains would be noted. Most importantly, data collection would not be limited by one or two research questions. The artifact assemblages would be catalogued so that they could be accessible to future researchers interested in other research issues.
Research conducted after the completion of several high profile New York City projects serves as an example of this approach. Graduate students and professors have used the data from these projects to pose new research questions and undertake new innovative studies (see Janowitz 1993, Rothschild 1990, Wall 1994). As these post-project studies have demonstrated, the form and research focus of the original project does not necessarily hamper future research using the collections and data generated by these projects.

If Miller and Klein's approach is not acceptable to historical archaeologists and other historic preservation professionals, then we must find the time, money, and resources to develop usable and up to date historic contexts (or historic contexts that may include Miller and Klein's approach or similar strategies). The only other option is to proceed under the status quo, dealing with these sites on a case-by-case basis, relying on the experience and knowledge of the historic preservation professionals involved in the current process. Unfortunately, many of these experienced professionals will be retiring in the not too distant future, and all of this knowledge and expertise will no longer be available, as these individuals are replaced by those with much less experience or not replaced at all (see Klein et al. 2002: 72). Maintaining the status quo is also contrary to the movement within the United States to streamline compliance with environmental laws and regulations.

Environmental streamlining calls for improved environmental/regulatory review of federally linked projects. It involves the reduction and elimination of delays and unnecessary duplication in current environmental procedures, including those associated with historic preservation. Streamlining also calls for earlier and more efficient coordination among agencies involved in the environmental decision making process (see Klein et al. 2002: 71-72). In 1998, the U.S. Congress mandated the streamlining of the environmental review process for transportation projects (see Klein et al. 2002: 71-72). This has been followed recently by a White House Executive Order (E.O. 13274, September 18, 2002) that also focused on the streamlining of transportation project environmental reviews. The White House also established a task force in May 2001 for streamlining reviews associated with energy projects (see www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases, Executive Order 13212).

Successful environmental streamlining requires access to information on the location and nature of significant environmental resources, including archaeological sites, early in the project and program planning process. Historic contexts provide this type of information in a clear and justifiable (and defensible) framework. So, continuing the status quo in terms of how we identify and evaluate important archaeological sites runs contrary to these new streamlining mandates in the United States, resulting in delays and conflict with project designers and planners, other environmental specialists, and at times, the public. If we continue with the status quo, we do so at our own peril.

Advancing the Development of Historic Contexts: Models, Approaches, and Funding

Historic context development, therefore, should be a major focus of our future efforts in terms of the identification, evaluation, and preservation of 19th-century farmstead sites in Canada and the United States. There are ways to overcome the impediments in the development and subsequent use of these contexts. The Oklahoma Department of Transportation (ODOT) is proposing an innovative approach to deal with these issues in the context of 20th-century archaeological resources that can be easily applied to 19th-century farmstead sites in the Northeast.

In a paper presented at the 2002 summer meeting of TRB's Committee on Archaeology & Historic Preservation in Transportation, John Hartely of the Oklahoma DOT reported that:

...the Oklahoma SHPO and ODOT are in
the initial stages of developing a context study to help clarify the actual value of archaeological data in the understanding of cultural events in the recent past. We are hoping to secure at least $350,000 through the TEA-21 Enhancement program to fund the majority of the study...SHPO will use the study to develop a context for 20th-century archaeological resources in the Statewide Historic Preservation Plan...The study will involve the archaeological, archival, and ethnohistoric evaluation of a statewide sample of between 40 to 70 20th-century rural archaeological sites, representing different regions of the state: Euro-American, African-American, and Native American components; differing economic status, differing degrees of integrity, content, size and complexity; and other key variables. An overarching goal of the project is to determine the conditions under which archaeological investigations are likely to be the primary means of addressing significant research questions regarding 20th-century history in Oklahoma (Hartley 2002).

Oklahoma’s historic context will include the evaluation of several key issues:
1) The type of deposits, features, and general content of 20th-century sites should possess before they have a reasonable potential to provide substantive historical, anthropological, or economic data;
2) The extent to which substantive anthropological, historical, or economic information regarding recent occupations ... can be more efficiently or accurately gathered by oral history and documentary research;
3) Regional, ethnic, cultural, or developmental differences in different areas of Oklahoma, and how these differences may affect the potential significance of archaeological resources from the recent past;
4) Appropriate archaeological methodologies for the identification, assessment, and preservation of archaeological resources of the recent past;
5) The feasibility of developing broad significance categories for recent archaeological resources, allowing certain low-significance categories to be excluded from routine documentation and evaluation requirements under Section 106 [of the National Historic Preservation Act] and other similar review processes, and;
6) The identification of the most potentially significant categories of such resources and developing programmatic methodologies for their evaluation and preservation (Hartely 2002).

An important component of Oklahoma’s approach is the development of programmatic methods for evaluating and preserving these sites. In this way, all parties involved in this program will have an agreed upon strategy on how these sites are to be dealt with; therefore, reducing project delays and conflicts. The programmatic methodologies become the way in which the components and recommendations of the historic context become operational.

