

The Applied Anthropologist

Vol. 31
No. 1
2011

INTEGRATED BOOK REVIEW SET

LAWRENCE F. VAN HORN, BOOK REVIEW EDITOR

ETHNOGRAPHY IN THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE: PAST
LESSONS, PRESENT CHALLENGES, FUTURE PROSPECTS

BASED ON A SPECIAL SECTION OF AN ISSUE OF *THE 2009*
GEORGE WRIGHT FORUM, GUEST EDITED BY JACILEE WRAY

COPIES ARE AVAILABLE FROM:
DAVID HARMON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
THE GEORGE WRIGHT SOCIETY
POST OFFICE BOX 65
HANCOCK, MICHIGAN 49930-0065
906-487-9722 OR INFOR@GEORGEWRIGHT.ORG

REVIEW

RICHARD V. BADALAMENTE

My father was an avid fisherman. As soon as my brother and I were old enough to float on an inner tube, he piled the whole family in the station wagon and headed up to the High Sierras. It was an annual adventure and involved as much exploration as it did fishing. On one of those early trips, Dad pulled off the road somewhere on the June Lake Loop, northwest of Mammoth Lakes, California, for a "call of nature," and I went off exploring on my own. I came upon a pile of odd-looking black rocks. Scattered around a large piece of this rock were many small pieces, as if something had shattered the rock. I picked up a piece at random. It was black as midnight, oval shaped, with a smooth depression that fit my thumb perfectly, and incredibly sharp, scalloped edges. I ran back to the car and showed it to my dad. "That's obsidian," he told me, and looking more closely, said, "It looks like an Indian hide-skinning tool."

On the drive to our camp, I sat in the back seat and fingered the piece of obsidian wondering who'd made the tool, how they'd used it, and what their life had been like. I didn't know it at the time, but I was forming ethnology questions of archeology and ethnography. I still have that piece of obsidian, and, after all these many years, I still have that curiosity about the early indigenous peoples who inhabited North America.

So, it was with great interest that I picked up The George Wright Society's special section (*cum issue*) of the *Forum*, *Ethnography in the National Park Service* (Volume 26, Number 3, 2009). Jerry L. Rogers, who spent 34 years in the National Park Service (NPS), writes in his introduction to the issue in a feature titled the National Park Service Centennial Essay Series 1916 - 2016, that the issue should be treated by authors and readers alike as a *call to action* (p.12) for re-creating a sound NPS ethnography program by the beginning of the NPS's second century in 2016. But why "re-create?"

As Jacilee Wray writes in her forward to the issue, the NPS established an applied ethnography program two decades ago. Muriel "Miki" Crespi was hired to develop and lead the program (p.40). Unfortunately, as Erin McPherson and Kat Byerly point out in their essay, "The Challenge of Ethnography," after Crespi passed away in 2003, her position was left vacant and NPS ethnography program funding was decreased, staffing declined, and the program's effectiveness and visibility deteriorated; thus Jerry Roger's *call to action*.

It's apparent from the essays in this issue that Crespi, with the support of people like Rogers, Rowland T. Bowers, and Douglas Scovill, did ground-breaking work in creating a substantive ethnography program that addressed the complex of laws and policy that lay persons like myself – people who visit and enjoy our national parks – know little or nothing about. These laws, which have acronyms like NAGPRA, NEPA, NHPA, AIRFA, and ANILCA, deal with a maze of issues and ideas like cultural patrimony, cultural affiliation, historic preservation, and religious freedom. Respectively, these laws are the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, the National Environmental Policy Act, the American Indian Religious Freedom Act, and the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act. As the essays in this slender volume point out, they define several things. One is the way our setting aside of and use of the special places that make up our national park system affect our access to, enjoyment of, and stewardship of the parks. A second is their preservation of cultural and natural resources. And a third is relating to the indigenous or traditionally associated peoples whose lives have for so long been inextricably bound to them such cultural and natural resources now managed by the National Park Service.

It is heartrending and instructive to read of the testimony of a Native Alaskan, described by David J. Krupa in



The Applied Anthropologist



WRAY ET AL.



Ethnography in the NPS...

his essay (p.101), who spoke to her concerns during the hearings on the establishment of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA):

All these years people live there and it is still the same. They never ran out of moose. And when you get that moose you get a moose skin. And you make your moccasins so you make it through the winter and you wouldn't freeze...We pick berries every summer, and all kinds of places back there to pick berries (Flora Bergman, Alakaket, Alaska, 1979)

An essay by Wray, Alexa Roberts, Allison Pena, and Shirley Fiske, serves as a retrospective on the impressive body of work done by Muriel Crespi to create an ethnography program within the National Park Service that recognized the broader cultural significance of national park lands to Native American and other traditionally associated peoples. Again, the writers lament the fact that since 2003, when Crespi lost her third battle with cancer, "the position of chief ethnographer has remained unfilled" (p.48). David Ruppert's essay points to the same lacuna and stresses the need to rethink ethnography in the National Park Service.

Essays by Michael J. Evans, by Jenny Masur, and by Barbara A. Cellarius give the reader insight into ethnography applied in specific areas of interest for the NPS, some of which, for example, dealing with Native Americans' connection to Pipestone National Monument, Minnesota, via the so-called "peace pipe" made famous in Western movies, will open the park visitor's eyes to the legitimate concerns of traditionally associated peoples.

Walter R. Echo-Hawk, Jr., in his essay, "Under Native American Skies" (pp. 58-79), calls for a new American "land ethic," in the vein of Aldo Leopold, the influential American ecologist, who decades ago urged us to think of ourselves as members of the "biotic community." Echo-Hawk laments the conqueror and colonizer mentality of European settlers, who indiscriminately despoiled the land and displaced or destroyed the native peoples who lived upon it. For him, this mentality still exists, for example, in the agriculturalists who feel they must combat nature with toxic pesticides to pursue their ends, or in the industrialists, who remove whole mountain tops because it is more economical to get at the coal underneath.

I will be forever grateful to my father for sharing with me his love of the outdoors and his spirit of adventure. My boyhood experiences exploring places along the Tioga Pass in the High Sierras, the Devils Post Pile, the Giant Sequoias, and many others, including the incomparable Yosemite – all in California – instilled in me a reverence for nature that is hard to put into words, but that I found reflected in the essay by Echo-Hawk, who writes of "...a wondrous land where everything has a spirit, including the earth, water, every living thing, and even the mystical powers of the universe" (p.67).

Richard V. Badalamente's Ph.D. is from Texas Tech University in human factors and behavioral science. He is retired. A former technical group leader for Human Factors and Production Analysis at the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL), he served as the PNNL systems integrator for its Operations Improvement Program and the special assistant for re-engineering for the U.S. Department of Energy's Richland, Washington, Field Office. He led re-engineering efforts in support of the Hanford Transition and Security Transition Programs. He is the author of a number of works, both non-fiction and fiction, including a haunting story titled "The Starving" about colonial Jamestown, Virginia, that is available electronically from amazon.com. His contact information is as follows: 3904 South Irby Street, Kennewick, Washington (WA) 99337-2452 USA; 509-586-6142; rbad2@charter.net.

REVIEW



GEORGE S. ESBER

Ethnography in the National Park Service is a publication of the George Wright Society which provides a forum for promoting research across disciplines for the purpose of enhancing cultural resource management. This issue is devoted to an assessment of the ethnography program in the National Park Service over twenty years after its inception.

At the outset, the organization of the volume is somewhat puzzling, leading off with a "Centennial Essay" by Jerry Rogers, and two other essays. A "Foreword" by Guest Editor Jacilee Wray follows these, describing the remaining articles in the issue yet referencing back to Roger's article. This arrangement appears strange, as though the volume were divided in two parts; yet the papers generally do make for a single cohesive book.

