Course Description

Archaeological sites have long been considered places of historical and cultural significance and symbols of national and ethnic identity. More recently they have offered new opportunities for economic and touristic development and the exploration of power relations and human rights. With a unique and complex set of physical conditions including fragmentation, illegibility, extreme environmental exposure and material deterioration, as well as contested ownership and control, their conservation, management, and interpretation as heritage places require special knowledge and methodologies for both heritage specialists and archaeologists.

This seminar-studio will address the history, theories, principles, and practices of the preservation and interpretation of archaeological sites and landscapes. The course will draw from a wide range of published material and experiences representing both national and international contexts. Topics will include documentation and recording; site formation and degradation; intervention strategies including interpretation and display, legislation, national and international policy, and contemporary issues of power relations, cultural ownership, and public involvement.

The course will be organized as a seminar incorporating readings, lectures and discussions on major themes defining the subject of ruins and archaeological site conservation. Readings have been selected to provide exposure to seminal works in the development of theory and method as well as current expressions of contemporary practice. This will set the background for the selected case study site which will provide students the opportunity to work with primary and secondary materials related to archaeological and ruin sites: excavation reports, stabilization work, conservation, interpretation, and management plans. Students will study specific issues contributing toward the development of a conservation and management program in accordance
with guidelines established by ICOMOS/ ICAHM and other official agencies (e.g., national legislation such as NPS-28).

2021 Case Study Site: Reluctant Ruins: Power, Race and Adobe – Fort Union National Monument

The ruin has long captured the imagination of poets, writers, artists, and architects. From Colonna to Goethe, from Soane to Tschumi, the ruin has evoked the entire spectrum of human responses. The ruin admonishes, delights, and instructs in its fragmentation, defiantly resisting attempts to suspend its ‘unbecoming’. Until the scientism of the 20th century, ruins allowed the receptive visitor the solace and contemplation of nature and the inevitable fallibility of the material world. Today, the ruin, and especially the modern ruin, causes us to confront the myth of human progress and the failure of our own institutions. This discomfort has often been tamed or neutralized by transforming the ruin into ‘heritage.’

One hundred miles northeast of Santa Fe is the largest adobe ruin in North America and once the largest U.S. military reservation west of the Mississippi River. Few American landscapes embody human time and the vastness of space as Fort Union where adobe, brick, and stone walls that once helped define and defend Manifest Destiny now defiantly resist wholesale destruction from the harsh climate of New Mexico’s northeastern plains. Established as a National Monument on June 28, 1954, Fort Union would challenge every succeeding generation of cultural resource specialist—archaeologists, architects, historians, engineers, scientists, conservators, and masons—to find a sustainable solution to the preservation of its earthen walls. Doggedly enduring, like its equally venerable neighbor, the Santa Fe Trail, whose eroded wagon ruts traverse the endless open landscape around the site, the ruins of Fort Union now face unprecedented challenges as increased cycles of extreme weather undermine and topple walls, destroying what has silently stood for over 150 years.

Extreme weather is not the only challenge facing Fort Union. Out-dated interpretation demands a renewed narrative on the importance and meaning of the site within a broader social and cultural context addressing power relations as understood through race, ethnicity, gender, and non-military life as played out on the plains of eastern New Mexico. In addition, the original Mission 66 visitor center and museum including its displays are under revision and the ruins and landscape need to be re-evaluated in terms of their display as part of a larger evolving cultural landscape.
Requirements
Grades will be based on the research proposal and research paper and the submitted questions and class discussions on the weekly readings and topics. Grading will be in accordance with general academic policies: a grade of A/A- will represent exceptional work, B/B+ will represent good work that meets the academic standard set for the course, and B- will represent work that is just under the established standard. C and C+ are barely passing for graduate courses and will indicate work that is less than satisfactory. Failure to meet the minimum requirements will result in an F. All work is to be delivered on the dates described in the syllabus or agreed upon in class if changed. Final grades will be based on contribution to class discussions (20%), Research Proposal (30%) and Research Report (50%). More detailed specifications for the Research Papers are in separate guidelines and at the end of the syllabus.

Students are asked to contribute to a positive learning environment and to review the school’s guidelines on academic integrity at: [http://www.upenn.edu/academicintegrity/ai_codeofacademicintegrity.html](http://www.upenn.edu/academicintegrity/ai_codeofacademicintegrity.html)

Representation of someone else’s work as your own, without proper attribution, is a serious breach of these guidelines. Cell phones are prohibited during class and are to be put away except during break time. Laptops are allowed for class notes only. Use will be discontinued if the policy is abused. Discussion leaders will be selected each week to lead the class in the assigned readings.