The TEA-21 Enhancement program referred to by Hartely is a program created by Congress in relation to the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA), which was continued under the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21). These acts authorized states to spend a percentage of their allocation of surface transportation funds on enhancement projects that meet 12 specific enhancement activities. These activities include such things as scenic or historic highway programs, landscaping and other scenic beautification, rehabilitation and operation of historic transportation properties, historic preservation actions that have a transportation link, and archaeological research and planning (see http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment). Transportation enhancement monies are one source for funding historic context development in the United States.

The Oklahoma study provides one example of how to develop historic contexts and to place this effort within the context of both historic preservation and the environmental review process. The problem of
defining appropriate and important research issues against which sites can be evaluated is accomplished through a multidisciplinary approach that also involves detailed research and field investigations of a representative sample of the resources across the state. We are not recommending the total adherence to the Oklahoma approach, as parts of the study are problematic. For example, the issues used in the evaluation of significance include the notion that if information on the past can be more “efficiently or accurately gathered” through documentary sources, then the archaeological record of some of these 20th-century sites is of less value and not significant. As many of the articles in this volume have demonstrated, our understanding of the historic past and the research issues we posed are greatly enhanced when multiple lines of evidence are used. Also, the Oklahoma study does not appear to include the interest of the public as one of the factors in determining significance. Again, as noted in several of the volume’s articles, the value of these sites to the public must be an integral component of any evaluation of significance. The Oklahoma study, nevertheless, is a valuable model for states and provinces to implement, adapting this study to local conditions, research, and public interest.

An important component of any effort to identify appropriate research issues for inclusion in an historic context is the synthesis of previous investigations. Any synthesis effort would require the inventory and assessment of reports and findings on file at state and federal agencies, in addition to the creation of 19th-century farmstead site databases. As Huey (2000: 33–34) notes:

A searchable database is needed, listing all nineteenth-century sites that have been found, and it should include a variety of attributes for each site in addition to location and approximate date range. With these data, archaeologists have both the opportunity and the responsibility to produce meaningful research results. Perhaps what is needed is a permanent task force of historians and archaeologists to utilize archaeological data that have been and are being generated and to reexamine historical interpretations of the nineteenth century.

Huey’s recommendations echo those made by William Lipe back in the 1970s. Lipe (1977) called for a similar approach in the context of what was referred to then as “salvage archaeology.” Referring to recommendations offered by Tom King and Robert McGimsey, Lipe discusses the need for developing research priorities for each region of the country and that the regional plans be updated periodically. He goes on to discuss the

...formation of regional archaeological “cooperatives” to facilitate team approaches to regional research designs and permit regional organization of salvage and archaeological resource management. Such cooperatives would integrate the efforts of archaeologists from universities, colleges, museums, and avocational groups ... Such notions are appealing, for they provide means whereby academic research might be coordinated with emergency salvage proper and whereby the knowledge, expertise, and influence of many individuals from diverse institutions could be pooled (Lipe 1977: 37).

Today, one would add local, state, provincial and federal agencies, along with CRM firms, to Lipe’s list of those that should be involved in such “cooperatives.” Lipe’s recommendations, when applied to the identification, evaluation and treatment of 19th-century farmstead sites, are compelling. Such “cooperatives,” or “task forces” as recommended by Huey, could be the source for both the identification of research issues and the creation of viable historic contexts.

What would be academia’s role in such an effort? The authors recommend that academia’s role would mirror an existing mission
of universities and colleges: long term, focused research. The world of CRM, unfortunately, does not allow its practitioners the time and resources to conduct long-term research, in depth synthesizes of past work, nor detailed re-evaluations of past studies and collections. The fruits of such research are extremely valuable, resulting in new insights and viewpoints, and in advancing our knowledge of the past. Lu Ann De Cunzo’s and O’Donovan and Wurst’s articles in this volume are good examples. These authors used the results of multiple compliance-related archaeological projects, supplemented by their own research, to present and support their observations about these sites and their placement in rural society. Another good example is Diana Wall’s dissertation research on the early 19th-century cult of domesticity and the separation of home and work place. Wall presents her case using several archaeological sites excavated as a result of New York City’s historic preservation regulations, and she re-examined the collections from these sites as part of her research efforts (Wall 1994).

Students and faculty at universities and colleges could direct some of their research efforts to the great number of CRM reports and collections that exist throughout the region, and assist in synthesizing and advancing our current approaches to farmstead sites. This research would be conducted in partnership with both government agencies and CRM firms, with the agencies providing the funding. A product of these efforts would be the creation of historic contexts.