The volume's second article describes "Park Break," an experiential learning program written by students Tinelle Bustam, Michelle Moorman, Carena van Riper, Sarah Stehn, and Rebecca McCown, who all participated in the Park Break Program. The platform introduced them to various aspects of park management, and included some discussions with stakeholders, although their particular discussions were not germane to issues of the ethnography program. The essay, while interesting, does not fit well with the theme of the volume.

Jerry Rogers, who retired after many years with the National Park Service (NPS), was instrumental in making the ethnography program a reality. He sets the stage documenting the history of the ethnography program as well as its rise under the immediate leadership of the late Dr. Muriel "Miki" Crespi. Roger's concern now is with a critical juncture at which he contends, there is a loss of vision. He attributes the problem to a number of factors, including changes in leadership, a shift in emphasis within the bureaucracy, and budgetary cuts. He calls for a new vision for the ethnography program to be developed from within the National Park Service and implemented by professionals within the Service.



The Applied Anthropologist



An overview of the remaining articles reveals a common theme: ethnography plays an important role in reaching out to and consulting with peoples traditionally associated with ethnographic resources in the parks. Beyond that, however, there is a need to clarify what actions follow, or should follow from consultations with stakeholders. Differing positions are presented, ranging from basic consultations as required by law to the less common practice of fully engaging stakeholders in decision-making actions.

Ultimately, the National Park Service is a bureaucratic organization held responsible for managing the resources of the parks. The NPS not only has the authority but a legal responsibility for carrying out its mission; yet within that mandate, the Service is required by laws and executive orders to consult with and collaborate with traditionally associated peoples, leaving open to question, exactly what is required for full compliance and how might clarification help in creating or redefining a new vision.

An essay by Kirsten Leong et al., "Moving Public Participation beyond Compliance," dissects the issues of public involvement and notes that relationships between agencies and stakeholders are critical to effective resource management. Through interviews with numerous resource managers, the authors suggest there is a problem of power distribution between the extremes of top down management with no stakeholder and full public engagement where stakeholders have the ability to influence (though not control) decision making.

In their essay, Leong et al. provide qualitative evidence of the obvious: working cooperatively with stakeholders provides more satisfying results for all parties involved. The authors emphasize the need for what they call "relationship building" as an important component of the ethnography program. The desired outcomes of relationship building could be articulated and hence useful for refining a new vision for the ethnography program.

Following the curiously placed "Foreword," Jacilee Wray et al., provide a summary of Miki Crespi's vision for the ethnography program and her work to realize that end. The essay, "Creating Policy for the National Park Service," clearly outlines Crespi's intentions in program development, raising the curious question as to why a loss of vision ever occurred. The authors point out the importance of institutionalizing the ethnography program to prevent gaps in its implementation, but for whatever reasons, Crespi's position was not filled following her death, thus disrupting the continuity of the program she established.

David Ruppert sounds the same alarm regarding the lack of a chief ethnographer to maintain the momentum. Further, he believes that advances of ethnography in working with traditional peoples have diminished and need to be revitalized. Ruppert's emphasis is on consultation and

information gathering to allow the National Park Service to satisfy legal requirements. He understates the role ethnography could play by involving traditionally associated peoples beyond consultation.

Michael Evans, in a case study from Pipestone National Monument describes the role of ethnography similarly, but seeks to negotiate the needs of stakeholders with park management policies. The work at Pipestone clearly attended to the needs of stakeholders and the importance of the resources to them, and demonstrates the additional role ethnography can play by using data to help shape policies.

Barbara Cellarius discusses the Ethnographic Overview and Assessment (EOA), as a basic research document but one that can also be used to initiate engagement with traditionally associated peoples. This is illustrated in an example from Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve in South Central Alaska, where the EOA was used to collect and analyze documented information about people associated with parks, but it included some interviews and discussions with the traditionally associated peoples. Input from the people resulted in an expansion of who ought to be included in the EOA and their participation motivated them to contribute additional information through research of their own initiative. Thus, the EOA served not only as a starting point for ethnographic work, but it began the process of engaging people in the project to the extent that the community itself became involved in assembling a body of data important to the EOA.

David Krupa, dealing with national parks in Alaska, emphasizes the value of traditional ecological knowledge, as he says, to "inform our collective knowledge" in ways that make managers aware of stakeholders' needs. He acknowledges the complaint of local peoples when their views are solicited but then are often overlooked in the aftermath. He identifies the need for "substantial input into the management of the resources that support their lifestyles..." with an emphasis on a "meaningful role in subsistence programs from concept to completion." As with the essay by Leong, et al., the outcome of "involvement" or "relationship building" is left without defining the end result.

Erin McPherson and Kat Byerly conclude the volume with an essay, "The Challenge of Ethnography," noting the standard body of legislative mandates requiring ethnographic work, usually consultation, with traditionally associated peoples. Further, they take note of the Director's Order no. 28, *Cultural Resource Management*, issued in 1985 and which called for a distinction between archaeology and applied cultural anthropology. They concur that the ethnography program has been losing ground, partially for lack of current leadership, but also because attempts to consult traditionally associated peoples are met with "no response," raising the question of exactly what actions are





required to satisfy requirements for consultation. This could technically be met by submitting a letter through the postal service, as had been done frequently before Crespi's time at the helm. However, Crespi pushed for far more involvement with traditionally associated peoples.

In searching for a new vision, ethnographers might consider visiting Clinton's Executive Order 13084, calling for "regular and meaningful consultation *and collaboration* [emphasis mine] with Indian tribal governments in the development of regulatory practices on Federal matters that significantly or uniquely affect their communities..." While not all traditionally associated peoples are American Indians, the intent of Clinton's Executive Order has been largely overlooked for its potential in working with stakeholders. Both Krupa and Cellarius demonstrated the value of involving traditionally associated peoples beyond consultation. It remains to be seen, to what extent ethnographers will be amenable to engaging traditionally associated people in decision making processes rather than merely to gather data and opinions from them prior to insular decision-making by NPS personnel.

Jenny Masur's essay addresses some of these important points. She raises the notion of "civic engagement," which she differentiates from "public involvement" by drawing on language in NPS 2006 *Management Policies* calling for "reasonable and effective means to involve the public in decisions at the park and program level." Masur, along with Leong et al, highlight that point; that is, the park bureaucracy clearly holds the authority and the power to remain the sole decision maker, but within that power, NPS workers can engage traditionally associated peoples in decision making activities beyond collecting data from them or by simply consulting with them.

Further, Masur rightly stresses the need for properly trained, professional ethnographers to do this work. Several authors follow up on Rogers' claim that the ethnography program has experienced setbacks, yet they have not addressed the problem of non-ethnographers, particularly archaeologists infiltrating the ethnography program, even though, as McPherson and Byerly point out, a clear distinction between archaeology and applied cultural anthropology is necessary. Archaeologists' training and orientation differs from that of ethnographers who are trained and prepared to engage in the kind of civic participation Masur urges.

In this volume, several authors emphasized the need for a new vision and/or new leadership in the ethnography program. Walter Echo-Hawk addresses the big picture in terms of a need for a land ethic, and refers to the work of Aldo Leopold, who recognized the need for a world view valuing the relationships among all animals (people included), the plants, and their connection to the earth. Echo-

Hawk acknowledges Leopold's view as consistent with the beliefs of American Indians and other indigenous peoples.

In contrast, he sees the direction of resource management as the result of a cosmology of domination, of religious dogmas apart from the earth, of colonialism and its drive to control resources, and of resource managers steeped in the bureaucracy and the political atmosphere surrounding it. These are powerful forces that operate in opposition to the land ethic called for by Echo-Hawk but that need to be reckoned with for constructive management.

