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The United States Forest Service holds in public trust hundreds upon thousands of historically significant sites. For decades, the management of these special places has focused on basic site identification and protection to meet legal compliance measures for Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Standard practices within the agency led to cultural sites being identified on the ground in a cursory fashion, but with little research or follow up into the history of the site of the people that had created and occupied it. Sites reflecting the identity, history, or material culture of People of Color were especially lost in the standard site recording process. Deeper research into just a few of these sites revealed a common theme, that of settlements where people pursued civil rights and resisted racism. There exists an opportunity to develop and implement a heritage-based program that focuses more closely on civil rights, honors the histories of resistance, challenges the preconceived narratives of American history, and reflects the diversity of the American people. Three nineteenth century archaeological sites located on federally managed lands in Missouri, Illinois, and Indiana uniquely express the pursuit of civil rights and resistance and serve as pilot sites by which to implement a program within the Forest Service. By implementing such programming, the agency can identify additional sites, affect its own culture, and uplift and amplify narratives representative of the public it serves.
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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

The US Forest Service (USFS) is the second largest federal land management agency in the United States. The agency is also the largest forestry research organization in the world. The Forest Service stewards over 192.8 million acres across 155 National Forests and 20 grasslands across the United States (US Forest Service 2021). Dubbed the “land of many uses”, these publicly owned lands are managed for various products and purposes, including timber harvesting, fire suppression and prevention, recreation, range, watershed and resource protection, restoration, and aquatic and wildlife habitats (USFS 2013).

The lands managed by the USFS were previously home to innumerable Indigenous people for thousands of years. Colonialism, exploration, and expansion brought pioneering and European settlement, mining, farming, logging, ranching, and western based development practices to the landscape. That same landscape witnessed the depopulation of Indigenous peoples, expansion, slavery, industrialization, war, and boom to bust economies, cottage industry, and settlement. Traces of historic land use and elements of the past cultural landscapes are still visible today in the form of historical and archaeological sites, descendant communities, and traditional knowledge that is passed from generation to generation.

Despite the diversity of ethnic groups making up America today, racism still has a strong grip on many people. Reminders of this social problem include the murder of George Floyd in 2020, ongoing police brutality, resistance to the removal of offensive monuments and memorials, disparities in civil rights, and continued social injustice. We tend to think of Civil Rights movement as starting in the 1950’s, however, the foundation
of the Civil Rights movement was established well before. In the United States, there has been a long-standing struggle by African Americans and People of Color to end legalized and standardized discrimination, disenfranchisement, and racial segregation. We can trace the earlier historical and archeological record of civil rights in physical manifestations such as the establishment of settlements, the building of schools and educational institutions, and in designating places of worship.

Amidst the recent volatile pandemic and political discourse, discussion and debate regarding social and environmental justice flourished. The USFS responded with intensified Diversity and Inclusion trainings, statements of support, and “listening and learning” sessions that provide space for employees to communicate (virtually) regarding the current social pulse and racism (US Forest Service 2020a). Professionals in their fields searched for ways to challenge narratives, renovate constructs and processes, reconsider history, and affect the future of their resource. Recognizing that the identified and interpreted history and sites of past Americans on USFS managed lands does not reflect the diversity of the American public (past or present), the agency has recently committed to amplifying the voices of all communities and sharing the history of how people have used lands that are now public (US Forest Service 2020b).

This thesis identifies and outlines a program to locate, preserve, and interpret sites and narratives that reflect past people’s pursuit of civil rights on USFS managed lands, especially that pursuit by African Americans. Until recently there were not agency-driven efforts to share these histories and site narratives. Furthermore, the agency’s past policies and priorities, complex relationship with the communities on and near public lands, the interpretation of history, and the management of these lands have
not led to inclusive stewardship and management of cultural resources and histories. Federal agencies manage a large part of the Nation’s heritage. Unfortunately, those agencies struggle to meet their basic public stewardship responsibilities to the legacy of the land (Advisory Council on Historic Preservation 2001). This thesis will provide the context for and process to change the agency by implementing a Sites of Civil Rights and Resistance program.

Forest Service Lands: Acquisition and Designation

The late nineteenth and early twentieth century American landscapes were the origination grounds for academic, grassroots, and government conservation movements towards forest management, forest science, and research. Witnessing the depletion of forested lands, the state of New York established forest reserves as early as 1885 with Pennsylvania quickly following in its footsteps (Atwood, Donovan, Gray, & Tonsfeldt 2005). Many saw the designation and management of forest reserves as an opportunity to protect watersheds and their potential downstream economic importance.

The Timber Culture Act of 1873 and the creation of the Division of Forestry in the Department of Agriculture (1881) were attempts to regulate the marginalized forested areas and develop sustainable measures. The successful repeal of the Timber Culture Act in 1891 and the passage of the Forest Reserve Act in that same year brought about nationally managed forests. The Forest Reserve Act also gave the President the power to “set apart and reserve” lands “wholly or partially covered with timber” in any state or territory (Atwood et al. 2005).
The Forest Management Act of 1897 gave the president power to dissolve the forest reserves and exclude valuable agricultural and mineral lands. It also stated that the purpose of these reserves was watershed protection, fire protection, and securing the valuable timber supply. The General Land Office (GLO) in the Department of the Interior was designated the managers of the forest reserves. The GLO was aided by the Division of Forestry in the Department of Agriculture for technical support. The Transfer Act of 1905 moved the Forest Reserves to the Bureau of Forestry, later known as the U.S. Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture. After 1907, the President was required to have Congressional approval to create new national forests (Schrepher et al. 1973). Forest reserves became known as national forests. The Forest Transfer Act also marked a major shift in management of federal lands. Supported by President Theodore Roosevelt, the Forest Reserves shifted from being land “reserved from use” to lands with “managed use”.

