Landscape Approaches in Historical Archaeology: The Archaeology of Places

Nicole Branton

Introduction

Landscape archaeology is a framework for modeling the ways that people in the past conceptualized, organized, and manipulated their environments and the ways that those places have shaped their occupants' behaviors and identities. Landscape archaeology is concerned with both the natural and the human-built environment, as well as places that are strictly symbolic. The landscapes in landscape archaeology may be as small as a single household or garden or as large as an empire. They may also include a number of alternate landscapes nested within them. Although resource exploitation, class, and power are frequent topics of landscape archaeology, landscape approaches are concerned with spatial, not necessarily ecological or economic, relationships. While similar to settlement archaeology and ecological archaeology, landscape approaches model places and space as dynamic participants in past behavior, not merely setting (affecting human action) or artifact (affected by human action). Landscape archaeology can be said to be the archaeology of "place" (Anschuetz et al., 2001:159), a paradigm that in its simplicity encompasses all the material elements of human–environment relationships through time (also see Pauls, 2006).

This chapter explores the landscape paradigm in historical archaeology, primarily from the perspective of North American historical archaeology. After defining the components of landscape, it presents key themes in the application of landscape to the archaeology of the historical past. The chapter concludes with a case study that illustrates the suitability of a landscape approach to the analysis of the material components of place, identity, and power.

N. Branton e-mail: nbranton@fs.fed.us

Landscape and Its Elements

Landscapes are bounded spaces in which human behaviors occur. Landscape refers not only to scale but to the nature and context of the bounded space and the human behaviors that occur within it. However, a landscape is not simply a container for human action. A critical component of landscape approaches in archaeology is the interrelationship between a place and the human behaviors that occur within it.

The natural occurrence of such minerals as gold and silver, for example, made the mountains of Colorado an ideal setting for the gold- and silver-mining industries of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, drawing first prospectors and then individual miners, mining companies, railroads, and eventually a variety of environmental-remediation professionals to the area. Today, the mountain mining landscape has been dramatically altered by the activities of these people and is marked by features such as massive waste rock and slag piles, adits, mills, mining towns, and railroads, all created by humans in order to extract resources. Coloradans today who have no personal experience of silver or gold mining are affected by

T. Majewski, D. Gaimster (eds.), *International Handbook of Historical Archaeology*,
DOI 10.1007/978-0-387-72071-5_4,

these symbolic landscapes that communicate the history of mining even after most veins have been emptied. This is the interplay of humans and environment that characterizes landscape. What distinguishes archaeological landscapes from other environments (or nonsocial landscapes) is their ability to signal and shape human behavior, the use to which humans actively put them to signal and shape desired behavior, and the archaeologist's ability to interpret past human behaviors from their physical and documentary remains.

Landscape approaches always reference spatial relationships, such as differential access to resources, visibility, nearness or distance to other places, and such less ecological qualities as beauty, highness, lushness, color, or relative height in comparison to other places. The built environment, in particular, is often communicative in terms of beauty, differential power, and symbology and is often consciously constructed to convey these qualities.

The concepts of place and space are the building blocks of landscape theory and provide an important vocabulary for landscape analysis. Place is an extraordinarily common concept that is profoundly difficult to define. Most people recognize a habitation or a region as "home," experience nostalgic longing for it when absent from it, and even restrict certain activities to its boundaries. There are locations such as home towns, colleges, and previous vacation spots that they return to again and again to try to reconnect with past experiences.

Place refers to this common human tendency to attach cultural meaning (often connected to individual or group memory) to discrete locations. The term applies not only to a physical locus of activity but also to an entire suite of behaviors that occur in that location or in reference to it, including commemoration, ceremonies, storytelling, and identity formation (De Cunzo and Ernstein, 2006; Holtorf and Williams, 2006). Places shape human activities by their physical construction and have their physical constructions shaped by human activities. They are not simply locale, although their physical characteristics are significant in their life histories. Rodman (1992:642) suggests that "places not only feature in inhabitants' (and geographers') narratives, they are narratives in their own right." This concept of place as text can be problematic for archaeologists, particularly since places are "multivocal," having different meanings to social groups or individuals within a group. These issues can be mitigated by careful attention to scale and the use of multiple lines of evidence. Oral history is a particularly useful tool for accessing the narrative meanings of multivocal places (Branton, 2004; Whiteley, 2002).

In transferring these abstract concepts to archaeological analysis, Preucel and Meskell (2004:216) explain that "Space is usually defined as a natural science concept, the physical setting within which everything occurs," while "Places can be regarded as the outcome of the social process of valuing space." In other words, place emphasizes the human component of space and "opens up the possibility of focused work rather than abstract, decontextualized spatial analyses" (Blake, 2004:235). "Space" is also used in landscape archaeology to describe the contextually empty area between places.

Landscape expands the concept of place to a network of places that function as both setting and narrative. Like place, landscape is a slippery concept that seems to be redefined by each scholar who handles it. For a range of examples, see Anschuetz et al. (2001), Greider and Garkovich (1994), Hirsch (1995), Knapp and Ashmore (1999), Marquardt and Crumley (1987), Rossignol (1992), Rotman (2003), Tilley (1994), and Whittlesey (1998). While they vary in their particulars, each of these definitions recognizes that landscape describes the relationships between humans and their spatial, physical environments. Definitions vary in the degree to which humans and their settings influence *each other*, and whether this influence can be expanded to include symbolic components. In this sense, landscape approaches may also include such nonphysical, social components as place attachment, commemoration, and storytelling, which are not inherent in the physical characteristics of a place. These behaviors may occur only at prescribed places or in reference to those places, often because of culturally significant events that occurred there. Archaeologists' definitions of landscape also vary in terms of whether these symbolic and behavioral components of place are observable archaeologically.

Landscape archaeology is characterized by a "cacophony of voices and landscapes" (Bender, 1993:275), but it typically refers to two different things. First, it may be used as a *scale* of analysis that addresses past behavior across multiple localities,

transcending the traditional "site" as a unit of observation and instead observing past activities at the scale of neighborhood, colony, or region. This dissatisfaction with the site concept is particularly understandable in historical archaeology, which deals with stratified societies in which many social units coexist in what would be called the same "site." Landscape approaches treat this co-occupation as "nested" landscapes. The scale of a landscape may be defined by social as well as physiographic boundaries, as by the diaspora of a given ethnic group.

The second usage of the term "landscape archaeology" is as an interpretive framework that specifically addresses the relationships between past human behaviors and the physical (or social) space in which they occurred. This usage grew out of processual approaches such as settlement archaeology and human ecology but has also expanded to include a variety of more symbolic models of human–land interactions.

For a landscape analysis to be coherent, the landscape must have clearly defined boundaries. Landscapes are broad and complex, but they nonetheless reference "a singular moment of material practice" (Rotman, 2003), and it is impossible to define that moment (which may in fact represent months, years, or generations) without clearly defined boundaries. Boundaries may be physical or ideational but must originate in the social context and must have emic utility. They must be spatial, but not necessarily "real," as in the case of Traditional Cultural Properties (in U.S. historic preservation law) or spiritual places. Archaeologists working with landscape must consciously and explicitly define their units of analysis in terms of their physical limitations (a watershed or mining district), temporal setting (the American Civil War or the Great Depression of 1929 to ca. 1939), and, most importantly, its sociocultural context, or the people to whom the landscape is significant.