Echo-Hawk responds to the need for a new vision of ethnography along with other managerial programs in our federal agencies. His point is that indigenous peoples have long held views needed for good resource management, and that many NPS operations are steeped in views antithetical to them. Ethnography has reached out, in varying degrees to indigenous peoples, but Echo-Hawk believes an ethnography program can additionally bring back to managers the mind-set found in indigenous communities. His arguments support the need for involving the knowledgeable, traditionally associated people in the decision-making processes going far beyond consultation. While his ideas may appear radical to an entrenched bureaucracy, it is within the power of ethnography to reach out to stakeholders and reorient resource management practices as a result of their direct input. By involving those who have lived sound ecological practices in decision-making, the ethnography program is certain to produce sound resource management practices.

George S. Esber holds a Ph.D. in anthropology from the University of Arizona. He was the first Southwest regional ethnographer in the National Park Service. He recently retired from the faculty of the Department of Anthropology at Miami University, Oxford, Ohio. He may be reached at 3489 Riggs Road, Oxford, Ohio (OH) 45056-9245 USA, at 513-404-0437, and at gsesber@gmail.com.

REVIEW



DARBY C. STAPP

The collection of papers on the National Park Service (NPS) Ethnography Program is an important addition to the literature on heritage protection. The papers focus on traditional places and resources and the efforts of a dedicated staff to make them available to groups with historical and cultural ties. Collectively, the papers describe the development, goals, execution, and evaluation of an important NPS heritage program. Described are individuals, policies, struggles, peoples, and accomplishments over a quarter century. Administrative histories and reflexive contributions such as these are important because they provide documen-



The Applied Anthropologist



tation and context for the programs under which heritage-related work has been conducted. Having information such as this allows us to evaluate experiences, learn from them, and improve them.

The NPS Ethnography Program is important to document because of its use of cultural anthropologists as professional ethnographers. Since the 1960s, hundreds of historians, archaeologists, architectural historians, landscape architects and museum specialists were hired to help the Federal government protect the country's heritage; cultural anthropologists, for the most part, did not share in the bounty. Even when new laws or guidance began being implemented, elevating the importance of traditional use areas and the need to consult with Native American tribes and other affected groups, cultural anthropologists only occasionally became involved. Many of these duties, which included meeting with tribal representatives and learning about important places and resources were simply added to the responsibilities of existing staff. Ethnographic research and consultation were typically conducted by archaeologists, communication staff, or someone else—if they were conducted at all.

The NPS Ethnography Program description provided in the *George Wright Forum* allows us to see what cultural anthropologists can do when they have the resources and authority. As the program evolved, the NPS staffed headquarters and the regional centers with professional ethnographers, as did a few high profile parks. The program was designed to meet four main objectives: help the agency comply with new requirements associated with Native American involvement, begin identifying traditional groups that used specific areas now designated as national parks, learn about the traditional places and resources that people used in order to better understand the human and environmental history of the park, and work with contemporary groups to facilitate use of the land and its resources and help perpetuate traditional ways of life.

The program never fully reached its potential due to inadequate funding and ambivalence by bureaucrats and park managers. The post-2000 period was especially difficult, when the founding program manager passed away, leaving a key vacancy that has yet to be filled. Nevertheless, as these papers demonstrate, substantial work was accomplished. Throughout the articles we learn how ethnography can be applied to real world settings and where positive contributions can be made. We also learn about the things that did not go so well. The authors indicate that the program is at a crossroads; without more funding and management support, the program will flounder.

I found the papers to be highly informative. Being in the heritage protection field, I had heard about the NPS Ethnography Program for years, knew some of the people, saw some of their presentations at professional conferences, and

read some of their work. But I never fully understood the Ethnography Program or its scale. That gap has been filled after reading this set of papers.

The articles were particularly interesting to me because they provided a good comparison to the alleged *protected area* where I work. The Hanford Nuclear Reservation is not a national park, but it is a government facility 560 square miles in size. Although considered to be among the most polluted places on earth, it has also come to be regarded as an environmental and cultural treasure: the last 52 miles of Columbia River undammed, large tracts of natural habitat, and sacred to Mid-Columbia Tribes. Part of Hanford was declared the Hanford Reach National Monument in 2000 by President Bill Clinton. Located in the heart of Indian country, there is active involvement of three federally recognized tribes (Yakama Nation, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian reservation, the Nez Perce Tribe), and one unrecognized group (the Wanapum). The papers made me wonder how we might have made better use of ethnographers following the NPS model, as opposed to the minimal ethnographic efforts that we managed to get funded and accomplished with existing staff.

Most agencies, in fact, do not have an ethnography program, and as we learn from the papers, the majority of national parks do not either. Whereas the National Park Service issued a policy directive specifying that traditionally affected people need to be consulted as part of park management, most other agencies develop cultural resource programs to comply with requirements found in laws such as the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA), the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). These laws require consultation with Native American groups, interested parties, and the public. Understanding the ethnohistory of the area is an important part of the job, as is working with indigenous peoples to learn about the resources. But the driver behind most of this work is point specific: approval of construction projects (NHPA, Section 106), repatriation of human remains (NAGPRA), or archaeological site looting investigations (ARPA). With short-term goals such as these, good ethnography gets under-valued by those involved.

This has led to a situation where we have lost the forest for the trees. Agencies are spending tens of thousands of dollars to dig holes to get an archaeological clearance under Section 106, but will not spend comparable sums to conduct historical or ethnographic research, or to interview people who might know about the place. Agencies will spend tens of thousands of dollars to recover and report on artifacts, but won't explain the information to descendants or consult with them to help mitigate the effects of the project on their way of life. We as a profession need to take a mo-



The Applied Anthropologist



ment, step back, remember what it is we are trying to do, and get rebalanced.

Jacilee Wray is quite clear about the direction she thinks we need to go: "As professional anthropologists and ethnographers, we must preserve for today's people and for future generations the lifeways of traditionally associated peoples" (p. 42). I agree with this statement. Traditional lifeways are dynamic. Persistence and replacement are two cultural processes constantly at work. We should be using our expertise to assist traditionally associated people in their efforts to maintain their cultural identity. We need to explain options, help explore alternatives, and most importantly, give people the freedom to choose for themselves, even when our professional judgment says otherwise.

Why? Because traditionally associated groups have a wisdom unique to them, much of which is based on many generations of experience with the environment. Their knowledge and unique ways of making decisions and solving problems has great value and is needed by humanity. This wisdom, this collective experience should not be lost, at least not involuntarily. Those groups perpetuating their way of life should be assisted in accessing places they care about, in obtaining resources that are needed to maintain traditional ways, and in sharing economic opportunities such as jobs or grants. Walter R. Echo-Hawk provides an excellent discussion on this issue, and helps explain why the dominant society fails to value the knowledge and wisdom of the less dominant.

While I agree with Wray's statement, I think it important to note that not all anthropologists and ethnographers would agree that we have a professional responsibility to help preserve lifeways of traditionally associated peoples. The statement suggests a level of activism that make many anthropologists uncomfortable. As long as we are there to assist—not direct—traditionally affected people in their desire to maintain a way of life, then to my mind, we do have this professional responsibility.

We as a profession have a long way to go to meet the goal of aiding the perpetuation of traditional lifeways. The papers indicate that the national parks are notoriously under-staffed and under-budgeted for all the things they want to do. Without clear direction to the contrary, most park supervisors and other land managers do not put ethnographic research above the spending line. As a result, decisions being made about the park and its resources are not fully informed, so that there is an incomplete understanding of the history, environment, traditional resources in the areas being protected. That means that the benefits of applied ethnography are not accrued, and that our goal to preserve traditional lifeways is not being met.

The papers make clear that NPS budgets are too small to do the things that need to be done. This is common

throughout the federal agencies, but especially so within the Department of Interior, where the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Fish and Wildlife Service reside. Good research, be it ethnographic, historical, architectural, or archaeological, usually takes the back seat to the short-term efforts required by new projects and new directives. There is no time for important long-term activities because everyone is too busy clearing new projects, updating management plans, writing procedures, justifying work that needs to be done, and writing white papers and recommendations that sit on desks and bookshelves across the federal complex.

