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Introduction: Imparting Values / Making Connections

John H. Jameson, Jr. and Della A. Scott-Ireton

Very deep, very deep is the well of the past. Should we not call it bottomless?
– Thomas Mann

The spectacle of archaeology stirs the public interest like few other topics. Solving the detective story, finding the missing pieces of the puzzle, understanding an instilled sense of identity, making emotional and intellectual connections to resource meanings, entering global discourses and debates on heritage protection and conservation - all are part of the nexus of cultural values that define the meaning of archaeology to individuals and to the public at large.

Use of the term “value” is increasingly permeating public, private, and international discourses on heritage management. We hear about human vs. material values, tangibles vs. intangibles, moral vs. corrupt values, and religious vs. secular values. In many of our discussions, the word “value” is used interchangeably with other terms such as attribute, quality, and interest. But the term “value” is useful because it commonly connotes humanistic and emotional qualities. Values relate to tangibles and intangibles that define what is important to people. In all societies a sense of well-being is associated with the need to connect with and appreciate heritage values. In heritage management, we commonly articulate “values” as attributes given to sites, objects, and resources, and associated intellectual and emotional connections that make them important and define their significance for a person, group, or community. Site managers should strive to identify and take these values into account in planning and public interpretation efforts as well as physical treatments (Jameson, 2006).

As archaeologists and cultural resource managers, we endeavor to develop more holistic interpretations in which the values of sustainable environment and heritage are inextricably linked. We have recognized that multidisciplinary and inclusive approaches are the most effective. The sites we deal with are no longer limited to great iconic monuments and places, but can include millions of places of importance to sectors of society that once were invisible or intentionally ignored. These sites can play an important role in fostering peaceful multicultural societies, maintaining communal or ethnic identities, and serving as the indispensable theater
in which the ancient traditions that make each culture a unique treasure are performed periodically, even daily. The values of these sites and features often are not readily obvious in the material fabric or surrounding geography, but they must be identified and they require a narrative for the fullness of their meaning to be properly conveyed to local people, site visitors, and the public at large. This is accomplished through processes of public interpretation and education (Jameson, 2006).

Because of the great adaptability of humans for thousands of years, patterns of human settlement and activity have reached nearly every corner of the globe. With fluctuating sea levels, some terrestrial habitation areas have become submerged, adding further complication to their archeological and depositional characteristics, descriptions, and interpretations. Archaeological sites of all ilks are located in public spaces as well as private spaces, on land as well as underwater. Maritime cultural resources encompass sites and associations of human actions, both within and bordering on navigable waterways. In many cases, sites are in close proximity to urban areas or can easily be reached by boat, although their visibility may be low or limited. This leads to special challenges for site management regarding conservation, protection, and enforcement of legal mandates for public education, outreach, and interpretation.

We believe that one of the primary purposes of public interpretation in maritime heritage management is to foster the understanding that cultural resources are fixed points or inalienable objects in the public conscious. The placement of inalienable objects in museums - behind glass, spot-lighted, or otherwise specially treated - signifies inherent value through the mode of display. Sites such as shipwrecks provide special challenges in that they are rarely entirely raised, conserved, and placed in an exhibit. The vast majority of shipwrecks and other submerged maritime sites that are interpreted at all are in situ at their resting place on the ocean floor. Thus, in order to be effective, archaeologists, resource managers, and interpreters must employ innovative and provocative interpretive strategies that go beyond traditional exhibition techniques in illustrating and emphasizing the heritage values associated with shipwrecks and other sites within the maritime landscape.

The Challenges and Opportunities of Heritage Tourism

At an ICOMOS conference on heritage tourism in 2004, Richard Engelhardt, UNESCO regional advisor for culture in Asia and the Pacific, addressed the escalating impact of tourism on Asia’s heritage sites. According to Engelhardt, the major threat to heritage sites in the region is the rapidly growing tourism industry (Engelhardt, 2004). Engelhardt’s arguments strike a chord with those who have worked with indigenous and First Nations communities and have seen how tourism can hijack local community agendas. In this scenario, heritage “experts” and advisers see the role of heritage as a mechanism for local identity building, and, in some cases, as an aid to communities in protecting sites from exploitation and in buffering them from the juggernaut of tourism.
In heritage management, we are just beginning to realize and appreciate the effects of globalization. Heritage tourism, with its ties to the currents of rapidly evolving global economies, is causing increasing needs and demands for cross-cultural and international communication and interdisciplinary training. The emphasis is on transferable skills such as applying interdisciplinary approaches, writing for both academic and non-academic audiences, developing effective oral presentations, and gaining experience with multimedia packages.