The last is perhaps the most critical boundary for meaningful landscape analysis. Landscapes have meaning to a discrete group of people at a defined time and place. Thus, landscapes are said to be "multilocal" (sharing features with other overlapping landscapes) as well as "multivocal" (carrying and communicating different meanings to different people) (Rodman, 1992). Historical archaeology has made significant contributions to landscape theory through its documentation of the material correlates of multiple coexisting and overlapping cultural landscapes in multiethnic or otherwise stratified societies. Knapp and Ashmore (1999; also Tilley, 1994:20) label these landscapes "nested landscapes." This concept acknowledges that "family, kin, community, gender and age/experience would have linked land, dwellings, and ceremonial spaces" (Knapp and Ashmore, 1999:16–17) that occupy the same physical spaces but may hold very different meanings to each group. Kealhofer (1999:61) clarifies that "How landscape is structured shapes individuals' actions, but different individuals and different groups perceive the same landscape differently." A similar relationship, called "cultural landscape layering" (Stoffle et al., 2003:104), exists when a given place functions in multiple cultural landscapes. Given this complexity, it is essential that landscape analysis explicitly defines the social group with which a landscape is identified.

Landscape Approaches in Historical Archaeology

Landscape is not unique to historical archaeology, or even to archaeology in general. In applying landscape concepts, historical archaeologists have borrowed heavily from anthropology (Hall, 1969; Hirsch, 1995; Hirsch and O'Hanlon, 1995; Rodman, 1992), cultural geography (Penning-Rowsell and Lowenthal, 1986; Sauer, 1925), and urban planning, architectural history, and other social sciences (Greider and Garkovich, 1994; Lowenthal, 1986; Tuan, 1977, 1991; Zube et al., 1982). Historical archaeology's material culture and theoretical orientations make it ideally suited to exploiting the subtleties of landscape's flexibility as "an unstable category, sitting uneasily between opposed ecological or 'naturalistic' and ideological or 'culturological' approaches to human society" (Tilley, 1994:37). This unique ability to draw together multiple lines of evidence and model a vast range of human–place interactions in the past makes landscape archaeology an ideal tool for examining things as diverse as tenements and utopian communities, formal gardens and mining camps, natural resources and creation stories. Landscape approaches embrace, and

even demand, a rich variety of evidence (artifacts, text, and oral history). Many of the traditional lines of inquiry in historical archaeology—especially colonialism, urbanization, globalization, ethnogenesis, and class conflict—demand a framework that melds the physical and ideational.

The historical development of landscape archaeology has been well documented by other authors (Anschuetz et al., 2001; Ashmore, 2004; Bender, 1993; Knapp and Ashmore, 1999; Preucel and Meskell, 2004; Rossignol, 1992; Stoddart, 2000a; Yentsch, 1996), but some attention to the foundations of landscape approaches is warranted in order to clarify key issues and the directions in which this subfield is moving. Landscape is many things to many researchers. At its simplest and clearest, a landscape is "a piece of topography bounded by its use by a given social group" (Rockman, 2003:13). Where theoretical opinions diverge in archaeology is at what kind of use defines a landscape and what scale of topography or built environment it must include. The topography of a cultural landscape may consist of such natural elements as mountains or of such human-built elements as architecture. More murkily, the topography of a landscape may also consist of locations that are exclusively symbolic.

Until recently, archaeological treatments of landscape have tended to split into two camps, those that emphasized the explicit, positivist characteristics of landscape (physical features, land use, and economic or ecological limitations of environments) and those that emphasized the inherent characteristics of landscape (the symbolic role of architecture and spatial organization and the "meaning" of places). The fracture between explicit and inherent approaches corresponded generally, with some exceptions, with whether the archaeologist was American (explicit) or British (inherent). In *Ideas of Landscape,* British archaeologist Matthew Johnson (2007) explores this difference in more depth and proposes an "alternative agenda" for a more interdisciplinary historic landscape archaeology that capitalizes on archaeology's empirical strengths and is relevant to contemporary social concerns. Another recent compilation of articles, *Landscapes under Pressure: Theory and Practice of Cultural Heritage Research and Preservation,* edited by Ludomir Lozny (2006), addresses the broad spectrum of views on cultural landscapes as well as the practical considerations of identifying and managing them.

Explicit landscape approaches model landscapes as settings for action or as units of analysis. They are frequently concerned with exploring the limitations of the site concept for processual archaeology and the effects of natural and cultural transformation processes on land occupied by humans (Dunnell, 1992; Rossignol, 1992). Positivist landscape researchers draw theoretically from cultural ecology and the scientific approaches of the "New Archaeology," particularly nearest-neighbor analysis, settlement archaeology, and central-place theory, and are concerned with explicit, positivistic approaches to human spatiality. Explicit approaches treat landscape as land use. A recent innovation in explicit approaches to landscape is "landscape learning," a framework that describes the process by which humans gain and use environmental knowledge during colonization of new locations (Meltzer, 2003; Rockman, 2003). Although landscape learning is primarily concerned with environmental constraints and human adaptations to them (land use), it emphasizes cognition and identity (Hardesty, 2003), and social knowledge is critical in the learning process.

Researchers who apply more inherent approaches to landscape archaeology tend to draw theoretically from social theory (Ashmore, 2004; Blake, 2004), such as phenomenology (Bender, 1993; Tilley, 1994). These studies emphasize humans' experience and perception of landscapes, as well as "how landscape features are socialized and how cultural features become naturalized" (Ashmore, 2004). Phenomenological landscape studies emphasize the ways that the physical construction of places conditions cultural behavior and the creation of memory. Blake (2004:236) warns that phenomenological approaches "tend to universalize the way humans experience, treating experience as a precultural process onto which contingently derived meanings are pasted." Critical in the work of inherent landscape archaeology is an emphasis on the creation of memory and the meaning of significant places for identity formation.

Although landscape archaeology remains theoretically diverse, the dichotomy between processual and postprocessual approaches to historical landscapes shows signs of blurring. This may be in part due to the "usefully ambiguous" (Gosden and Head, 1994) nature of landscape itself, which demonstrates

the interconnectedness of people and their environments (Anschuetz et al., 2001; Lekson, 1996). Historical archaeologists are increasingly combining both positivist and post-positivist approaches to landscape, each of which facilitates particular lines of inquiry. Metheny (1996:384) offers an inclusive definition of landscape theory in historical archaeology. Landscape archaeology is:

> concerned with both the conscious and the unconscious shaping of the land: with the processes of organizing space or altering the land for a particular purpose, be it religious, economic, social, political, cultural, or symbolic; with the unintended consequences of land use and alteration; with the role and symbolic content of landscape in its various contexts and its role in the construction of myth and history; and with the enactment and shaping of human behavior within the landscape.

Metheny solves the formidable problem of defining what landscape archaeology *is* by providing a list of what it *does*. This definition also clearly delineates how landscape functions as two different artifacts—one that is physically shaped by human activities and another that is a symbolic archive of past social relations.