This situation is especially frustrating outside the federal land managing agencies, where most cultural work is done by private-sector-based cultural resource contractors. In these settings, conflict of interest is inherent. Further, limited dollars obtained for cultural projects force competitive bidding, putting pressure on bids to be as low as possible to win the award. Two areas that consistently get cut are background research and consultation. Other negative aspects of the private contractor model are that investigators change from project to project, eliminating any hope of continuity and institutional memory. Individuals who have never worked in a community might show up one day ready to evaluate any number of resources for significance. Imagine the amount and quality of effort that goes into a project when no one knows who to talk to, where to go for information, and the background research has only been funded for a few days of labor. The amount of archaeological work performed is generally inadequate, but the situation is even more dire for historical and ethnographic research. It takes years, not days or weeks to learn about a place and the people, develop relationships, and learn about the needs of traditionally associated peoples. That time frame is not compatible with private sector heritage management.

If the United States is going to keep the private contractor model for heritage preservation work, and all indications are that it will, then the country also needs to support a strong stewardship model for federal agencies and local governments. If private contractors can only budget a few hours and days to complete complex historical and cultural research, then they need to have access to repositories and individuals who are the keepers of the knowledge. They need archives and people whom they can talk to and make sure that important sources of information are not ignored. The days of driving around and doing *ad hoc* checking until the budget runs dry have to end.

In conclusion, the NPS papers demonstrate that heritage preservation is an important part of the cultural perpetuation process, and that ethnographic research is critical to understanding the needs and concerns of traditionally associated peoples. Collectively, the papers show the con-



The Applied Anthropologist



tributions that a sustained ethnographic research program can contribute to the parks, to the affected people, and to the public, which gains a greater understanding of the park and its resources. Finally, better information leads to better management.

Two questions arise: (1) what needs to be done from a policy perspective to aid the ethnography program for the National Park Service, and (2) what needs to be done to ensure that ethnographic consideration is given in other protective areas where it makes sense? Equally important, if not more so, what policy changes are needed to maintain the information that already has been collected and to continue the many relationships that have been started. The decade following 2000 was not good for heritage management in the United States, at least not in the federal sector; the description of the NPS Ethnography Program during this era is similar to what happened in many programs.

At Hanford, the U.S. Department of Energy managed to destroy a nationally recognized cultural program by installing managers who had no training, experience, or real interest in cultural resource management at Hanford or anywhere else for that matter. The department dumped half of the resources on the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, knowing full well that the Fish and Wildlife Service did not have the budgets to perform the required activities. Staff with decades of professional experience in cultural resource management (CRM) were suddenly *persona non grata*, and any recommendations made by them were viewed with suspicion and contempt. Staff were instructed to no longer bring recommendations that conflicted with upper managements vision to only spend money for clean-up. "If it's not cleanup, we're not doing it" was the mantra. The cultural resource organization that had worked for two decades learning about and fighting for Hanford's resources was rewarded with budget cuts, forced reductions in staff, and orders that breeched professional ethics. Where there once was consistency in reviewing projects and making determinations based upon requirements, knowledge, and previous commitments, now the Department of Energy lets each cleanup contractor bring in people from out of the region to perform compliance activities. It is an interesting correlation that the less background research one conducts about a place proposed for development, the less significance it seems to have. By short changing the research and review process, cleanup projects can meet the schedules and the large cleanup firms can collect their so-called *performance-based incentives*. Low points included the day we were told in managerial terms to "give away the archaeological collections because we are not in the collection business," and similarly the day we were told that historic sites were not archaeological sites, but rather "waste sites" exempted from national historic preservation laws.

While conditions have improved somewhat, the structural damage that has occurred cannot be fixed overnight. Professionals with decades of experience cannot be replaced by recent graduates from out of the region. It is a very real possibility that decades of data gathering and database development will be lost because new managers and new staff will not know why they need "all these records" to complete Hanford's cleanup. Stewardship at Hanford means management of residual wastes, not protection of the cultural and natural environment for future generations. The situation at Hanford may be unique, but I think it is not.

Given the many changes that have occurred in heritage management in the last decade, and the challenges that we continue to face, it is time to think about the adjustments that need to occur in national and regional heritage policy. This set of papers, written mostly by full-time applied ethnographers, is an excellent step in the policy change process, as it broadens awareness of the problem and facilitates development of policy options that can lead to improvement. The actions that Jerry Rodgers identifies in his essay to help revitalize the heritage field in the United States provide an agenda that we should all support and assist in implementing. The authors are commended for taking the time out of their busy lives to publish their thoughts and experiences.

Darby C. Stapp's Ph.D. is in American Civilization/ Historical Archaeology from the University of Pennsylvania. He recently took early retirement from the Battelle Memorial Institute and began Northwest Anthropology LLC to conduct heritage resource impact assessments for tribes and agencies. He may be reached at 2754 Stonecreek Drive, Richland, Washington (WA) 99354-2149 USA, at 509-554-0441 and dstapp@pocketinet.com.

REVIEW



FREDERICK F. YORK

The George Wright Society was founded in 1980 and its journal, *The George Wright Forum*, in 1981 to promote "the protection, preservation, and management of cultural and natural parks and reserves through research and education" (George Wright Society 2010). This review focuses on the second of two issues of the *Forum* published in 2009 that deal with cultural resource management topics and the National Park Service of the United States Department of the Interior. The first focuses on "Traditional Cultural Properties: Putting Concept into Practice" (George Wright Society 2009a). The second is being reviewed here (George Wright Society 2009b). It concentrates on the nearly thirty-year history, present status, and future of the ethnography program of the National Park Service.



The Applied Anthropologist



I am pleased to do this review and consider it a welcome opportunity to communicate with anthropologists outside of the National Park Service concerning a program that I have been involved with since the summer of 1991 when I was the first of three anthropologists hired to initiate programs in three out of ten regions that existed at the time. For the record, in July of 1978 Lawrence F. Van Horn Ph.D., was the first cultural anthropologist hired as such in the National Park Service. That was at the NPS Denver, Colorado, Service Center to work in park planning on general management plans (Van Horn 2003a and 2003b). Muriel "Miki" K. Crespi, Ph.D. became the second cultural anthropologist to be hired as such. That was in 1981 to work in the NPS Washington, D. C. Office (WASO) to develop what became the Applied Ethnography Program. Regional anthropologists were then hired in 1991. This hiring was accomplished under the GS (General Schedule) 190 (General Anthropology Series). There is no series in the General Schedule for *ethnographer*. The first three such regional anthropologists were George S. Esber, Ph.D. for the then Southwest Region; David E. Ruppert, Ph.D. for the then Rocky Mountain Region; and, Frederick F. York, Ph.D., for the then Pacific Northwest Region.

Ethnography in the National Park Service contains an initial piece by Jerry L. Rogers, a professional historian. Now retired, he is a 34-year NPS veteran who served for 14 years as the associate director for cultural resources management. His cultural resource duties covered the national park system. For historic preservation, he had duties both within and outside the system. This contribution is part of an on-going *National Park Service Centennial Essay Series* (pages 6-13) being featured serially in *The George Wright Forum*.

Rogers enthusiastically advocates the need for "Ethnography in a National Park Service Second Century." In the context of a brief history of the National Park Service developing its first ethnography program, he laments...

...losses in funding, staffing, professional capability, and especially leadership between 2001 and 2009 [that] had been so extensive that making progress meant starting over... Let's skip the sugar coating about our task. Creating a sound NPS ethnography program by the time of the agency's centennial [August 25, 2016] means starting over.