Some resource specialists engaged in the heritage tourism industry start from the premise that tourism is inevitable and that tourism accompanied by some form of public interpretation is the ultimate outcome of the heritage endeavor. Those of us whose primary goals and interests are conservation should be determined that our values and standards are not compromised or diminished. The challenge is to ensure that high standards of skill and competency in heritage management are accepted, welcomed, and valued at local and community levels. A special challenge pertains to maritime and underwater resources that are particularly susceptible to sensationalism and exploitation by those whose primary motive is profit.

**Purpose and Content of this Volume**

Quality public interpretation and outreach can assist in managing and protecting archaeological sites in remote locations. They also are key elements in garnering public and institutional support for research and in monitoring “ownership” by local communities and frequent users who can assist in long-term preservation and public stewardship. The chapters in this book encompass both on-site and off-site interpretative efforts including heritage trails, virtual trails, museum exhibits, and examples of public interpretation as a management tool. Sites and projects from coastal, intertidal, fully submerged, and deep water archaeological contexts are presented to illuminate effective interpretive and management strategies. These include examples of maritime heritage trails and underwater parks, field schools, avocational training, classroom instruction, and innovative diver access programs, as well as exhibits, virtual visits, and educational programs at maritime museums.

The volume is organized into broad topical foci, beginning with introductory, broad-based discussions by John Jameson and Della Scott-Ireton, respectively. The editors explain that the primary goal of public interpretation and outreach at maritime sites is inclusive public access to accurate and non-sensationalized information. They point out that the cultural heritage values inherent at sites and objects are links to the past and stimuli for heritage tourism. They also explain the need to record public archaeology and public interpretation successes so that others will not have to reinvent the wheel. Another broad-based chapter by David Nutley follows with a discussion of the management and public interpretation strategies implemented in New South Wales, Australia, that has resulted in the development of a three-part plan. Nutley explains how elaborate partnerships allow the respective parties and interests to be identified, engaged, and empowered, ensuring that
the effective management of underwater cultural heritage is not reliant on the finite resources of one agency.

The introductory chapters are followed by three presentations about the brave new world of underwater and maritime heritage trials. Roger Smith tells how the Florida Division of Historical Resources’ Maritime Heritage Trail was conceived with an interpretive strategy of providing information rather than a marked route. The program also utilizes posters and brochures and a Web site to get the word out. Next, Margaret Leshikar-Denton and Della Scott-Ireton describe the Cayman Islands Maritime Heritage Trail Initiative’s goals of fostering stewardship and encouraging preservation, as well as how it enhances existing diver tourism and helps to relieve pressure on fragile coral reef ecosystems. Jennifer McKinnon follows with a description of an elaborate partnership strategy used to manage the sites and tell the story, using innovative interpretive guidebooks, of the 1733 Spanish Plate Fleet wrecks located in the Florida Keys.

The next seven chapters describe a variety of innovative programs involving partnerships for management and interpretation of maritime resources. In chapter seven, Jason Burns describes the successful alliance forged for waterfront revitalization in Georgia. Georgia’s maritime archaeology program revitalization projects, he explains, provide opportunities for connections between the past and the present through effective interpretations of cultural heritage resources, such as river towns, in ways that demonstrate significance and meaning. Programs that reach out to scuba diving enthusiasts are important in efforts to foster public stewardship of our irreplaceable maritime heritage. Joseph Zarzynski presents the challenges of public interpretation at Lake George in New York, where a rich military and maritime heritage spans several centuries. A variety of interpretation strategies have been adopted involving a partnership of underwater archaeologists, multi-media technicians, and avocationalists to “make shipwrecks speak.” Another very important and successful diver awareness program is outlined by Mark Wilde-Ramsing and Lauren Hermley from North Carolina’s Underwater Archaeology Unit. The program, Dive Down, is internationally recognized as an exemplary effort to maximize public educational and outreach opportunities involving the story of Blackbeard’s flagship, Queen Anne’s Revenge. The program is designed for advanced recreational divers and includes four educational modules focusing on maritime history, underwater archaeology, ecology, and geology.