Issues and Themes in Landscape Archaeology

Gardens as Formal Landscapes

Historical archaeology's first forays into landscape grew naturally from the discipline's beginnings in historic preservation. The reconstruction of historically important sites such as Jamestown, based on archaeological as well as textual evidence, was often the reconstruction of past landscapes. Archaeology of formal gardens has been a particularly fertile subfield in historical archaeology (Beaudry, 1996; Brown and Samford, 1990; Leone, 1989; Leone et al., 1988; Metheny et al., 1996; Upton, 1988), where documentation of both garden owners and their built environments is frequently available to aid interpretation and where the units of analysis are landscapes that "were usually designed and created to be seen and experienced" (Rotman and Nassaney, 1997:42). Garden archaeology therefore moved rapidly from garden reconstruction to analysis of the use of formal gardens to communicate messages about social order and status. Garden archaeology has yielded significant studies that are both explicit and inherent. Metheny et al.'s (1996) careful presentation of garden archaeology method at the Morven estate marries explicit method and inherent interpretation, linking excavated landscape features to an "emic grid" of perspective based on historical landscaping practices and architectural analysis.

Gardens are formally designed landscapes that are consciously designed to reflect the real or desired economic, social, or political status of their builders. Gardens may be considered according to how they conform to such formal aesthetic standards as the Georgian order or traditional English landscape gardens, or they may convey the owner's ability to tame wilderness (Kealhofer, 1999). In their physical construction, formal gardens force visitors to experience them from a strictly controlled perspective. Landscape archaeology of gardens attends to "how the organization of sight, control of movement, and the structure and pattern of space construct our subjectivity—our sense of who we are and how we relate to one another and to the world around us" (Kryder-Reid, 1996:228–229).

Spatiality of Power Relations

Landscape approaches are useful tools for those historical archaeologists who study the material reflections of power relations. Power is reflected in the landscape both through differential access to resources (Hautaniemi and Rotman, 2003; Paynter, 1982) and the manipulation of the built environment to reproduce and naturalize the existing (or desired) ideology of the powerful. Nassaney and Abel (2000) write, "In industrial capitalism, the built environment is a material expression of order and control that is designed to maximize profit through spatial hegemony." The built environment may be constructed to physically constrain workers, to discourage labor organization, to facilitate surveillance, or simply to inspire awe of a land- or factory owner's power over nature. The spatial components of power relations have been apparent in the historical archaeology of work sites (Beaudry and Mrozowski, 2001; Nassaney and

Abel, 2000; Mrozowski et al., 1996; Pappas, 2004; Shackel and Larsen, 2000) and plantations (Delle, 1999, 2000; Epperson, 2000; Young, 2003).

Manipulation of space is not, however, exclusively a tool of the powerful. Several historical archaeological studies (Branton, 2004; Casella, 2001; Delle, 2000; Ruppel et al., 2003; Shackel and Larsen, 2000) have uncovered the manipulation of space and the built environment by subaltern groups, especially as strategies of resistance. The spatial construction of mining towns illustrates not only the almost complete control that mine owners exerted over their workers but also the gender, status, and ethnic divisions maintained among miners themselves (Baxter, 2002; Hardesty, 1998; Lawrence, 1998). Frequently, subordinated groups manipulate their spaces in order to create private places where activities may occur outside of the view of the powerful. This issue of surveillance is an emerging issue in the spatiality of power relations in historical archaeology (Epperson, 2000). The spatiality of resistance also includes symbolic identification with culturally critical places, such as memorials.

Pappas's (2004) analysis of community structure in a California logging camp illustrates the use of spatial organization to facilitate corporate paternalism. At considerable cost and difficulty, the Pickering Logging Corporation designed the Soap Creek Pass camp in a way that encouraged nested households within the larger context of the camp. Families were provided increased privacy in "family areas," while remaining on the site to model appropriate family living for single loggers. Bachelors, meanwhile, were housed in the central area of the camp in mobile buildings that suited their transient status; these single-laborer cabins were located so as to be visible at all times from their supervisors' homes.

Interior Space, Public and Private

Until recently, interior space received relatively little scholarly attention from historical archaeologists applying a landscape paradigm. This disparity reflects the discipline's neglect of the household in general rather than any substantive difference between the way humans experience indoor and outdoor space. Indeed, "human activity, cultural expression, political statements, and reflections on worldviews occur within the bounded spaces of structures as well [as the outside world]" (Rotman, 2003:5). When archaeologists do treat interior space, they often do so as part of a larger discourse of private and public space and the "spheres of separation" associated with gender relations. In this treatment, private space is considered feminine, and public masculine. Places that are literally outside the house, such as house yards and exterior kitchens, are usually considered interior space by archaeologists, since much domestic labor and household relations occur in these places.

Barile and Brandon's (2004) volume presents several papers with innovative attention to the intersection of space and gender, particularly in the archaeology of households. An early example of archaeological treatment of private, interior space (although literally "outside" the house) is Leone's (1978) study of Mormon fences. Leone recognizes not only the ecological function of fences that protected agricultural spaces from wind but also the ways that fences around house lots created private spaces within a very public religious community. He summarizes, "In a town where the social structure was based on equal property and close cooperation, and where order was maintained through everybody knowing everybody else's business, fences drew the literal line between closeness and privacy" (Leone, 1978:198). More recently, Baxter (2002:25) describes the efforts Victorian oil workers and their families made to "separate home from work, to distance the smells of the kitchen from smoke-belching boilers, and the strum of the guitar on the porch from the pounding of the drill," by locating their homes a long distance from their work sites, using landforms as visual barriers between public and private space.

Heritage

A significant subfield in the historical archaeology of landscape pertains to memorials. This is the deliberate commemoration of certain highly visible places—at the expense of other places—in the

interest of the production of heritage. The term "heritage" is usually reserved for the conscious reproduction of public memory through the commemoration of historically critical events in the national identity of Americans since the late nineteenth century (Lowenthal, 1998; Shackel, 2000:177); it is a uniquely modern, nationalistic phenomenon. Heritage attends to official memorials and official histories, and by implication, to the privileging of certain histories over those of less powerful social groups. The scale at which a place is commemorated reflects a social group's structural power. However, the commemoration of special places associated with culturally significant events is not limited to "official memory" (Shackel 2003). Historical archaeology is giving increasing attention to the memorials of subordinate groups (Brown, 2001; Dubel, 2001; Horning, 2001; Whitley et al., 1999).

Most historical archaeology concerned with heritage and memorials has focused on national memorials or sites that played a role in some critical national event, especially an armed conflict (Baker, 2000; Dubel, 2001; Ireland, 2003; McGirr, 2003; Saunders, 2001; Shackel, 2001a, 2004). As Brown (2001:103) observes, "as a military struggle ends, the war of words and meanings begins." These are contested landscapes, and archaeologists are understandably concerned with the misuse of their work as "proving" what they consider a single narrative in a contested history. Construction of a memorial is never a politically neutral event. "One of the most effective ways of monopolizing the telling of history is to establish permanent or 'official' memorials at key historical sites" since "such memorials usually serve the interests of some living individuals or factions at the expense of others" (Novak and Kopp, 2003:102).

The discourse of heritage articulates with archaeology for two reasons. First, academic interest in the archaeology of history (as opposed to prehistory, which is more widely identified with an ethnographic "other") is intrinsically linked to colonialism and modern political interests; it is the archaeology of "us" (Ireland, 2003:62–63). Second, the conflict over interpretation of contested places is essentially a conflict over the meaning and the use of material culture. This contested material culture may be the artifacts interpreted at sites, the physical environment of sites, or memorials themselves, along with the interpretation provided for visitors' consumption. Historical archaeologists often struggle with this situation and search for ways of mitigating the privileging effect of memorials. Leone (1978:193) summarizes, "History may be the commonly agreed-on lie but, for that common agreement to be sustained and realized in individuals, they must see it for themselves." The physical immediacy and seeming neutrality of artifacts can be dangerous, especially when presented in a museum case. As Leone suggests, context is critical to combating the misuse of historical archaeological data for political ends, as is the fair presentation of unflattering information and alternate narratives of historical events. Heritage archaeology is primarily concerned with unpacking the multiple meanings of memorials and presenting the context from which places draw their power. Heritage archaeology draws attention to the ways that memorials legitimize particular interpretation of the past and encourage the forgetting of competing interpretations (Shackel, 2001a); therefore, heritage is always in some way about power.