Here is how the NPS story of ethnography program growth began. In 1981, Doug Scovill, an archaeologist (B.A. California State University, Sacramento 1957), was the chief anthropologist of the National Park Service who hired Muriel "Miki" Crespi (Ph.D. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign 1968) (Van Horn 2003b). Crespi, ac-

ording to Rogers, soon had the support of NPS officials, including the Mesa Verde National Park superintendent, the Rocky Mountain regional director, and the director of the National Park Service, to convene the First World Conference on Cultural Parks, which was held at Mesa Verde in 1984 (National Park Service 1989). The three themes of the conference were technology and preservation of cultural parks, tourism and use of cultural parks, and cultural parks and native peoples. The conference, Rogers says, "articulated a reason for the ethnography program and provided a beginning upon which to build" (page 7). Prior to the conference Rogers and Crespi had...

...developed a vision of at least one professional ethnographer in each [NPS regional office]...Through a special committee from the Society for Applied Anthropology, with representation from the American Anthropological Association, New Mexico Senator Pete Dominici learned of our vision and arranged for a small appropriation to begin to carry it out (page 7).

With the cooperation of regional directors and cultural resource program managers in the Pacific Northwest Region (based in Seattle, Washington), the Rocky Mountain Region (based in Denver, Colorado), and the Southwest Region (based in Santa Fe, New Mexico) positions for the first regional Ph.D. level cultural anthropologists to initiate regional aspects of the Applied Ethnography Program were advertised, and three anthropologists were hired by those regions in the summer of 1991, as mentioned above. Although Rogers does not go into any detail on this program growth, he notes that "over time we were able to get the program up and running throughout most of the agency" (page 8). In the 1990s, the ethnography program grew with the hiring of cultural anthropologists in three additional regions (the Midwest, Northeast and Southeast Regions) for a total of six Ph.D.s based in six regions by 2000 and a staff of from one to three additional M.A. and Ph.D. level anthropologists working in the city of Washington with Crespi.

If the decade of the 1990s was one in which the relatively small ethnography program grew and prospered under the direction of Crespi, with the support of Rogers and Scovill. and later his successor, Francis P. "Frank" McManamon, Ph.D., the decade that began in 2000 was one in which the program declined. Reductions in budget and staff were exacerbated by less support from higher levels following Scovill's departure from the NPS Washington Office in 1996, the retirement of Rogers in 2002, and the death of Crespi on April 25, 2003. As Rogers notes, the ethnography program has suffered not only because of Crespi's passing and the failure to hire anyone to fill her





position, but also because of a lack of leadership at higher levels of the National Park Service in the last decade.

Rogers presents his support for the revival of the ethnography program in the context of a broad vision for the future of the National Park Service. He makes six points regarding the need for a strong ethnography program to understand and deal with new concentrations of ethnic populations:

1. To function within a National Park Service properly attuned to its second century, the ethnography program must envision itself in a similarly broad scope. Much remains to be done in positive interactions that benefit tribes, and such interaction must be a prominent part of the future.
2. Learning about and from other cultures is at the heart of the ethnography program.
3. Knowing how to do this right will require ethnographers along with a host of professionals from other disciplines.
4. The skills of ethnographers will be helpful in figuring out whether certain inholdings are or are not cultural resources that the Park Service should preserve.
5. The National Park Service must lead the change or else be led by it.
6. A strong ethnography program will be needed if the Park Service is to understand and deal with new concentrations of ethnic populations.

Rogers concludes that...

...A vision is best developed by those who will work to carry it out. The task therefore belongs to what remains of the ethnography cadre inside [the National Park Service] and to outside professionals who are closely associated with it...Eventually the process and its recommended vision must have the blessing of the National Leadership Council [NPS regional directors, the director of the Denver Service Center, the director of the Harpers Ferry Interpretive Center] and the director [of the National Park Service] (page 11).

In the foreword (pages 40 – 42), Jacilee Wray does an excellent job of briefly describing each of the ethnographic articles that follow. She sets the stage by quoting Crespi (page 40):

Two decades ago, the National Park Service established the Applied Ethnography Program. Since then, the concept, data, and strategies of *cultural anthropology, or ethnography, as the NPS calls it* [reviewer's emphasis], have helped

the agency hear and see what had been typically unheard and unseen. By giving voices to communities and indigenous people, and visibility to the resources they value, the discipline has enriched our understanding of heritage by illuminating the places and concerns that have been unknown, but [are] knowable (Crespi 2001).

Wray along with Alexa Roberts, Ph.D., Shirley J. Fiske, Ph.D., and Allison Pena, A.B.D., co-author the article on "Creating Policy for the National Park Service: Addressing Native Americans and Other Traditionally Associated Peoples" (pages 43 – 50). These authors provide some detail on the development of the ethnography program by drawing on an oral history interview of Crespi by Fiske that was conducted in 2002 and other sources. This contribution focuses on the NPS policy relating to Native Americans finalized by Crespi and others in 1987 and the incorporation of portions of that policy into the 1988 NPS *Management Policies* as a "catalyst for the...ethnography program" (page 43).

These authors summarize a series of types of anthropological studies that came to guide research and then became standard examples as products of the program: cultural affiliation studies, rapid ethnographic assessments, and ethnographic overviews and assessments (page 47). They then turn to discussions of two concepts: *ethnographic resources* and *traditionally associated peoples*. With reference to the former, they note that this term piggybacked on existing and familiar concepts such as *archaeological resources, historic resources, and natural resources*. It was intended to bring visibility to the human dimensions of historic sites, structures, objects, and landscapes (Crespi 2003:42). They later put this resource category in the context of a database named the *Ethnographic Resources Inventory*, and they conclude that because the database was discontinued "the ethnography program declined" (page 48).

These authors further note with reference to *traditionally associated peoples* that a new definition was included in the 2001 NPS *Management Policies* as...

...those cultural groups and people who have a connection to a park that predates the park's establishment, whose association with the park has endured at least two generations, and to whom the park's resources are essential for their continued identity as culturally distinct peoples (page 47).

The acting NPS director at the time, Dan Wenk, is quoted as giving the following guidance to park managers:

The creation of parks was influenced by Native Americans, African-Americans, Hispanic-Americans, and Asian-Americans. The stories of





[these] and other minorities already exist in national parks and need only to be discovered or told (page 49).

About the forthcoming NPS centennial, these authors pose a series of questions that they then refer to as goals:

How will the National Park Service discover these stories? What tools will we use to understand the deeply embedded cultural values attached to park lands and resources...? How will we steward resources with an informed knowledge of the many layers of cultural meaning they contain? How will we foster a connection between park lands and the complex cultural fabric of future generations (page 49)?

Their conclusion is a “re-energized, redesigned ethnography program is necessary to accomplish these goals.”

David Ruppert’s “Rethinking Ethnography in the National Park Service” spans pages 51 – 57. He, as mentioned above, was one of the first three anthropologists hired in 1991. He now serves as the assistant director for Indian affairs and American culture in the Intermountain Region of the National Park Service based in Denver, Colorado, with frequent details to the Washington Office. He says that the NPS...

...ethnography program (cultural anthropology) was established in 1981 primarily to consult with traditional and/or ethnically distinct communities and document park places and resources that are culturally significant... [with the National Park Service determination] that there was value in finding how others in an often overlooked diverse citizenry, viewed and valued the places and resources – views often different from those of the agency [and that] a better understanding of these NPS and community similarities and differences could lead to constructive resolutions to on-going and potential management conflicts (page 51).

Ruppert points out the importance of laws requiring federal agency compliance as well as that of the civil rights movement in the 1950s and 1960s. That includes the American Indian Movement specifically in terms of the need for the National Park Service in the 1970s and 1980s to examine its policies relative to the exercise of American Indian religious freedom and the conduct of traditional cultural practices, including access to places and resources within parks (page 52). Ruppert adds that changing demographics at present require the National Park Service to understand differing cultural perspectives and underscore the need to “revitalize the existing ethnography program” (pages 54 - 55). As an introduction to presenting a

ten item list of suggested tasks he notes that cultural anthropology within the National Park Service...