Not all maritime cultural resources are located under water. Victor Mastone and David Trubey explain how the SHIPS program in Massachusetts fosters public stewardship by engaging the beach-walking public in the discovery of maritime archaeological sites and by helping them record and report shipwrecks and other historic resources located on the state’s beaches. John Halsey then describes public interpretation efforts surrounding beached shipwrecks in the Great Lakes. With furnishings, passengers, and crews spread all across the Great Lakes region, these shipwrecks provide the background and props for telling compelling stories of the crews’ and passengers’ lives and deaths, “the wonder and sadness connected with these Great Lakes wrecks.”
Maritime resources located in extremely deep water present a particularly difficult challenge for managers charged with their protection and interpretation. Dave Ball, Jack Irion, and Chris Horrell of the U.S. Minerals Management Service tell of that agency’s deep-water shipwreck management and outreach program that provides unique opportunities to educate the public about all varieties of vessels operating in the Gulf of Mexico, their role in maritime history, and their overall importance to the history of the nation. The WWII Japanese midget submarine found in deep water near Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, is described by Hans Konrad Van Tilburg. The vessel’s unique history is related, along with the impressive orchestration of efforts involving three federal agencies and other partners to study the vessel and its environment. Van Tilburg concludes with a thoughtful discussion of the challenges associated with preserving maritime cultural resources in a harsh environment, and of presenting those resources to a public who will never be able physically to visit them.

Next come compelling accounts of the discovery, recovery, and public interpretation and outreach efforts associated with the internationally renowned Confederate submarine *H.L. Hunley*, sunk near Charleston, South Carolina. The extraordinary array of partnerships assembled for the project complements its remarkable discovery, preservation, and research strategies. First, Dave Conlin describes the National Park Service’s involvement in the *H.L. Hunley* project through its in-house Submerged Resources Center and illustrates the ingenious methods employed to raise the vessel intact. James Hunter then explains how the *Hunley* project has involved a myriad of both public and private partnerships. Ultimately, he explains, the Herculean international efforts to conserve *H.L. Hunley* have laid the foundation for a much larger public outreach and education goal: the creation of an international museum that will permanently exhibit the submarine and its associated artifacts.

The final chapter by Gordon Watts and Kurt Knoerl points out the opportunities for public interpretation afforded by computer reconstructions and virtual reality models. With today’s and tomorrow’s technology and the availability of delivery modes afforded by the Internet, the non-diving public can be brought into a virtual world of underwater archaeological research.

In compiling this book, we have attempted to bring together, in an easily accessible manner, state of the art ideas, research, and scholarship associated with maritime public education and interpretation. With few publications currently available that feature the public interpretation of maritime and submerged cultural resources, this volume adds to a limited body of knowledge in a field that is steadily growing. Because public interpretation of archaeological resources on public lands often is mandated by law, this book should be helpful to managers who are tasked with implementing public education and outreach programs and who want to know what has been tried and tested, what has proved successful, and what has not reached full potential. We also think this book will be useful for those new to the field and for those who are experienced but want to try new directions.
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Not All Wet: Public Presentation, Stewardship, and Interpretation of Terrestrial vs. Underwater Sites

John H. Jameson, Jr.

The Nautilus was piercing the water with its sharp spur, after having accomplished nearly ten thousand leagues in three months and a half, a distance greater than the great circle of the earth. Where were we going now, and what was reserved for the future?

– Jules Verne, 20,000 Leagues Under the Sea

Introduction: A Heritage of Conservation and Interpretation

The beginnings of cultural heritage management in the United States can be traced to the conservation movement of the nineteenth century and the developing concepts of public stewardship of lands and resources in the early and mid-twentieth century. By the 1960s, public concern for the preservation “for posterity” of thousands of endangered sites such as the Southwest pueblos and prehistoric mound complexes culminated in the passage in 1966 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Among other things, the act called for establishment of a National Register of Historic Places and a process to identify and protect sites eligible for listing in the Register. The act also established the president’s Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and authorized federal funding to be used by the states to review and comment on National Register eligibility determinations. For federally licensed or sanctioned actions, the Section 106 process of the National Historic Preservation Act applies, as set forth in implementing regulations. Section 106 of the act requires that federal agencies take into account the effects of their undertakings (any sanctioned action or project) on historic properties and afford the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation an opportunity to comment on such undertakings. This federal law applies to projects where federal funding is involved or where a federal agency permit is required.