Heritage archaeology is also concerned with the memorialization behaviors—ceremonies, commemorations, and interpretation—that occur at significant places (Schofield and Johnson, 2006). As such, the archaeology of heritage suggests a fourth line of evidence to historical archaeology. In addition to artifacts, texts, and oral history, it is essential that archaeologists who study memorials draw on the ongoing behaviors connected to sites. This evidence may take the form of stories (both formal and "vernacular") told at the site, visitation, and other forms of commemoration. Shackel and Palus (2006) talk about "remembering industrial landscapes" and the fact that histories of the working class are often downplayed or omitted in the "official" memories of these places. Monuments may also be "sites of consumption" (Blake, 2004:242), where the unique behavior of tourism offers visitors the opportunity to consume a piece of localized and objectified history. This form of place consumption may not be unique among landscapes (Basso, 1996) but certainly represents a departure from the "inside meaning" of places, as it is deliberately oriented toward outsiders. Place consumption brings outsiders in through the creation of nostalgia for a time or cultural setting that may never have actually existed.

Place and Identity

With the emergence of inherent approaches to landscape archaeology, archaeologists have turned (along with geographers and anthropologists) their attention to the ways that space, and especially culturally significant places, figure in the formation and reproduction of identity. At its most basic level, space can be correlated with identity in terms of territory, the bounded space in which a given group resides or which the group identifies as "theirs." Individual places also hold great power as landmarks of key events in a group's identity formation. The built environment may reflect the ways that people strategically modify their surroundings to communicate their role in society or modify the way they are perceived or remembered.

Kealhofer (1999) provides a compelling example of the archaeology of identity and place in her study of constructed landscapes in colonial Virginia. Early settlers, intent on creating new lives for themselves, consciously transformed their new environments in order to authenticate their new identities (Kealhofer, 1999:58; see also Winer, 2001). Kealhofer's data illustrate the multiple scales at which landscape is constituted and nested: spatial (garden and tobacco plantations), material (built, planted, and cleared places), and social (household, plantation, and community). These varying scales of landscape are linked to scales of identity at the level of individual, family, and community. The construction of small-scale landscapes, such as gardens, allowed colonists to make physical their conceived landscape (that of the triumph of ordered plantings over wilderness) before it could be constituted on the larger regional scale.

Case Study in Landscape, Identity, Power, and Memory: The Internment Eventscape

As these themes illustrate, historical archaeology has become increasingly concerned with the political struggle over identity and history in stratified societies. Landscape is a powerful tool in this line of inquiry. Landscape provides archaeologists a lens through which to examine the ways that people use their environments as tools of self-definition and a means to legitimize and naturalize that identity. The following case study illustrates these issues as a part of a special kind of archaeological landscape that results from people's participation in culturally critical events.

Following the Japanese military attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, President Franklin D. Roosevelt responded to anti-Asian hysteria within the United States by issuing Executive Order 9066, designating secure areas along the Pacific Coast from which all "persons of Japanese ancestry" were soon forbidden. A total of 117,000 people, two-thirds of which were U.S. citizens, were interned in relocation centers in desolate areas of the continental interior portion of the United States.

The War Relocation Centers (commonly called "camps" or "internment camps," although "internment" literally refers to the detaining of enemy aliens) were enormous, hastily constructed complexes whose boundaries were demarcated by barbed wire, armed guards, and signs marking restricted areas—internees could be, and were, shot for crossing such boundaries. Former-internees' memories of these places are marked by physical descriptions of the desolation of their location, the barrenness of the camp layouts, the way that dust storms filled their barracks, and the lack of privacy.

Archaeology and Oral History

The archaeology of Japanese American internment during World War II is ideally suited for a landscape approach. Internment was profoundly spatial, involving the "internal exile" of over 100,000 people in desolate areas of the continental interior. The space of the War Relocation Centers, although not specifically designed to create a sense of alienation, nonetheless dramatically communicated the internees' prisoner status. Internees lived in identical, anonymous barracks that were so hastily built that large spaces were left between the boards—allowing dust, cold, noise, and prying eyes into the living quarters. Families were assigned to a single barrack room, and the showers and toilets were located in large, open rooms.

Internees were not, however, entirely powerless over their environment. They borrowed or stole construction materials and fabric to create privacy with room dividers and curtains. Internees organized work details to construct bathroom stalls and Japanese-style tubs (T. Norikane, in Branton, 2004:136), and eventually gardens, walkways, cemeteries, and recreation facilities. All of these physical elements are part of the internment landscape, which includes the War Relocation Centers, the U.S. Department of Justice camps in which Japanese American community leaders were held, and the Assembly Centers to which internees were first evacuated. The temporal boundaries of the internment landscape are not limited to the years (1942–1946) in which Japanese Americans were incarcerated. The landscape of internment continues to have meaning to Japanese Americans today. After the camps were closed, and internees had restarted their lives, they maintained a quiet attachment to the places of internment, visiting their former camps, collecting artifacts, and signaling this attachment by asking Japanese American strangers upon meeting, "What camp were you in?"

Power and Privacy

Although the War Relocation Centers were largely demolished upon closing, archaeological and oral historical investigations (Branton, 2004; Burton, 1996; Burton et al., 2002) have begun to reveal data about the built environment of internment sites and the ongoing role that landscape has played in internment resistance. Contrary to the official history of internment, archaeology and oral history indicate that Japanese Americans did not (and do not) go along compliantly with their incarceration.

Ceramics recovered from the Manzanar War Relocation Center landfill suggest that female internees may have served tea and other traditional foods in their barracks, despite rules forbidding cooking. Along with the distinctive vitreous, white-bodied earthenware (hotelware) dishes issued by the U.S. Quartermaster Corps (and manufactured in the United States) for use in the camp mess halls, the Manzanar landfill contained numerous oriental porcelain tablewares in such traditional Japanese forms as tea and rice bowls, sauce dishes, and sake cups and bottles (non–U.S. made) (Branton, 2004; Majewski, 1996).

Oral and documentary data confirm that internees held occasional parties in their barracks and valued the ability to invite friends "home" for snacks. This food sharing may have been a strategy for resisting the negative effects of mess-hall dining on the family. Manzanar's internees were required to take their meals in the camp's mess halls, with the result that families no longer shared meals together, and children spent markedly less time with their parents and grandparents than they had prior to relocation. Like the construction of barriers and curtains, providing even small meals in the barracks was a strident attempt to create a sense of normalcy for families and friends. For interned women, this creation of "home spaces" within the very public barracks setting represented a reaffirmation of their identities as traditional homemakers and challenged their imposed identities as prisoners.