...works with contemporary issues...[and]... traditional communities and their use of, and value they give to, places and natural resources...[with ethnography] as a social science methodology that...investigates links between community cultural values and park natural and cultural resources...[and that] resides in some limited space between the cultural and natural resource programs (page 55).

Walter R. Echo-Hawk, Jr., is a well-known and widely respected American Indian attorney who authors “Under Native American Skies” (pages 58 – 79). The central theme focuses on the need for the United States to develop a clear land ethic (page 58) to build upon seeds planted by Aldo Leopold in the mid-twentieth century (page 59) through the use of “the cosmology of Native peoples who reside in indigenous habitats embedded in the natural world” (page 58). Echo-Hawk states that the need for “a strong federal ethnography program is self-evident,” and he refers to a series of legal obligations. He cites Executive Order 13007 on *Indian Sacred Sites* and the following laws: the American Indian Religious Freedom Act (AIRFA), the Alaska Native Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA), the National Environmental Protections Act (NEPA), the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), the Native American Graves Protection and Rehabilitation Act (NAGPRA), and the Endangered Species Act (ESA). He sees the National Park Service as...

...a world leader in preserving the natural world and its cultural treasures [noting in addition that the development] of the ethnography program needed to comply with these laws... led land managers into the modern era as society began to change the way that it looks upon public lands [and] has laid the groundwork for developing a land ethic in the 21st century (page 61).

Echo-Hawk then calls upon federal agencies to do more than merely comply with such laws but to “help lead our nation toward a land ethic for the twenty-first century.” In his view, the challenge...

...requires more than a bare-bones ethnography program run by a room full of cultural anthropologists...Instead, the task requires a comprehensive interdisciplinary approach guided by comparative religion experts, Indian studies scholars, historians, ecologists, ethnobotanists, wildlife and fisheries biologists, traditional tribal religious leaders, and tribal



The Applied Anthropologist



hunters, fishers, and gatherers to synthesize our cultural resources into an American Way of looking at the land, and teach that ethic to the general public (page 62).

His plea concludes with a call for ethnography programs to become part of “a larger interdisciplinary infrastructure designed for a bigger task in synthesizing a land ethic” (page 62).

Michael J. Evans, Ph.D., the author of “Applied Ethnography and Park Management at Pipestone National Monument” (pages 80 – 84), began his association with Crespi and the developing NPS Applied Ethnography Program before the first three regional anthropologists were hired. He actually was part of a team of anthropologists headed up by Richard Stoffle, Ph.D., now with the University of Arizona’s Bureau of Applied Research in Anthropology (BARA), when an initial workshop for the program was held near Santa Fe, New Mexico in August 1991. Subsequently, Evans worked with Crespi in the Washington Office and then moved to the NPS Midwest Region where he continues to work.

Evans refers to a variety of basic cultural anthropology studies conducted through his Midwest Applied Anthropology Program that researches traditional land use, ethnobotany, and ethnozoology. This effort includes “special ethnographic studies on peoples associated with specific parks” (page 80). This list adds to the list of studies presented earlier in the volume by Wray and her coauthors (see above and page 47 of the volume under review).

Evans describes two studies for Pipestone National Monument, Minnesota, that were done in 1995, shortly after his program took form in 1994 (page 81). One study is a preliminary documentation of federally recognized American Indian tribes culturally associated with the national monument. The second study documents the ownership of 200 pipes in the monument’s museum collections (page 81). Those two studies led to a third traditional use study conducted during 1996 and 1997. A general management plan (GMP) process involving visits to the national monument in 2000 (National Park Service 2008) likewise led to both a comprehensive ethnobotanical study and a more refined cultural affiliation study. In conclusion, Evans remarks that the studies have influenced the decision-making of the national monument’s everyday management (page 83).

Jenny Masur, Ph.D. is another Crespi-associated anthropologist as she was part of her staff before the first regional anthropologists /ethnographers were hired in 1991. Subsequently, Masur has worked as the regional coordinator of the Underground Railroad National Network to Freedom that is headquartered in the National Capital Region. Her contribution emphasizes “Working with

Traditionally Associated Groups: A Form of Civic Engagement” (pages 85 – 94).

Masur’s piece is very informative concerning the wide range of traditional associated peoples (TAPs) that the National Park Service needs to take into account in its planning for the future, its everyday operations, its research, and its interpretive programs to visitors. Masur makes two major points. The first is that the ethnography program is not simply a program about federally recognized American Indian tribes, including Alaska Natives, or other indigenous peoples associated with the United States (pages 86 – 91). Secondly, ethnographic studies can facilitate civic engagement and help parks distinguish between traditionally associated groups and other types of interest groups. This understanding applies to...

...especially larger, more generic groups who may also have legitimate reasons for lobbying for more attention from NPS managers and friends’ groups [concluding that]...the benefits of knowing the associated people means better sensitivity to these groups and will help park managers in decision-making. Knowledge about TAPs can encourage the preservation ethic, minimize park disputes with neighbors, maximize community support and cooperation with other agencies, and avoid complaints (pages 91, 93).

Barbara A. Cellarius, Ph.D., offers “Ethnographic Overviews and Assessments: An Example from Wrangell – St. Elias National Park and Preserve” (pages 95 – 100). She previously did research for the National Park Service in the southeastern United States but is now park-based in Alaska. In this regard, she is like Wray and Pena, referred to above, who are, respectively, park-based anthropologists in the states of Washington and Louisiana. Her park, by the way, consists of more than 13 million acres established through the Alaska National Interest Land Conservation Act in 1980 and is the single largest unit in the national park system.

Cellarius stresses the need for conducting more than one basic ethnographic overview and assessment in Wrangell – St. Elias because of both the size of the park and its cultural diversity. It is home to three distinct Alaska Native groups with distinctive languages and English-speaking European Americans. She concludes that the benefit of a complete ethnographic overview and assessment goes beyond the resulting report itself. Benefits include facilitating building upon existing partnerships and relationships for the park, creating opportunities for new partnerships, and increased interaction between park staff and the members, staff, and officials of local communities for mutual benefits (page 99).





David J. Krupa. Ph.D., writes on “A Balancing Act: Ethnography, Subsistence, and Alaska Parks” (pages 101 – 109). Like Cellarius, Wray, and Pena, Krupa is a park-based anthropologist. At Yukon – Charley Rivers National Preserve, he considers ANILCA parks in the context of recognizing and “protect[ing] human use, occupancy, and subsistence activities by Alaska Native and non-Alaska Native rural residents with cultural and historic ties to... parklands” (page 101).

Krupa begins with information about gathering oral histories and refers to the development of “Project Jukebox” at the University of Alaska – Fairbanks, which he characterizes as...

...a pioneering project to digitize oral history interviews with added text, photographs, maps, and other material and make them available on computer and, later, via the Internet (page 102).

He then describes efforts to document traditional ecological knowledge (TEK). He treats the process of preparing an ethnographic overview and assessment, the idea of intellectual property, the necessity of community consultation, and the formation of advisory groups under ANILCA. Subsistence harvest research is discussed as well as the impact of climate change on Arctic communities and the involvement of park ethnographers with park managers. This topic concerns the impact of park policies and management actions on subsistence users (pages 102 – 107). Krupa’s conclusion asks whether the National Park Service is fulfilling “ANILCA’s promise to its resident peoples” through protecting “a way of life” while protecting land and resources. His short answer is yes (page 108).