Until the late 1980s, the main body of heritage management literature focused on emerging standards of recordation and significance evaluation promulgated by the “36 CFR 800” code of federal regulations to enforce the 1966 act. Today, public archaeologists realize that they are the purveyors of the promised
“posterity” of the 1960s and 1970s and, with the many thousands of sites investigated and millions of artifacts collected and conserved, that we have an imperious, even ethical, responsibility to provide public access and benefit. With widening definitions of stakeholders, including the realization of the importance of traditional and indigenous cultural values, major developments, such as the emergence of ethnically sensitive archaeologies, have forever changed the ideological landscape of heritage management. Enhanced standards for site and artifact recordation, curation, accountability, and site stabilization, coupled with a proliferation of educational and public interpretation efforts, have underlined public agency commitments to preserve our rich cultural heritage and to make it more meaningful to people (Figure 1.1).
Values-Based Management and Holistic Interpretations

A discussion and articulation of the term “value” is increasingly permeating public, private, and international discourses. We hear about, for example, human vs. material values, tangibles and intangibles, moral values, religious vs. secular values. In many of our discussions, the word “value” is used interchangeably with other terms such as attribute, quality, and interest. But the term “value” is useful because it commonly connotes humanistic and emotional qualities. One might say that the term “value” in this sense is values-loaded. Values relate to tangibles and intangibles that define what is important to people. In all societies a sense of well being is associated with the need to connect with and appreciate heritage values. An understanding of how and why the past affects both the present and the future contributes to a sense of well being.

In heritage management, we articulate “values” as attributes given to sites, objects, and resources, and associated intellectual and emotional connections that make them important and define their significance for a person, group, or community. Site managers should strive to identify and take these values into account in planning, physical treatments, and public interpretation efforts. Operating in postcolonial contexts, we attempt to illuminate the undocumented details and contexts of cultural history beyond diluted and incomplete recordings of what the prominent historical archeologist James Deetz described as “a minority of deviant, wealthy, white males.” To many of us, the most important outcome of archaeology is to democratize history. We have had the time and resources to contemplate and explore these issues in ways that contribute to the democratization of heritage values. Under the big umbrella of heritage we include industrial sites, historic houses, battlefields, cultural landscapes, historic and cultural corridors, historic districts, sacred indigenous sites, submerged sites, and places of memory and conscience of the recent past. Our own values affect this process and represent attempts to present, protect, and understand the past in modern contexts (Jameson, 2005; US/ICOMOS, 2004).

By examining the places people lived and the traces left behind, archaeologists strive to discover the fabric of everyday life in the past and to apply this knowledge in seeking a greater understanding of the broader historical development of societies. We use archaeology to sharpen our focus on the past and to help explain how we have arrived at the present, and even to project the future. We believe that archaeology can provide insights into historical processes that written records by themselves cannot. Interpretations in archaeology attempt to deal with the unintended, the subconscious, the worldview, and mind-sets of individuals (i.e., their humanistic values) as reflected in the sites, features, and artifacts left behind (Jameson, 2005).

Typically, at heritage sites, “authenticity” is offered through presentation of information and by experts along with physical and sensory trappings such as exhibits, three-dimensional reconstruction, audio-visual sounds and sights, smells, and special effects. The terms “authenticity” and “integrity” are linked in meaning in that the latter can mean unspoiled, physical, or unadulterated authenticity.
“Authenticity” and “integrity” as terms can be seen as representing the values of historic preservation, as articulated by archaeologists, architectural historians, and other resource specialists.

Today, the effects of globalization are being felt in complex and significant ways. Heritage tourism, with its ties to the currents of rapidly evolving global economies, is causing increasing needs and demands for cross-cultural and international communication and interdisciplinary training. Emphasis is on transferable skills such as the application of interdisciplinary approaches, writing for both academic and non-academic audiences, oral presentation, and experience with multimedia packages. Heritage management in the West is increasingly focused on preservation (especially resource integrity), on public interpretation issues, and on developing analytical and technological competences. Because of the increasingly diverse and multicultural nature of audiences, training programs are shifting in emphasis from an academic to an increasingly applied focus. Professional or formal training of local staff is necessary to ensure that high standards are maintained and are, for many regions, internationally portable. Those of us whose primary goals and interests are conservation should be determined that our values and standards in this scenario are not compromised or diminished. The challenge is to ensure that high standards of skill and competency are accepted, welcomed, and valued at local and community levels (US/ICOMOS, 2004).