Historians and social scientists who have studied relocation have long dismissed the idea of Japanese American resistance with the term *shikataganai*, a Japanese phrase meaning "it cannot be helped." However, some internees did resist, especially through this kind of everyday resistance (Scott, 1985). Internees stole food and building materials, smuggled such contraband as cameras and alcohol into the camps, and engaged in antiadministration and antigovernment humor.

The most overt form of internee resistance occurred when the U.S. government began drafting young Japanese American men from inside the camps. For 315 of these young men, who became known as the Resisters of Conscience, the irony of being called upon to fulfill the duties of citizenship while being denied its privileges was too great; they refused to report for their physical exams. Because they were called on as individuals, many saw their draft notices as their first opportunity to directly challenge the violation of their civil rights. They considered their actions patriotic and hoped that their actions would bring attention to the unconstitutional incarceration of their families. As Resister of Conscience, Joe Norikane (in Branton, 2004:121) explained, "if you're going to fight for your country and your homes, I ain't going to go die for my home in the concentration camp." They were labeled draft

dodgers, and all were imprisoned and fined for Selective Service violations.

The resisters' decision to protest was extremely unpopular in the atmosphere of "200% citizenship" in the camps. The post-war Japanese American community invested its identity in its perseverance under mistreatment and especially in the extraordinary record of the all–Japanese American 442nd Regimental Combat Team, the most decorated unit of its size in World War II. In this setting, the Resisters of Conscience were made to feel ashamed of the stand that they took against internment, and many never spoke of their wartime experiences until very recently.

The Gordon Hirabayashi Recreation Site

Again, the built environment was instrumental in uncovering evidence of internment resistance. Following the Redress movement (in which the U.S. government apologized and paid reparations to former internees), Japanese Americans began actively working toward preserving and formally memorializing internment sites. Today, nearly all of the War Relocation Center sites have some kind of formal interpretation or historical designation. The struggle for these memorials has also been the struggle over *which* internment history will be preserved. At most sites, the narrative of the Resisters of Conscience has been suppressed.

In 1999, the Coronado National Forest dedicated a unique internment memorial, the Gordon Hirabayashi Recreation Site. The memorial is located at the site of the former Catalina Federal Honor Camp, a prison work camp in the mountains of southern Arizona that housed 45 Resisters of Conscience and Gordon Hirabayashi, one of only three Japanese Americans to legally challenge relocation itself. The Honor Camp resisters, who call themselves "Tucsonians," have retained an attachment to this place and have held reunions since the 1940s. Several of the Honor Camp resisters attended the dedication and participated in an oral historical study of their wartime experiences and relationships with the camp. As a result, the history of internment that is presented at this site includes the Resisters of Conscience.

That the Honor Camp exists as place only in the context of a bounded social group should be evident to any outsider who visits it. The sense of this place is not apparent in the broken concrete slabs that remain at the site but rather in the way that Japanese Americans identify, imagine, remember, and contest this place as associated with the experience of internment and resistance and the multiple ways it is metaphorically tied to their identity as an ethnicity and as a community of Americans (after Feld and Basso, 1996:11). Part of the significance of this place is the way that it facilitates storytelling, particularly instructional storytelling about appropriate American behavior, intended to "transform and further empower" (Low, 1994) future generations.

Many of the "Tucsonians" told stories at and about the Honor Camp that they had never told before, with the intention of "correcting" the official history of internment. Without exception, the Tucsonians related their experiences not to being Japanese American, but to being American and to standing up for their Constitutional rights. They also talked about the community of the Tucsonians, how they identified not only as Resisters of Conscience but also as a community tied to the Honor Camp. Many referenced how important they felt it was to finally tell younger generations of Japanese Americans about the unique stand that they made for their civil rights. All expressed a feeling that all Americans should be prepared to make personal sacrifices like theirs in order to uphold the Constitution, since "the constitution is just a piece of paper. It's the people who got to protect that" (Taguma, in Branton, 2004:123).

The naming of the Honor Camp site as the Gordon Hirabayashi Recreation Site reflects the fact that part of the power of this place is derived from its association with a particular person. Hirabayashi was not a Resister of Conscience (he did not resist the draft). Rather than assembling with his neighbors for removal to the relocation centers, Hirabayashi presented himself to the U.S. Federal Bureau of Investigation with a statement explaining that he could not participate in relocation because it was unconstitutional. He was sentenced to serve four months in prison. Forty years after his conviction, Hirabayashi's case was reopened based on previously suppressed evidence and his conviction overturned. The case prompted a federal commission to rule that the internment of Japanese Americans during World War II

was motivated by racial prejudice, wartime hysteria, and failed political leadership. Many Japanese American visitors to the site, including the Resisters of Conscience and other Conscientious Objectors who served time there, identify the importance of the place with him, even though he spent only a few months there.

The fact that most Japanese Americans have not spent time at the Honor Camp does not diminish its importance to the broader Japanese American community. The meaning of the place reflects Japanese Americans' self-definition (Greider and Garkovich, 1994:10). As examples of how Japanese Americans have acted in defense of civil rights, the Resisters of Conscience and Gordon Hirabayashi are tied to Japanese American identity as *Americans*. That a place still exists where these individuals came together and where their story has been recognized and told to a new audience is the fulfillment of a quest to be recognized as legitimate Americans that began with internment. The Honor Camp is a memorial that actively and overtly communicates. It has an agenda to inform its visitors, both Japanese American and otherwise, about a hidden history. The Honor Camp exemplifies Shackel's (2001a:666) contention that visible and visited places like national parks and forests make ideal "arenas for negotiating meanings of the past."

The Tucsonians who participated in the Gordon Hirabayashi Recreation Site dedication and subsequent oral history project consider the site a place to educate people, especially young Japanese Americans, about the "real" history of internment. Their goals take two forms: first, they want their stories told, their counter-memories of resistance included alongside the officially sanctioned stories of the veterans. The resisters' second goal is to educate all visitors to the site about the constitutional issues they challenged through their resistance. The Tucsonians hope that, by using the site to convey the story of Gordon Hirabayashi and the Resisters of Conscience to a new audience, they may shape future generations in accordance with their values of civil rights. They are actively involved in place-making through the commemoration of the Honor Camp and communicating the meaning of the place in verbal and written stories (Basso, 1996; Tuan, 1991).

The persistence of places like the Gordon Hirabayashi Recreation Site suggests a unique kind of landscape. An *eventscape* (after Stoffle et al., 2000:9) consists of a network of thematically connected places associated with a social group's participation in a culturally critical, persistent event—often associated with the emergence of an ethnic or community identity. Eventscape encompasses not only locations within a landscape but also the behaviors such as commemoration, storytelling, visitation, and instruction in appropriate behavior that take place at those sites as part of the cultural transmission of information about the event across generations. The internment eventscape is instrumental in incorporating new generations of Japanese Americans into the internment story. The Gordon Hirabayashi Recreation Site is a landmark of resistance, not only because of the Resisters of Conscience who were imprisoned there but also because of its function as a mouthpiece for the lost histories that are now challenging the master narrative of relocation. It is at this particular place that Resisters of Conscience are finally able to share their stories of the contested past and gain equal standing with Japanese American veterans (Branton, 2004). It has been appropriated (Basso, 1996:143), not only by its former prisoners and their families but also by the Japanese American community, as a place that expresses their identity as Americans, an identity that they have negotiated and sought recognition of since December 7, 1941.