#AskMe
In order to insure a positive, open and respectful learning environment, we invite you all to email us as to how you identify: preferred name to use in class, preferred pronouns, anything that will allow us to create the best classroom environment possible to learn together. You can also use designations after your name id in Zoom, for example: Frank Matero (he/him/his)

For more information: [https://lgbtc.vpul.upenn.edu/pronouns/](https://lgbtc.vpul.upenn.edu/pronouns/)

Class Format
Classes will be held in person and follow lecture and seminar format. Most topics will be introduced by an illustrated lecture followed by discussion of the lecture and readings. All students are expected to come prepared and on time. Please bring notes on the readings so we can have a meaningful conversation in the time available. Fieldwork is an important component of the course. We will make a trip to the site as well as other associated sites in the area to experience the issues first-hand as well as to collect additional field data and meet with NPS resource managers.
Products
For the final project, we would like to propose that the class produce individual research related to the production of a Conservation Management Plan. In order to do this, we will draw on the excellent professional studies and published research, photo-archives, and past student research that already exist about the site and have been organized for you in the course folder. Our collective task will be to evaluate and assess the current condition, management, and interpretive program of Fort Union National Monument by considering its “life history” including its design and occupation, abandonment, deterioration, past and current preservation, and the risks, threats, and unrealized potential now associated with its interpretation and display including climate change.

Each student will be required to identify a topic of interest for further research and development. A list of topics will be distributed for your consideration. The class will then discuss and decide on the content and format and each will be responsible for contributing equally to the group enterprise. Individual work will be original research in the form of a written paper, visuals, and an in-class presentation. This will be delivered by each student in two stages: 1-A Research Proposal and 2-the final Research Paper.

Research Proposal (30%)
The goal of a research proposal is to present and justify the need to study a research problem related to a critical issue at the study site and to present the practical ways in which the proposed study should be conducted. The design elements and procedures for conducting the research are governed by standards within the predominant discipline in which the problem resides. Research proposals contain extensive literature reviews. They must provide persuasive evidence that a need exists for the proposed study. In addition to providing a rationale, a proposal describes detailed methodology for conducting the research consistent with requirements of the professional or academic field and a statement on anticipated outcomes and/or benefits derived from the study's completion.

A proposal should contain all the key elements involved in designing a completed research study, with sufficient information that allows readers to assess the validity and usefulness of your proposed study. The only elements missing from a research proposal are the findings of the study and your analysis of those results. In addition to the written proposal, a formal summary oral version will be presented in class at mid semester.

A typical research proposal includes the following components:

1. Introduction
2. Review of Literature
3. Methodology
4. Preliminary findings based on existing work
5. Discussion
6. References
7. Appendices (if needed)

Research Paper (50%)
The Research Paper in this case will be your written and illustrated chapter or stand alone component that contributes to the CMP. When you write an essay, you use everything that you personally know and have thought about a subject. Research topics are to be discussed and identified no later than the field visit or midterm to allow sufficient time to research and prepare. In addition to the final written document, a formal summary illustrated version will be presented in class at the end of the semester.

Critical Dates:
10/11 Draft Research Proposals due
10/25 Final Research Proposals due
12/13 Final Presentations
12/06 Draft Research Papers due
12/13 Final Research Papers due with revisions

Required Course Textbooks:


Class Schedule (All guest lectures provisional until confirmed)
09/06 Introduction to the course: objectives, methodologies & structure Archaeological theory, practice, and the archaeological ‘site’ - Matero + Erickson
09/13 Values-based planning for archaeological sites - Matero
09/20 Site formation and deterioration- Erickson + Matero
09/27 Archaeological landscapes as cultural heritage - Erickson
10/04  Introduction to Fort Union National Monument - F. Matero + C. Erickson
Discuss proposed fieldwork, survey, and data collection

10/10-10/16  SITE VISIT

10/18  Understanding risk, threat, and vulnerability – J. Hinchman

10/25  Midterm Presentations-Research Proposals due

11/01  Uses and abuses of the past - Imperialism, Internationalism and Archaeology in the Un/Making of the Middle East- Lynn Meskell

11/08  Economic sustainability of archaeological sites - Peter Gould, Consulting Scholar, Penn Cultural Heritage Center