In many developing countries, heritage management is emerging as a critical component of national economies to promote tourism and to structure development initiatives. Development schemes focus on sustainable concepts that encourage both the preservation of resources and the recognition of socio-economic values of local people. And, hopefully, these schemes involve participative decision-making and learning processes attuned to the culture and traditions (i.e., values) of the people affected. These trends can be seen as facets of the post-modern paradigm that reflect the principals of multiculturalism and more subjective interpretation (US/ICOMOS, 2004).

We should keep in mind that one effect of globalization is that prescriptions for authenticity, integrity, and most concepts associated with modern and standardized definitions of historic preservation originated in Western systems of classification and ranking, that is, the notion that heritage is an inclusive possession of all humanity belonging to no one individual. Concepts such as World Heritage Site, National Park, and other forms of commemoration developed within Western philosophical traditions. Who are the people in charge of heritage sites? They are usually Western or Western-trained. In the U.S., for the most part, it is government and museums. What values in society do they reflect?

Stewardship can be defined as a long-term commitment to protecting and managing cultural values and their associated physical and nonphysical aspects and integrities. In the U.S. National Park Service and elsewhere, as “experts” and resource specialists at parks and sites, we see ourselves as the everyday stewards of our national treasures, tasked to preserve these values and their associated environments for the benefit and enjoyment of the people, that they be left unimpaired for the
enjoyment of future generations. Our public interpretation programs seek to create opportunities for audiences to form intellectual and emotional connections to the meanings and significance of historical and archeological records and sites and the peoples who created them.

It is important for those of us who manage, study, and present the past to be aware of how the past is understood within the context of socio-economic and political agendas, how that influences what is taught about the past, and how the past is valued, protected, authenticated, and used. We must understand the philosophical, political, and economic forces that affect how sites and parks are managed. We know that archaeological resources, as well as the built environment, are being degraded. Dwindling budgets and reductions in personnel are exacerbating the problem. Political currents are threatening to weaken long-standing principles, standards, and commitments to public stewardship. Heritage tourism pressures have become important elements of interpretive messages at parks, historic sites, and museums.

We are functioning in political climates that increasingly reject or discourage institutional and, especially, governmental husbandry or stewardship of cultural resources and values. The challenge for archaeologists and other resource stewards is to educate ourselves on the requisite knowledge, skills, and abilities to deal with these issues. Paramount for educators and interpreters is to ensure that our audiences connect with and understand cultural heritage values, those tangibles and intangibles that define what is important to people.

We strive in these endeavors to develop more holistic interpretations, in which the values of sustainable environment and heritage are inextricably linked. We have recognized that multidisciplinary and inclusive approaches are the most effective. The sites we deal with are no longer limited to great iconic monuments and places, but now include millions of places of importance to sectors of society that once were invisible or were intentionally ignored. These sites can play an important role in fostering peaceful multicultural societies, in maintaining communal or ethnic identities, and in serving as the indispensable theater in which the ancient traditions that make each culture a unique treasure are performed periodically, even daily. The values of these previously ignored and heretofore low priority sites and features often are not readily obvious in the material fabric or surrounding geography, but they must be identified and require a narrative for the fullness of their meaning to be properly conveyed to local people, site visitors, and the public at large. This is accomplished through processes of public interpretation and education (US/ICOMOS, 2004).

For many of us trained and employed in archeological pursuits, our “value sets” if you will, are changing and evolving, albeit uneasily in some circles, from traditional definitions – i.e., historic, archeological, scientific – to incorporate intangibles such as aesthetic, artistic, spiritual, and other values stemming from introspection. This involves an expansion and broadening of the content of “archaeological knowledge” to be more inclusive and accepting and less authoritative – that is, a broadening of the meaning of “expert.” This trend will result in profound ramifications for definitions of significance in heritage management.
deliberations and what is ultimately classified, conserved, and maintained. It will change the role we play and the values we present in historic preservation and education. It will affect our strategies for conducting research and the public interpretation of that research. One of the very important developments in this trend is the emergence of the interpretive narrative approach in archaeological interpretation, where archaeologists, instead of just presenting sets of derived data, actively participate in structuring a compelling story. The narrative is used as a vehicle for understanding and communicating, a sharing as well as an imparting of archeological values within the interpretative process (Jameson et al., 2003).