Future Directions

Landscape has been a part of historical archaeology since its garden archaeology and site-reconstruction beginnings. As increasingly recent and complex history falls under the umbrella of historical archaeology, archaeologists have tremendous opportunities to influence the direction of landscape theory development in archaeology and beyond. Historical events such as post–World War II suburban community development, creation of modern utopian communities such as ecovillages, and memorialization of the Vietnam War and the American Civil Rights movement are excellent data sets for testing assumptions about the role of place and space in stratified, factionalized, power-laden settings.

In order for landscape theory to become more than a theoretical trend, however, historical archaeologists must be more deliberate in their usage of landscape terminology. As noted above, the building blocks of landscape—place, space, power, access, and the use of landscapes—are nebulous concepts that require concrete examples in order to define their edges. The range of human behaviors associated with places is just as slippery. A greater body of deliberate landscape archaeology work is needed. Historical archaeologists must clearly define the boundaries and reference social groups of the landscapes they study, particularly in situations of nested landscapes and multiethnic or otherwise stratified societies. They must also be explicit in the units of observation and analysis they use in landscape studies, rather than lumping all "natural" or "built" elements into a messy but convenient stew they call "landscape." Moreover, the simplistic usage of landscape simply as a scale of analysis must be replaced by a deliberate analysis of the ecological, economic, and social components that make landscape a meaningful analytical tool.

Toward the end of bridging explicit and inherent approaches, it is essential that historical archaeologists test the assumptions underlying landscape theory. That is, do people assign space based on differential power or rank? Are landscape values such as height, proximity to resources, and "order" versus "wildness" universally positive? Do people always attach meaning to places and, if so, does this vary according to the mobility of groups or a group's newness to a setting? Do people who enter a new environment cluster together or spread out? Finally, who builds the built environment? In other words, in a designed landscape such as a company town, who decides where things are built, and is this power shared across multiple factions? Answering these foundational questions about the materiality of social space is critical to making landscape theory useful across archaeology.

Answers may come from simply building a body of archaeological studies of space, but landscape theory may benefit even more from ethnoarchaeological studies of modern built environments. New "master-planned" housing developments, contested monuments, office buildings, artist colonies, and green housing communities are ideal laboratories for testing landscape models and clarifying the assumptions about space, place, and power that underlie them.

As the case study above demonstrates, monuments and memorials are also fertile ground for observing landscapes and landscape behavior unfolding. As lightning rods of identity, "big places" like the Manzanar War Relocation Center, the World Trade Center, the New York African Burial Ground, and the Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site in Colorado give archaeologists an opportunity to directly observe not only how places become important to people but also the multitude of place behaviors that occur there. At the World Trade Center Memorial, for example, one can study not only memorial creation but also the development of master narrative, commemoration, differential strategic power, pilgrimage, place consumption, and the influence of eventscapes on emerging identities. By applying these landscape models to such recent memorials, historical archaeologists may also achieve the Holy Grail of archaeology, making the study of the past relevant to the present by identifying appropriate ways for preserving and commemorating culturally significant places.

References

Anschuetz, K.F., Wilshusen, R.H., and Scheick, C.L., 2001, An Archaeology of Landscapes: Perspectives and Directions. *Journal of Archaeological Research* 9:157–211.

Ashmore, W., 2004, Social Archaeologies of Landscape. In *A Companion to Social Archaeology,* edited by L. Meskell and R.W. Preucel, pp. 255–271. Blackwell, Malden, Massachusetts.

Baker, F., 2000, The Berlin Wall: Production, Preservation and Consumption of a 20th-Century Monument. In *Landscapes from Antiquity,* edited by S. Stoddart, pp. 289–316. Antiquity Publications, Cambridge.

Barile, K.S., and Brandon, J.C., editors, 2004, *Household Chores and Household Choices: Theorizing the Domestic Sphere in Historical Archaeology*. University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa.

Basso, K.H., 1996, *Wisdom Sits in Places: Landscape and Language among the Western Apache*. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.

Baxter, R.S., 2002, Industrial and Domestic Landscapes of a California Oil Field. *Historical Archaeology* 36(3):18–27.

Beaudry, M.C., 1996, Why Gardens? In *Landscape Archaeology: Reading and Interpreting the American Historical Landscape,* edited by R. Yamin and K.B. Metheny, pp. 3–5. University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville.

Beaudry, M.C., and Mrozowski, S.A., 2001, Cultural Space and Worker Identity in the Company City:

Nineteenth-Century Lowell, Massachusetts. In *The Archaeology of Urban Landscapes,* edited by A. Mayne and T. Murray, pp. 118–131. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Bender, B., editor, 1993, *Landscape: Politics and Perspectives*. Berg, Providence.

Blake, E., 2004, Space, Spatiality, and Archaeology. In *A Companion to Social Archaeology,* edited by L. Meskell and R.W. Preucel, pp. 230–254. Blackwell, Malden, Massachusetts.

Branton, N., 2004, *Drawing the Line: Places of Power in the Japanese-American Internment Eventscape*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Arizona, Tucson. University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Brown, G., 2001, Wounded Knee: The Conflict of Interpretation. In *Myth, Memory, and the Making of the American Landscape,* edited by P.A. Shackel, pp. 103–118. University Press of Florida, Gainesville.

Brown, M.R., and Samford, P.M., 1990, Recent Evidence of Eighteenth-Century Gardening in Williamsburg, Virginia. In *Earth Patterns: Essays in Landscape Archaeology*, edited by W.M. Kelso and R. Most, pp. 103–121. University Press of Virginia, Charlottesville.

Burton, J.F., editor, 1996, *Three Farewells to Manzanar: The Archaeology of Manzanar National Historic Site, California*. USDI National Park Service, Western Archeological and Conservation Center, Tucson, Arizona.

Burton, J.F., Farrell, M.M., Lord, F.B., and Lord, R.W., 2002, *Confinement and Ethnicity: An Overview of World War II Japanese American Relocation Sites*. University of Washington Press, Seattle.

Casella, E.C., 2001, Landscapes of Punishment and Resistance: A Female Convict Settlement in Tasmania, Australia. In *Contested Landscapes: Movement, Exile and Place,* edited by B. Bender and M. Winer, pp. 103–120. Berg, Oxford.

De Cunzo, L.A., and Ernstein, J.H., 2006, Landscapes, Ideology and Experience in Historical Archaeology. In *The Cambridge Companion to Historical Archaeology,* edited by D. Hicks and M. Beaudry, pp. 255–270. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Delle, J.A., 1999, The Landscapes of Class Negotiation on Coffee Plantations in the Blue Mountains of Jamaica, 1790–1850. *Historical Archaeology* 33(1):136–158.

Delle, J.A., 2000, Gender, Power, and Space: Negotiating Social Relations under Slavery on Coffee Plantations in Jamaica, 1790–1834. In *Lines That Divide: Historical Archaeologies of Race, Class, and Gender,* edited by J.A. Delle, S.A. Mrozowski and R. Paynter, pp. 168–201. University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville.

Dubel, J., 2001, Remembering a Japanese-American Concentration Camp at Manzanar National Historic Site. In *Myth, Memory, and the Making of the American Landscape,* edited by P.A. Shackel, pp. 85–102. University of Florida Press, Gainesville.

Dunnell, R.C., 1992, The Notion Site. In *Space, Time, and Archaeological Landscapes,* edited by J. Rossignol and L.A. Wandsnider, pp. 21–42. Plenum Press, New York.