Erin McPherson and Kat Byerly cogitate on “The Challenge of Ethnography” (pages 110 – 119). McPherson holds a M.A. in public history and Byerly a B.A. in anthropology and M.Sc. in Islamic and Middle Eastern studies with an emphasis on indigenous peoples. They worked in association with the National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA), which is an independent, non-governmental organization (NGO). With the NPCA Center for the State of the Parks, they conducted assessments of the condition of all categories of cultural and natural resources according to a standardized methodology and research protocol. McPherson and Byerly provide NPCA background material:

The National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA), founded in 1919, is a private, non-profit, nonpartisan organization that advocates for the health and preservation of the national park system, with a mission to protect and enhance America’s national parks for present and future generations. In 2000,

NPCA initiated the Center for the State of the Parks (CSOTP) program with a goal of developing the first complete, comprehensive, and informed understanding of natural and cultural resource conditions in our national parks (page 111).

McPherson and Byerly indicate that over the course of nine years some 70 assessments were completed at parks (page 112). However, the alphabetical list for completed State of the Parks Reports by park name according to the NPCA website as of May 3, 2010 shows only 56 park units. In any event, the lists of cultural resources in condition assessment reports for Redwood National and State Parks, California and San Juan Island National Historical Park, Washington, includes the following categories: *Archeology, Cultural Landscapes, Ethnography, Historic Structures, History, and Museum Collection and Archives*. The entry for ethnography in the Redwood report includes a parenthetical reference to “(Peoples and Cultures)” but the San Juan report does not (National Parks Conservation Association 2008 and 2007).

McPherson and Byerly begin with a definition of *ethnographic resources* taken from *NPS-28: Cultural Resource Management Guideline 1998* (National Park Service 1998) to present the institutionalized perspective on this type of cultural resources. Their findings are based on a subset of parks, and they note that...

...ethnography is a challenge for park managers because it can refer to a wide variety of resources and cultural groups, as well as require additional management, funding, and staff...30 percent [of parks assessed] did not have enough research or other information available with which to conduct an assessment of their ethnography programs... Overall, 66 percent of parks where an ethnography program existed or might apply had no ethnographic overview or assessment or any other research identifying traditional uses and significance to the park to traditionally associated populations (page 112).

The theme of *ethnography as a challenge* continues with the segue of McPherson and Byerly about their list of six research findings that outline some of the most pervasive challenges inherent in preserving, managing, and interpreting ethnographic resources in the national park system. They indicate that the ethnography program is often the least straightforward and the most challenging undertaking of all the cultural resource programs (page 112). Despite pervasive challenges, McPherson and Byerly conclude that...



...By preserving and interpreting ethnographic resources through an active ethnography program, national parks enrich the park experience for visitors and add another dimension to the intrinsic importance of preserving these resources for future generations (page 117).

Taken as a whole, it is clear that the contributors to this volume are sincere in their thoughts and desires to revive, revitalize, if not resurrect, a NPS ethnography program that clearly consists of NPS employees and contractors who have done important work in collaboration with park managers and a wide variety of traditionally associated groups during the last twenty to thirty years. The fact that so much excellent work has been done in the last decade is amazing given the relatively low funding for ethnography projects and the leadership gap that has been pervasive. We are now on the cusp of a new era in terms of having new NPS leadership at the national level, but we need to ask hard, if not frightening, questions about the utility of the concepts we have been using. That admonition applies to the structural and organizational setting for anthropology and related social sciences in the National Park Service. It recognizes constraints on multi- and inter-disciplinary approaches to addressing the needs of units of the national park system and the diverse communities that national park units should serve. And it involves opportunities for working together despite bureaucratic boundaries within the National Park Service and beyond.

I agree with Jerry Rogers that we need to start over (page 6) to renew a vision of the ethnography program. I further agree that a "vision is best developed by those who will carry it out . . . including what remains of the ethnography cadre within the" National Park Service (page 11). As I have consistently conversed for years with my fellow NPS anthropologists and those outside the National Park Service: We should critically discuss the discipline of anthropology as a social science and its past, present and future potential contributions to the National Park Service, peoples who are traditionally associated with the lands and resources managed by the agency, and to the public at large. In doing so, I would recommend discussions that might focus on the following questions:

Is ethnography anthropology?

Is ethnography a discipline?

Is ethnography a cultural resource?

Does ethnography as a cultural resource discipline need to have its own resource type to justify its existence in the NPS?

Now is the time to evaluate where we have been and where we want to go as anthropologists within the National Park Service.

Frederick F. York's Ph.D. in anthropology is from the State University of New York at Binghamton. His title in the National Park Service is that of regional anthropologist in the Pacific West Regional Office based in Seattle. He may be reached at the National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, 909 First Avenue, Seattle, Washington (WA) 98104-1060 USA, at fred_york@nps.gov and at 206-220-4148.

References Cited

- Crespi, Muriel "Miki" K.
2001 "Raising Muted Voices and Identifying Invisible Resources." In the special issue "People and Places: The Ethnographic Connection." Guest edited by Muriel "Miki" K. Crespi. CRM [Cultural Resource Management of the National Park Service] *Bulletin* 24 (5): 4 – 6.
2002 Interview with Muriel "Miki" K. Crespi by Shirley J. Fiske, Applied Anthropology Oral History Project of the Society for Applied Anthropology, Washington, District of Columbia. Transcript in the Oral History Collection of the University of Kentucky., Lexington, Kentucky.
2003 "Bringing people into the Equation." Unpublished manuscript. Copy in possession of the reviewer.
- George Wright Society
2009a "Traditional Cultural Properties: Putting Concept into Practice." *The George Wright Forum* 26 (1).
2009b "Ethnography in the National Park Service." *The George Wright Forum* 26(3).
2010 Web site accessed online May 3 at <http://www.georgewright.org/mission>.
- National Parks Conservation Association
2007 "San Juan Island National Historical Park [Washington]: A Resource Assessment. NPCA Center for the State of the Parks.
2008 *Redwood National and State Parks [California]: A Resource Assessment*. Washington, District of Columbia. NPCA Center for the State of the Parks.
2010 Web site accessed online May 3 at <http://www.npca.org/stateoftheparks/reports.html>
- National Park Service
n.d. "Passing of Doug Scovill" Obituary online at <http://inside.nps.gov/index.cfm>
1988 *Management Policies* [of the National Park Service]. Washington, District of Columbia: National Park Service, U. S. Department of the Interior. Updated in 2001 and 2006.
1989 *International Perspectives on Cultural Parks: Proceedings of the First World Conference, Mesa Verde National Park, Colorado, 1984*. Compiled by Muriel K. "Miki" Crespi. Washington, District of Columbia: National Park Service, United States Department of the Interior.
1998 *NPS-28: Cultural Resource Management Guidelines*. Washington, District of Columbia: National Park Service, United States Department of the Interior. See page 110 and endnote 1, page 118.
2008 *Final General Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement, Pipestone National Monument, Minnesota*. Denver, Colorado: Denver Service Center, National Park Service, U. S. Department of the Interior.
- Van Horn, Lawrence F.
2003a Personal communication from Larry Van Horn to Francis P McManamon and others, including Frederick F. York, May 7.
2003b "In Memoriam, Muriel 'Miki' Kaminsky Crespi." *High Plains Applied Anthropologist* 23 (2):164-165.



RESPONSE

**JACILEE WRAY WITH JERRY ROGERS,
BARBARA CELLARIUS, DAVID KRUPA,
SHIRLEY FISKE, ALLISON PENA,
MICHAEL EVANS, AND JENNY MASUR**

Thank you Richard Badalamente, George Esber, Darby Stapp, and Frederick York for your insightful reviews.

One of the most important reasons for writing this special section of an issue of *The George Wright Forum* was to motivate people to begin a dialogue with others that can assist us in proceeding to a new and stronger vision for an applied ethnography program and therefore renew the program within the National Park Service (NPS). We are pleased to read these reviews and feel a sense of support and understanding of the program.