Evolving Public Interpretation Standards

In the last few decades we have witnessed a dynamic period of evolving standards and philosophy in public archaeology and heritage interpretation. Philosophical approaches and techniques, exemplified by the U.S. National Park Service’s Interpretive Development Program (IDP), have formed a basis for the development of international definitions, standards, and approaches that lead to more effective strategies for site protection and conservation through enhanced public stewardship. These standards stem from the belief that public interpretation is probably the most important activity that occurs at an historic site in that it delivers the conservation, education, and stewardship messages that represent the transcendent humanistic values of the resource or site (NPS IDP, 2006) (Figure 1.2).

International initiatives, led by the non-governmental International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), are embodied in the ICOMOS Ename Charter on Interpretation that declares that, “Interpretation of the meaning of sites is an integral part of the conservation process.” Discussions on issues such as authenticity and inclusiveness continue to dominate international debates about the significance and proper use of sites.

The importance of interpretation in every region of the world led ICOMOS to launch in the spring of 2004 a profound global discussion on this issue, using the ICOMOS Charter on Interpretation and Presentation of Cultural Heritage Sites (Ename Charter) as a stimulus to guide and inform the process. A US/ICOMOS conference in May 2005 attempted to address the values attributed to heritage sites and features and why they need to be protected. It attempted to identify a degree of consensus on how to construct narratives and tell stories that convey “values” and “significance” to a society, community, group, or individual. It examined these topics in depth and worked to develop a global consensus on goals and acceptable standards. The need for this conference derived from public interest and mass tourism, the connections to current heritage management practices, and the expanding possibilities opened by modern technologies (US/ICOMOS, 2004).

The commitment of ICOMOS to development of interpretation standards is reflected in the newly formed ICOMOS International Committee on Interpretation and Presentation (ICIP). The aim of ICIP is to study the evolving
techniques and technologies of public interpretation and presentation, evaluating their potential to enrich contemporary historical discourse and to heighten sensitivity to the universal values and particular modes of human expression embodied in cultural heritage sites. The work of this committee will contribute to international dialogue and the planned adoption of a doctrinal document on interpretation at the Sixteenth ICOMOS General Assembly to be held in Québec, Canada, in 2008 (ICOMOS ICIP, 2006).

The challenges for international relevance and application posed by the ICOMOS Ename Charter initiative will form the center of future debates and deliberations. The goal of more inclusive interpretations will require an acceptance of divergent definitions of authenticity that depend on a level of tolerance of multiple definitions of significance with concomitant, objectively derived, assigned, and ascribed heritage values. We can hope that these efforts lead to the recognition
of humanistic values that are reflected in site commemoration and protection decisions by controlling authorities.

Public Interpretation of Terrestrial and Marine Sites

Submerged and marine sites have a social attraction and fascination for people. From Jules Verne to modern state-of-the-art explorations, such as with the American Civil War submarine *H.L. Hunley*, we are captivated by what can be brought from the deep.

In the 1980s, several thousand historically significant shipwrecks were located in the navigable waters of the United States. During this time, advances in technology made access to many of the shipwrecks more feasible. Confusion arose between state and federal courts because states claimed ownership of what appeared to be abandoned shipwrecks on their submerged lands, while federal courts resolved disputes concerning the discovery and contents of these shipwrecks by applying admiralty principles.