Funding for this research and historic context development could be sought, in the United States, through transportation enhancement monies, like the Oklahoma study. Other funding mechanisms include creative mitigation efforts, often referred to as “off-site mitigation.” The latter involves the redirection of portions of the funds that would normally go to the excavation, analysis and/or reporting of a site that was to be destroyed by a project (that is, the adverse effects on the site are resolved through the retrieval of data contained within the site, i.e., archaeological data recovery). In these situations, all of the parties involved make a decision to direct some of the data recovery funds toward the development of synthesizes or historic contexts. The development of these synthesizes or historic contexts would be viewed as a means to improve the preservation outcome of the project, to the benefit of archaeological resource protection and preservation in the area. Transportation enhancement monies and creative mitigation are only two ways to fund development of synthesizes and historic contexts. There are many other creative ways that agencies, including SHPOs, can redirect current preservation dollars toward addressing these critical needs.

The development of Delaware’s agricultural historic contexts employed some of the above recommendations and approaches. Delaware’s efforts were funded by the Delaware SHPO, with funds from their federal Historic Preservation Fund allocation, and by the University of Delaware through the Center for Archaeological Research, with additional support from Delaware Department of Transportation (De Cunzo, personal communication 2002). The first step in creating the historic contexts was the development of a Management Plan for Delaware’s Historical Archaeological Resources (De Cunzo and Catts 1990), which laid out the broad research domains later used in the historic contexts, and established the contexts as priority projects. Next, the historic contexts were produced for New Castle and Kent Counties (De Cunzo and Garcia 1992) and Sussex County (De Cunzo and Garcia 1993). The historic context authors worked with a committee of historical archaeologists in the state to establish priorities, research domains, significance statements, property types, etc.

The Role of the Public

What is the public’s role in the establishment of any “archaeological regional cooperative” or “task force,” or in the creation of his-
toric contexts, or at a more basic level, in defining what is and is not a significant farmstead site worthy of our consideration? Both the articles in this volume and the 1997 Altoona workshop highlight the importance and value of public involvement and education. The public needs to become both partners and advocates in the preservation of 19th-century farmstead sites. The 1997 workshop participants recommended that this could be accomplished, in part, by appealing to the public's sense of history. By tapping into this sense of history, we can demonstrate that farmstead archaeology is worth doing and is meaningful to local communities.

Common mechanisms to engage the public would include working with local historical societies and museums, communicating with the local media, designing museum exhibits, and having public tours of archaeological sites. Jameson's (1997) edited volume Presenting Archaeology to the Public contains many examples of successful public outreach efforts associated with compliance-mandated archaeological projects. However, we should also explore more innovative and interactive approaches to public outreach.

University-based social scientists, especially sociologists, often conduct what is referred to as "participatory action research," also known as "PAR." In participatory action research community members become partners with academics, and the goals and focus of research are decided jointly. Community members also assist in the research rather than just being the subject of the research, and they may suggest research that was not the initial priority of the social scientist. In the end, however, these joint projects are often richer and more detailed than a solely academic-focused effort. PAR is at the heart of "service-learning," the higher education reform movement to connect community service to academic courses. The National Community Service Act of 1993 further strengthened these academic initiatives for public outreach. So, how do these educational reform movements relate to our 19th-century farmstead site dilemma? One very positive benefit of PAR and service-learning is that community members often become involved in their own community history and participate in oral history projects (Baugher 2000). They also become grass root supporters of archaeology and historic preservation. Participatory action research and related approaches should, therefore, become part of any historic context development effort. In this way, what the public values is considered in tandem with what is important to historical archaeologists. As a result, we move beyond the status quo and gain a richer interpretation and understanding of our history.

The interests and concerns of the public must be given careful consideration by historic preservation specialists, even though the sites the public values might not meet standard significance and integrity criteria (which in the United States are defined by the National Register Criteria and the "Seven Aspects of Integrity" as presented in National Register Bulletin 15, Interagency Resources Division, nd). Though not strictly within the purview of historic preservation laws, such values need to be considered in the context of other environmental statutes, such as the National Environmental Policy Act, in the United States (see King 2002 for an interesting discussion of this issue).

An Action Agenda

The 1997 farmstead workshop in Altoona ended with the identification of an action agenda, focusing on two questions: "How do we, as a discipline, proceed with the research, interpretation, and preservation of these sites?" and "What specific actions should an organization like CNEHA take?" The authors hope that the recommendations in this summary along with the articles in this volume provide an initial framework to address these two questions. It is imperative that we act now given the continued loss of these resources through government undertakings, in addition to private development for which there is even less oversight. In addition, the mandates for
environmental streamlining coming out of the United States federal government will force the issue even more. This should be a concern for all archaeologists, whether they are in government agencies, CRM firms, universities, or museums.

The resources needed to accomplish the tasks at hand are readily available but we need to recognize that these resources exist and, use them. If we are truly willing to answer the question "We've got thousands of these! What makes an historic farmstead significant?" (Wilson 1990), we must move away from the status quo and take some bold actions. We also need to more fully engage our public partners, including local communities, historical societies, educators and students, and the media. With public support and advocacy, 19th-century farmstead sites in the Northeast will receive greater attention within the context of future historic preservation efforts.
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