There was a bit of confusion with the articles that should be acknowledged. The two articles that appear after Jerry Rogers' lead article were not part of our ethnography articles. One reviewer did review these, and noted that they were good articles, but was confused as to why they were there. They probably would have been better placed at the end of the *Forum* issue.

In response to the three specific reviews we found Badalamente's description of himself as a young lad looking at what sounds like an ethnographic site to speak volumes about the reasons applied ethnographers or anthropologists are important in the National Park Service; that is, we document appropriate and accurate information about cultural sites and the associated people. I was excited to read his boyhood description as I had just driven on that same route the previous month. I wondered if he would find out how old the tools were, what they were used for, where the group that likely made them had lived, where they live today, when they stopped using obsidian for tools, and if there were a museum where he could learn more. I wanted him to learn more, and I wanted to learn more.

Badalamente likes the mystical aspects of parks that can be heard through Native American voices as expressed by Walter Echo-Hawk in the volume. I do as well when I visit a national park; I want to understand who was here before and how they felt about this location. That is the park experience I seek, and I know many others do as well. I wish the National Park Service would utilize more research on these aspects.

The sense from all of the reviewers is that the ethnography program has accomplished an impressive amount of

work, especially given the great hardships we have endured. Some of our work may have ended on shelves, but ideally we have provided a legacy of research that should be used in interpretation to provide answers for park visitors and others.

Esber's question as to why "a loss of vision ever occurred" is best answered by Jerry Rogers:

Vision thrives when leaders look forward positively and inspire and enable their cadres.

Vision dies when leaders focus on restraining and inhibiting their cadres (Rogers 2010).

The NPS Washington Office's cultural resource programs had been managed for almost eight years in a restraining way. By comparison, the associate director of natural resources continued to support the natural resources programs and received the benefit of a funding and staffing initiative called the Natural Resource Challenge, while the programs that should have been championed by the associate director for cultural resources suffered a 25% reduction in funding and staffing. The energy of the cultural resource programs and staff was sapped, with no support as important vacated positions in program leadership, such as the one the late Muriel "Miki" Crespi had held for ethnography as chief ethnographer, were not filled.

Another question that Esber asks is:

To what extent ethnographers will be amenable to engaging *traditionally associated peoples* (TAPs) in decision-making processes rather than to merely gather data, prior to and insular to decision-making?

One method at Olympic National Park was/is to work with the two successive superintendents on planning for the general management plan (GMP) with the eight associated tribes. Another method was to establish a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the tribes to improve communication and schedule yearly meetings to talk about key issues, before they became crisis issues.

However, park managers move on and new managers often do not understand the key role a NPS anthropologist can fill in an extremely effective way. So how do we get the National Park Service to understand the important work of the anthropologist? Anthropologists have the experience and skills that facilitate the engagement of TAPs in decision making, but broad support for doing so needs to come from the top down, as well as from the bottom up. In the case of subsistence management in Alaska, Congress recognized the importance of involving local residents in the management of subsistence resources and activities with the creation of Subsistence Resource Commissions (SRCs). These park-based commissions provide a meaningful forum for local input to park management, and they are empowered to make recommendations to the secretary of the interior regarding subsistence resources. The secretary, in turn, is directed by Section

The Applied Anthropologist

WRAY ET AL.

Ethnography in the NPS...

810 of ANILCA (the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act) to approve such recommendations unless: 1) the proposal violates principles of wildlife conservation, 2) threatens healthy populations of wildlife in parks or monuments, 3) is contrary to the purposes for which the park or monument is established, or 4) would be detrimental to the satisfaction of subsistence needs of local residents. Beyond their legal advisory mandate, the SRCs provide an important forum for local concerns to be brought to the attention of park managers, and park staff report on NPS activities at the biannual SRC meetings. Although ANILCA is a very specific law to Alaska, in the lower 48 we can work closely with NPS natural resource staff, park managers, and traditional groups to share knowledge in a similar biannual forum so together we can address specific natural and cultural resources issues, which often overlap. We need to honor and preserve the vast knowledge of the associated traditional groups.

Stapp's review article was enlightening coming from the perspective of someone who really wants to learn about what an anthropologist does in the National Park Service and use it as a model for his work at Hanford Nuclear Reservation. In his career he has often seen examples where...

...ethnographic research and consultation were typically conducted by archaeologists, communication staff, or someone else-if they were conducted at all.

The reality is that the National Park Service still struggles with this same dilemma, partly because there are so few anthropologists, but also because our role is not widely understood.

Stapp also observes that we need a long-term commitment by anthropologists to develop relationships. This is very true. The anthropologist must establish and preserve relationships. It is a deep and significant commitment that often extends beyond the eight-hour schedule. However, changes in management can fracture those relationships very quickly, so the support we receive as a professional program is paramount.

Stapp provides us with three questions that we need to have our next chief ethnographer and the field anthropologists/ethnographers address as soon as possible:

- 1) What policy changes are needed to maintain the information that already exists and to continue to develop and maintain our relationships?
- 2) What policy changes generally need to be made?
- 3) What needs to be done to ensure that ethnographic consideration is given from now on?

These are questions that must be answered, developed, funded, and staffed in order for our vision to continue.

There are two final notes. First, the *NPS Management Policies* (2006) that address Native Americans, Traditionally Associated Peoples, and ethnography, were developed by our former Chief Anthropologist and the other NPS anthropologists. The policies have stood the test of three updated versions. They provide a wealth of guidance to managers and we highly recommend that they be referred to for guidance. Second, in 2011 the job opening for NPS chief (supervisory) ethnographer was at last officially posted.

Jacilee Wray's M.A. in anthropology is from the University of Northern Arizona. She is the park anthropologist on the staff of Olympic National Park, 600 East Park Avenue, Port Angeles, Washington (WA) 98362-6798 USA. She may also be reached at 360-565-3051 and at jacilee_wray@nps.gov.

Jerry L. Rogers' M.A. in history is from Texas Tech University. He is retired from the National Park Service in which he served as associate director for cultural resources. He may be reached at jrogers@grappawireless.com.

Barbara A. Cellarius took her Ph.D. in anthropology at the University of Kentucky. She is the park anthropologist at Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve, Alaska, and may be contacted at barbara_cellarius@nps.gov.

David J. Krupa is the park anthropologist for Yukon-Charley Rivers National Preserve and Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve, both in Alaska, and may be reached at david_krupa@nps.gov. His Ph.D. in anthropology comes from the University of Wisconsin at Madison.

Shirley J. Fiske earned her Ph.D. in anthropology at Stanford University. She is on the anthropology faculty at the University of Maryland at College Park and may be e-mailed at shirley.fiske@verizon.net.

Allison H. Pena is the park anthropologist at Jean Lafitte National Historical Park and Preserve, Louisiana. The University of Pittsburgh is the source of her A.B.D. in anthropology (all but dissertation). She serves as acting regional ethnographer for the Southeast Regions of the National Park Service. Her e-mail address is allison_pena@nps.gov.

Michael J. Evans' Ph.D. in anthropology is from the University of Florida. He is based in Moscow, Idaho, but serves as the regional ethnographer for the Midwest Region of the National Park Service. E-mail will reach him at michael_evans@nps.gov.

Jenny Masur took her Ph.D. in anthropology at the University of Florida. She is the manager within the NPS National Capital Region of the National Underground Railroad Network to Freedom, headquartered in Washington, District of Columbia. She may be contacted at jenny_masur@nps.gov.

References Cited

National Park Service
2006 *Management Policies* [of the National Park Service]. Washington District of Columbia: National Park Service, U. S. Department of the Interior. Updated from 1988 and 2001.

Rogers, Jerry L.
2010 Personal communication with Jacilee Wray, May 13.

NOTE: Lawrence F. Van Horn, Ph.D., served as Book Review Editor for this set of essays, as well as for the set in Vol. 30, No. 1-2 (2010).