The Abandoned Shipwreck Act of 1987 has attempted to remedy the legal confusion and focus more recent attention on submerged resources in the U.S. The act provided for the United States to assert ownership over any abandoned shipwreck in state waters and submerged lands. It also provided guidelines for the designation of abandoned shipwrecks as national historic parks, recreation areas, and marine biological sanctuaries. The act provides federal authority to transfer ownership of abandoned shipwrecks to the state on whose submerged lands the wreck is located. The act provides federal protection to any shipwreck that meets the criteria for eligibility for inclusion in the National Register for Historic Places. Disposal of dredged or other material on or in the near vicinity of such wrecks is prohibited by the act. The act allows for appropriate public and private sector recovery of shipwrecks consistent with the protection of historical values and environmental integrity of the shipwrecks and the sites. The National Park Service’s Abandoned Shipwreck Act Guidelines call for integration and consideration of shipwrecks into the general planning, engineering, operations, and regulatory compliance actions (Figure 1.3).

The Abandoned Shipwreck Act states that federal grants funds shall be available for a variety of activities, including interpretation of historic shipwrecks and properties. Working in partnership with various interest groups and providing for the interpretation of publicly owned shipwrecks helps increase the public’s knowledge and understanding of our nation’s maritime history.

Recent international efforts for protection of marine sites have addressed both direct and indirect impacts. For example, the adoption in 2001 of the UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage addressed the urgent need for an international legal framework to regulate activities that affect sites (Dromgoole, 2006). Hopefully, as with the Abandoned Shipwreck Act in the U.S., enhanced international protection measures will coincide with increased public interpretation and outreach efforts.
Advances in Technology Contribute to Greater Public Understanding and Attention to Submerged Sites

The focus of the vast majority of academic symposia and publications on the public interpretation of archaeological resources has been on terrestrial rather than on underwater or marine sites. Generally in the past, available technology provided greater access to terrestrial sites vs. marine or maritime sites. But modern technology now has generated an unprecedented profusion of data and opened greater public access to information about submerged sites, vessels, artifacts, and data (Figure 1.4). The new data and innovative strategies have made information more accessible for underwater archaeology and the stories it can tell about the human past.
How has technology expanded the archeologist’s reach to ever-deeper waters? A list of some of the major technological advances and the nature of their contributions would include (WHY Files, 2004):

- **Marine Magnetometry:** A popular underwater archeological technology where a magnetometer, a device that, in underwater investigation, is usually towed behind a boat, senses variations in the Earth’s magnetic field caused by metal objects. The instrument is towed in prescribed interval paths, following a grid.

- **High-Resolution Side-Scan Sonar:** A device that emits high-frequency sound waves and records the echoes. The pattern of signals, when analyzed by computer, provides near-photographic resolution of the lake or sea floor.

- **Laser Line Scan:** This device uses laser pulses, that, when fired downward, bounce off the sea floor back to the ship, where they are recorded and processed by computer. It has a laser-packed head that spins at nearly 3000 RPM, providing a nearly photographic coverage of the sea bottom.

- **Sub-Bottom Profiler:** This instrument sends out low-frequency sound pulses that can penetrate the seabed. It can be effective in detecting depositional layers of sediment.

- **Global Positioning System:** GPS is a satellite navigation system originally designed and controlled by the U.S. Department of Defense. GPS provides
specially coded satellite signals that can be processed in a GPS receiver, enabling the receiver to compute velocity, time, and position within a few meters or more accurately (University of Colorado, 2000).

“Where are We Going Now, and What is Reserved for the Future?”

Today, with the development and recognition of the benefits of more democratic, values-based management practices, heritage management world-wide increasingly encompasses an ethical responsibility to provide public access and benefit to an escalating variety of stakeholders. Evolving standards and philosophy in public archaeology and heritage interpretation, with a goal of more inclusiveness in interpretations and presentations, require a level of tolerance and recognition of diverging, multicultural perspectives. Enhanced international protection measures are coinciding with increased public interpretation and outreach efforts of terrestrial as well as maritime sites.

Where are we going now, and what is reserved for the future? With this adaptive take from Jules Verne, we note that advances in investigation and recording technology have the potential to vastly increase the scope and reach of underwater archaeology. Although public access to accurate and non-sensationalized information about underwater sites has often been hampered by media presentations that appeal to human curiosity and an amateurish “treasure hunt” mentality, an increasing number of successful projects, programs, and exhibits in recent years behooves us, the public archaeology and public interpretation professionals, to recognize and chronicle these exemplary efforts as collective experiences about what has worked and what has not worked. The chapters in this book highlight a number of exemplary success stories and serve as a start at alleviating the dearth of documented and comparable case studies on public outreach and interpretation of our submerged and maritime heritage.
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