Epperson, T.W., 2000, Panoptic Plantations: The Garden Sights of Thomas Jefferson and George Mason. In *Lines That Divide: Historical Archaeologies of Race, Class, and Gender,* edited by J.A. Delle, S.A. Mrozowski, and R. Paynter, pp. 58–77. University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville.

Feld, S., and Basso, K.H., 1996, Introduction. In *Senses of Place,* edited by S. Feld and K.H. Basso, pp. 3–12. School of American Research Press, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Gosden, C., and Head, L., 1994, Landscape—A Usefully Ambiguous Concept. *Archaeology in Oceania* 29:113–116.

Greider, T., and Garkovich, L., 1994, Landscapes: The Social Construction of Nature and the Environment. *Rural Sociology* 59:1–21.

Hall, E.T., 1969, *The Hidden Dimension*. Doubleday Anchor, Garden City, New York.

Hardesty, D.L., 1998, Power and the Industrial Mining Community in the American West. In *Social Approaches to an Industrial Past: The Archaeology and Anthropology of Mining,* edited by B.L. Knapp, V.C. Pigott, and E.W. Herbert, pp. 81–95. Routledge, London.

Hardesty, D.L., 2003, Mining Rushes and Landscape Learning in the Modern World. In *Colonization of Unfamiliar Landscapes: The Archaeology of Adaptation,* edited by M. Rockman and J. Steele, pp. 81–96. Routledge, London.

Hautaniemi, S.I., and Rotman, D.L., 2003, To the Hogs or to the House? Municipal Water and Gender Relations at the Moors Site in Deerfield, Massachusetts. In *Shared Spaces and Divided Places: Material Dimensions of Gender Relations and the American Historical Landscape,* edited by D.L. Rotman and E-R. Savulis, pp. 135–159. University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville.

Hirsch, E., 1995, Landscape: Between Place and Space. In *The Anthropology of Landscape: Perspectives on Place and Space,* edited by E. Hirsch and M. O'Hanlon, pp. 1–30. Clarendon, Oxford.

Hirsch, E., and O'Hanlon, M., editors, 1995, *The Anthropology of Landscape*. Clarendon, Oxford.

Holtorf, C., and Williams, H., 2006, Landscapes and Memories. In *The Cambridge Companion to Historical Archaeology,* edited by D. Hicks and M. Beaudry, pp. 235–254. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Horning, A.J., 2001, Of Saints and Sinners: Mythic Landscapes of the Old and New South. In *Myth, Memory, and the Making of the American Landscape,* edited by P.A. Shackel, pp. 21–46. University Press of Florida, Gainesville.

Ireland, T., 2003, The Absence of Ghosts: Landscape and Identity in the Archaeology of Australia's Settler Culture. *Historical Archaeology* 37(1):56–72.

Johnson, M., 2007, *Ideas of Landscape*. Blackwell, Malden, Massachusetts.

Kealhofer, L., 1999, Creating Social Identity in the Landscape: Tidewater, Virginia, 1600–1750. In *Archaeologies of Landscape: Contemporary Perspectives,* edited by W. Ashmore and A.B. Knapp, pp. 58–81. Blackwell, Oxford.

Knapp, A.B., and Ashmore, W., 1999, Archaeological Landscapes: Constructed, Conceptualized, Ideational. In *Archaeologies of Landscape: Contemporary Perspectives,* edited by W. Ashmore and A.B. Knapp, pp. 1–30. Blackwell, Oxford.

Kryder-Reid, E., 1996, The Construction of Sanctity: Landscape and Ritual in a Religious Community. In *Landscape Archaeology: Reading and Interpreting the American Historical Landscape,* edited by R. Yamin and K.B. Metheny, pp. 228–248. University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville.

Lawrence, S., 1998, Gender and Community Structure on Australian Colonial Goldfields. In *Social Approaches*

to an Industrial Past: The Archaeology and Anthropology of Mining, edited by A.B. Knapp, V.C. Pigott, and E.W. Herbert, pp. 39–58. Routledge, London.

Lekson, S.H., 1996, Landscape with Ruins: Archaeological Approaches to Built and Unbuilt Environments. *Current Anthropology* 37:886–892.

Leone, M.P., 1978, Archaeology as the Science of Technology: Mormon Town Plans and Fences. In *Historical Archaeology: A Guide to Substantive and Theoretical Contributions,* edited by R.L. Schuyler, pp. 191–200. Baywood, Farmingdale, New York.

Leone, M.P., 1989, Issues in Historic Landscapes and Gardens. *Historical Archaeology* 23(1):44–47.

Leone, M.P., Kryder-Reid, E., Ernstein, J.H., and Shackel, P.A., 1988, Power Gardens of Annapolis. *Archaeology* 42(2):34–37, 74–75.

Low, S.M., 1994, Cultural Conservation of Place. In *Conserving Culture: A New Discourse of Heritage,* edited by M. Hufford, pp. 66–77. American Folklife Center, University of Illinois Press, Urbana.

Lowenthal, D., 1986, Introduction. In *Landscape Meanings and Values,* edited by E.C. Penning-Rowsell and D. Lowenthal, pp. 1– 2. Allen and Unwin, London.

Lowenthal, D., 1998, *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Lozny, L.R., editor, 2006, *Landscapes under Pressure: Theory and Practice of Cultural Heritage Research and Preservation*. Springer, New York.

Majewski, T., 1996, Historical Ceramics. In *Three Farewells to Manzanar: The Archeology of Manzanar National Historic Site, California*, by Jeffery F. Burton, Part 3: Appendices and References, pp. 793–862 (Appendix D). Publications in Anthropology No. 67. USDI National Park Service, Western Archeological and Conservation Center, Tucson.

Marquardt, W.H., and Crumley, C.L., 1987, Theoretical Issues in the Analysis of Spatial Patterning. In *Regional Dynamics: Burgundian Landscapes in Historical Perspective,* edited by C.L. Crumley and W.H. Marquardt, pp. 1–18. Academic Press, San Diego, California.

McGirr, P.L., 2003, The Vietnam Veterans Memorial: Landscape and Gender in the Twentieth Century. In *Shared Spaces and Divided Places: Material Dimensions of Gender Relations and the American Historical Landscape,* edited by D.L. Rotman and E-R. Savulis, pp. 62–85. University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville.

Meltzer, D.J., 2003, Lessons in Landscape Learning. In *Colonization of Unfamiliar Landscapes: The Archaeology of Adaptation,* edited by M. Rockman and J. Steele, pp. 222–241. Routledge, London.

Metheny, K.B., 1996, Landscape Archaeology. In *The Oxford Companion to Archaeology,* edited by B.M. Fagan, pp. 384–385. Oxford University Press, New York.

Metheny, K.B., Kratzer, J., Yentsch, A.E., and Goodwin, C.M., 1996, Method in Landscape Archaeology: Research Strategies in a Historic New Jersey Garden. In *Landscape Archaeology: Reading and Interpreting the American Historical Landscape,* edited by R. Yamin and K.B. Metheny, pp. 6–31. University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville.

Mrozowski, S.A., Ziesing, G.H., and Beaudry, M.C., 1996, *Living on the Boott: Historical Archaeology at the Boott Mills Boardinghouses of Lowell, Massachusetts*. University of Massachusetts Press, Amherst.