11/15  The monumental and the trace: site conservation and display
Case Study: Gordion – F. Matero

11/22  The moveables-in situ artifact conservation and beyond – Lynn Grant


12/06  One on one reviews of Final Research Papers and Presentations

12/13  Final Presentations-Research Papers due
Reading Syllabus

09/06 Introduction: course objectives, methodologies, and structure
Archaeological theory, practice, and the archaeological ‘site’

FOR DISCUSSION:

Egloff, Brian and Douglas C. Comer. Conserving the Archaeological Soul of Places: Drafting Guidelines for the ICAHM Charter (Reader)

Jokilehto, Jukka. Conservation Concepts (Reader) or Chapter 1-Conservation concepts (Ashurst)

Lipe, William D. A Conservation Model for American Archaeology (Reader)


For those with no background in archaeology:


OPTIONAL READING:
Camardo, Domenico. Archaeology and Conservation at Herculaneum: From the Maiuri Campaign to the Herculaneum Conservation Project (Reader)


McGimsey, Charles, R. III. Statement before the [House] Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs (Reader)
Values-based planning for conservation and management of archaeological sites and landscapes; World Heritage conventions and charters; monuments, universal value and values-based planning

FOR DISCUSSION:
Carver, Martin. On Archaeological Value (Reader)

Clark, Kate. The Bigger Picture: Archaeology and Values in Long-Term Cultural Resource Management (Reader)


King, Thomas. Resolving a Conflict of Values in American Archaeology (Reader)


PLEASE REVIEW:


ICOMOS-Charters and other doctrinal texts

ICOMOS-International Committee on Archaeological Heritage Management
http://www.icomos.org/icahm/


Global Heritage Fund
http://globalheritagefund.org/
World Monuments Fund  
http://www.wmf.org/  

Getty Conservation Institute  
http://www.getty.edu/conservation/  

OPTIONAL READING:  


09/20 Site formation, weathering, and ruins  

FOR DISCUSSION:  
Agnew, Neville. Methodology, Conservation Criteria and Performance Evaluation for Archaeological Site Shelters (Reader)  

Charnov, Avigail. 100 years of Site Maintenance and Repair: Conservation of Earthen Archaeological Sites in the American Southwest, Journal of Architectural Conservation 17(2011):59-75  

How, Chris. Chapter 2-Stability and survival (Ashurst)  

Schiffer, Michael B. Formation Processes of the Archaeological Record. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, Chapter 8-Environmental formation processes: the site, 199-234.  

09/27 Archaeological landscapes as cultural heritage  

FOR DISCUSSION:  


OPTIONAL READING:


10/04 Fort Union National Monument- a brief history of archaeology, preservation and interpretation

FOR DISCUSSION:


Medley, Evan. “Particularly New Mexico’s Monument”: Place-Making at Fort Union, 1929-2014
PhD Dissertation, Arizona State University, 2016


Wilson, Rex L. Archeology and Everyday Life at Fort Union. New Mexico Historical Review 40, no. 1 (1965).

Zhu, Liping. From Ruins to a National Monument: Fort Union, New Mexico, 1891-1956. New Mexico. (Chapter 1, skim rest)


10/18 Understanding risk, threat and vulnerability

FOR DISCUSSION:

Logan, David and Richard Mackay, “Inventories and Heritage Management: The Australian Experience,” in Conservation Perspectives: The GCI Newsletter, Fall 2013
http://www.getty.edu/conservation/publications_resources/newsletters/28_2/inventories.html


Palumbo, Gaetano. Threats and Challenges to the Archaeological Heritage in the Mediterranean (Reader)

FOR REVIEW:
http://www.icomos.org/charters/archives-e.pdf

International Core Data Standard for Archaeological Sites and Monuments (standard adopted by CIDOC Archaeological Sites Working Group in 1995) in
11/01 \hspace{1cm} \textbf{Stewardship and ownership of the past: Uses and abuses of the past}

\textbf{FOR DISCUSSION:}
Chase, Arlen and Diane Chase. The Archaeology and Ethics of Collecting (Reader)
Fine, Kathleen. The Politics of 'Interpretation' at Mesa Verde National Park.
Hollowell, Julie. Moral Arguments on Subsistence Digging (Reader)


\textbf{OPTIONAL READING:}


Penn Cultural Heritage Center Website: http://www.pennchc.org/page/

President’s House Website:
http://www.ushistory.org/presidentshouse/history/index.htm