Nassaney, M.S., and Abel, M.R., 2000, Urban Spaces, Labor Organization, and Social Control: Lessons from New England's Nineteenth-Century Cutlery Industry. In *Lines That Divide: Historical Archaeologies of Race, Class, and Gender,* edited by J.A. Delle, S.A. Mrozowski, and R. Paynter, pp. 239–275. University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville.

Novak, S.A., and Kopp, D., 2003, To Feed a Tree in Zion: Osteological Analysis of the 1857 Mountain Meadows Massacre. *Historical Archaeology* 37(2):85–108.

Pappas, E., 2004, Fictive Kin in the Mountains: The Paternalistic Metaphor and Households in a California Logging Camp. In *Household Chores and Household Choices: Theorizing the Domestic Sphere in Historical Archaeology,* edited by K.S. Barile and J.C. Brandon, pp. 159–178. University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa.

Pauls, E.P., 2006, The Place of Space: Architecture, Landscape, and Social Life. In *Historical Archaeology,* edited by M. Hall and S.W. Silliman, pp. 65–83. Blackwell, Malden, Massachusetts.

Paynter, R., 1982, *Models of Spatial Inequality: Settlement Patterns in Historical Archaeology*. Academic Press, New York.

Penning-Rowsell, E.C., and Lowenthal, D., editors, 1986, *Landscape Meanings and Values*. Allen and Unwin, London.

Preucel, R. W., and Meskell, L., 2004, Places. In *A Companion to Social Archaeology,* edited by L. Meskell and R.W. Preucel, pp. 215–229. Blackwell, Malden, Massachusetts.

Rockman, M., 2003, Knowledge and Learning in the Archaeology of Colonization. In *Colonization of Unfamiliar Landscapes: The Archaeology of Adaptation,* edited by M. Rockman and J. Steele, pp. 3–24. Routledge, London.

Rodman, M.C., 1992, Empowering Place: Multilocality and Multivocality. *American Anthropologist* 94:640–656.

Rossignol, J., 1992, Concepts, Methods, and Theory Building: A Landscape Approach. In *Space, Time, and Archaeological Landscapes,* edited by J. Rossignol and L.A. Wandsnider, pp. 3–20. Plenum Press, New York.

Rotman, D.L., 2003, Exploring Shared Spaces and Divided Places on the American Historical Landscape. In *Shared Spaces and Divided Places: Material Dimensions of Gender Relations and the American Historical Landscape,* edited by D.L. Rotman and E-R. Savulis, pp. 1–23. University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Rotman, D.L., and Nassaney, M.S., 1997, Class, Gender, and the Built Environment: Deriving Social Relations from Cultural Landscapes in Southwest Michigan. *Historical Archaeology* 31(2):42–62.

Ruppel, T., Neuwirth, J., Leone, M.P., and Fry, G-M., 2003, Hidden in View: African Spiritual Spaces in North American Landscapes. *Antiquity* 77:321–335.

Sauer, C.O., 1925, The Morphology of Landscape. In *Land and Life: Selections from the Writings of Carl Ortwin Sauer,* edited by J. Leighly, pp. 315–350. University of California Press, Berkeley.

Saunders, N.J., 2001, Matter and Memory in the Landscapes of Conflict: The Western Front 1914–1999. In *Contested Landscapes: Movement, Exile and Place,* edited by B. Bender and M. Winer, pp. 37–54. Berg, Oxford.

Schofield, J., and Johnson, W.G., 2006, Archaeology, Heritage, and the Recent and Contemporary Past. In *The Cambridge Companion to Historical Archaeology,* edited by D. Hicks and M. Beaudry, pp. 104–122. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Scott, J.C., 1985, *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. Yale University Press, New Haven, Connecticut.

Shackel, P.A., 2000, *Archaeology and Created Memory: Public History in a National Park*. Kluwer Academic/Plenum, New York.

Shackel, P.A., 2001, Public Memory and the Search for Power in American Historical Archaeology. *American Anthropologist* 103:655–670.

Shackel, P.A., 2003, *Memory in Black and White: Race, Commemoriation, and the Post-Bellum Landscape*. AltaMira, Walnut Creek, California.

Shackel, P.A., 2004, Labor's Heritage: Remembering the American Industrial Landscape. *Historical Archaeology* 38(4):44–58.

Shackel, P.A., and Larsen, D.L., 2000, Labor, Racism, and the Built Environment in Early Industrial Harper's Ferry. In *Lines That Divide: Historical Archaeologies of Race, Class, and Gender,* edited by J.A. Delle, S.A. Mrozowski, and R. Paynter, pp. 22–39. University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville.

Shackel, P.A., and Palus, M., 2006, Remembering an Industrial Landscape. *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 10:49–71.

Stoddart, S., 2000, Introduction. In *Landscapes from Antiquity,* edited by S. Stoddart, pp. 1–6. Antiquity, Cambridge.

Stoffle, R.W., Carroll, A., Toupal, R.S., Zedeño, M.N., Eisenberg, A., and Amato, J., 2000, *The Land Still Speaks: Traditional Cultural Property Eligibility Statements for Gold Strike Canyon, Nevada and Sugarloaf Mountain, Arizona*. CH2M Hill and Federal Highway Administration, n.l.

Stoffle, R.W., Toupal, R.S., and Zedeño, M.N., 2003, Landscape, Nature, and Culture: A Diachronic Model of Human-Nature Adaptations. In *Nature across Cultures: Views of Nature and the Environment in Non-Western Cultures,* edited by H. Selin, pp. 97–114. Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht, the Netherlands.

Tilley, C., 1994, *A Phenomenology of Landscape: Places, Paths, and Monuments*. Berg, Oxford.

Tuan, Y-F., 1977, *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

Tuan, Y-F., 1991, Language and the Making of Place. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 81:684–696.

Upton, D., 1988, White and Black Landscapes in Eighteenth Century Virginia. In *Material Life in America, 1600–1860,* edited by R.B. St. George, pp. 357–370. Northeastern University Press, Boston.

Whiteley, P.M., 2002, Archaeology and Oral Tradition: The Scientific Importance of Dialogue. *American Antiquity* 67:405–415.

Whitley, D.S., Dorn, R.I., Simon, J.M., Rechtman, R., and Whitley, T.K., 1999, Sally's Rockshelter and the Archaeology of the Vision Quest. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 9(2):221–247.

Whittlesey, S.M., Ciolek-Torrello, R., and Altschul, J.H., editors, 1998, *Vanishing River: Landscapes and Lives of the Lower Verde Valley*. SRI Press, Tucson, Arizona.

Winer, M., 2001, Landscapes, Fear and Land Loss on the Nineteenth-Century South African Colonial Frontier. In *Contested Landscapes: Movement, Exile and Place,* edited by B. Bender and M. Winer, pp. 257–272. Berg, Oxford.

Yentsch, A., 1996, Introduction: Close Attention to Place—Landscape Studies by Historical Archaeologists. In *Landscape Archaeology: Reading and Interpreting the American Historical Landscape,* edited by R. Yamin and K.B. Metheny, pp. xxiii–xlii. University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville.

Young, A.L., 2003, Gender and Landscape: A View from the Plantation Slave Community. In *Shared Spaces and Divided Places: Material Dimensions of Gender Relations and the American Historical Landscape,* edited by D.L. Rotman and E-R., Savulis, pp. 104–134. University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville.

Zube, E.H., Sell, J.L., and Taylor, J.G., 1982, Landscape Perception: Research, Application and Theory. *Landscape Planning* 9:1–33.