11/08  Economic sustainability of archaeological sites

FOR DISCUSSION:
Deeben, Jos & Bert Groenewoudt. Handling the Unknown: The Expanding Role of Predictive Modeling in Archaeological Heritage Management in the Netherlands (Reader)

Fagan, Brian. Looking Forward, Not Backward: Archaeology and the Future of the Past (Reader)

Judge: The South Carolina Heritage Trust Program: Fifteen Years of Archaeological Site Acquisition and Management (Reader)

Sustainable Preservation Initiative Website: http://sustainablepreservation.org/

11/15  The monumental and the trace: site conservation and interpretation

FOR DISCUSSION:
Ashurst, John and Colin Burns. Chapter 4-Philosophy, technology and craft (Ashurst)

Buccellati, Giorgio. Presentation and Interpretation of Archaeological Sites (Reader)


Demas, Martha. Site Unseen: The Case for Reburial of Archaeological Sites (Reader)

Matero, Frank. Preserving and Presenting an Excavated Past (Reader)

Price, Nicholas Stanley. The Reconstruction of Ruins: Principles and Practice (Reader)

OPTIONAL READING:
Matero, Frank. Mudbrick Metaphysics. The Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites


Mason, Randall, Margaret G. H. Mac Lean, and Marta de la Torre. Hadrian’s Wall World Heritage Site: A Case Study.

Design and interpretation


Tilley, Christopher. Excavation as Theater (Reader)

White, Amanda. Chapter 6-Interpretation and display (Ashurst)
On Ruins


Fort Union: References

_History_


_Conservation_


_Landscape_


_Western Forts, Fort Union, The Santa Fe Trail_

[http://www.nps.gov/foun/index.htm](http://www.nps.gov/foun/index.htm)
[http://www.kansasheritage.org/research/sft/ft-union.htm](http://www.kansasheritage.org/research/sft/ft-union.htm)
[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CMIPzhJt8pQ](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CMIPzhJt8pQ)
[http://www.nps.gov/parkhistory/online_books/fosc/forts.pdf](http://www.nps.gov/parkhistory/online_books/fosc/forts.pdf)
[https://muse.jhu.edu/login?auth=0&type=summary&url=/journals/journal_of_military_history/v069/69.3state.html](https://muse.jhu.edu/login?auth=0&type=summary&url=/journals/journal_of_military_history/v069/69.3state.html)
[http://dla.library.upenn.edu/dla/franklin/record.html?q=American%20Forts%3A%20Architectural%20Form%20and%20Function&id=FRANKLIN_427011&](http://dla.library.upenn.edu/dla/franklin/record.html?q=American%20Forts%3A%20Architectural%20Form%20and%20Function&id=FRANKLIN_427011&)
[http://www.nps.gov/safe/index.htm](http://www.nps.gov/safe/index.htm)
[file:///C:/Users/matero/Downloads/NPS_1965_CommitteeReportonWesternMilitaryForts.pdf](file:///C:/Users/matero/Downloads/NPS_1965_CommitteeReportonWesternMilitaryForts.pdf)

_NPS Cultural Resource Documents_
http://npshistory.com/cultural_resources.htm
General References

Archaeology


Archaeological Site Conservation and Management


Websites

Center For Heritage and Society (UMass Amherst) http://www.umass.edu/chs/resources/index.html


ICOMOS-International Committee on Archaeological Heritage Management http://www.icomos.org/icahm/
Learning Sites Inc. The Leader in Reliable Archaeological Visualizations for Interactive Education and Research
http://www.learningsites.com/Mesa Verde National Park
http://www.nps.gov/meve/index.htm

Southwest Crossroads
School of American Research
http://www.southwestcrossroads.org/index.php

Getty Conservation Institute
http://www.getty.edu/conservation/
Getty Conservation Institute: Publications and Resources
http://www.getty.edu/conservation/research_resources/

Global Heritage Fund
http://globalheritagefund.org/

UNESCO World Heritage Centre website:

Criteria for World Heritage Listing (UNESCO):
http://whc.unesco.org/en/criteria/

The Global Strategy (UNESCO):
http://whc.unesco.org/en/globalstrategy/

Virtual Reality in Archaeology: Virtual Reconstructions by Dennis Holloway
Native American Places in Virtual Reality (Southwest computer modeling and animation)
http://www.dennisrhollowayarchitect.com/VirtualRealityArchaeology.html

World Monuments Fund
http://www.wmf.org/