Forestry east of the Mississippi River experienced different challenges than its western counterpart. Eastern states lacked large areas of public land that could be designated into national forests, and the Constitution did not provide for government purchase of private lands. Essentially, much of the land east of the Mississippi had already been claimed by private companies or individuals, leaving few large-acreage landscapes available to become national forests. Simultaneously, the adverse effects of mass timber operations on private lands were becoming apparent. Mass tracks of stumps and underbrush posed a volatile fire hazard. Watershed and stream erosion displaced materials and compromised water sources. The local and regional economies suffered as logging operations brought booming opportunity, but then crashed when the
slow-to-renew timber resources were completely exploited. These operations led to an increased expense to transport needed lumber from farther distances (Schrepfer, et al. 1973). Depleted landscapes, lack of resources, and genuine fear of wildfire further fueled the conservation movement. After generations of lumber operations in the northeast, the second and third growth of trees resulted in a poorer quality and less desirable materials. The region's lumber consumption outran production eight to one (Schrepfer et al. 1973:12).

However, the East had something the West did not. By 1900, major American forestry programs were in full swing at institutions like Yale, (Michigan) State Agricultural College, Pennsylvania State College and The New York State College of Forestry. In addition to conducting extensive research, these institutions were educating young foresters that would soon staff the state, federal, or private forestry organizations; build forestry programs at other academic institutions; or become policy makers through political positions. State funded research initiatives were aggressively tackling local issues in Maryland, Wisconsin, and Pennsylvania. Wisconsin also became home to the Forest Products Laboratory, specializing in wood utilization research (Schrepfer et al. 1973).

Despite state and private research initiatives, it quickly became obvious that managing forested lands east of the Mississippi Rivers required research to solve individual forest problems and guide land management practices. The agency responded in 1915 by organizing creating the Branch of Research to identify, coordinate, and lead scientific efforts.
To further aid forestry efforts in the northeastern states, the Forest Service recommended the significant acquisition of three million acres of watershed lands previously designated under the Weeks Act of 1911. Such an acquisition permitted the federal government to purchase land at the headwaters of navigable streams and created the National Forest Reservation Commission to determine the location of future national forests. The Clark-McNary Act of 1924 expanded the area that the federal government could purchase for national forests. As a result of the Weeks Act and the Clark-McNary Act, several national forests were created in the East. Citizens were not required to sell their lands if they discovered that their private or municipal land holdings were located within boundaries of a newly designated National Forest. However, many residents chose to sell their land because their land was either depleted of timber or poor farmland.

Legal decisions often result in the USFS assuming management of landholdings, all with cultural heritage. The agency acquired the Land Between the Lakes in Tennessee and Kentucky in cooperation with the Tennessee Valley Authority for energy and irrigation control. Deemed a National Recreation Area (NRA) and managed by the USFS, it now serves as a unique and significant destination for thousands of outdoor recreationists every year. Similarly, the Midewin National Tall Grass Prairie (MNTGP) in Illinois was a 40,000-acre acquisition from the Department of Defense (DoD) in the early 1980s. Located 53 miles south of downtown Chicago on the historic Route 66, the MNTGP still bears many of the structures associated with its role as an ammunitions arsenal from the late 1930s into the 1970s. Evidence of pre-wartime history includes the
Foundations of nineteenth century structures, a rock wall built by prisoners of the Civil War, and habitation sites of Native Americans.

After the Great Depression, the Forest Service also came to manage lands where private landowners had defaulted ownership. In the nineteenth century, lumber companies had purchased land to harvest timber. After the merchantable timber had been removed, the company had little use for what remained. Lumber companies eagerly sold their harvested land to hopeful farmers or people looking to own property or settle in a new location. Occasionally, lumber companies would sell land to a developer, or employ a salesperson to sell the lands. Lumber companies also refused to pay land taxes and allowed the land to revert to public domain.

Individuals hoping to “make a go” of farming on the deforested landscape saw opportunity in already cleared land, but soon discovered that the soil chemistry of many previously wooded landscapes was not fertile enough to support crops. In Michigan’s upper peninsula, for example, a large tract of land with an abandoned logging camp was sold (sight unseen) to members of an African American church in Chicago. Upon arrival, the new owners named their settlement Elmwood. Their experience was short lived, given the poor condition of the land and the hostility of the neighboring community (Bastian and Rutter 1987). Many such landscapes were depleted from aggressive deforestation, failed farming ventures, or abandoned and unfulfilled land claims. Economic recession, loss of jobs, increase in population, and a lack of effective land recovery practices were abundant across the East.

The Huron-Manistee National Forests in Michigan is an example of the US Forest Service obtaining lands for management through both methods: acquisition and
designation. In 1909, the Huron National Forest was designated and comprised of lands in the northeastern portion of Michigan’s lower peninsula. In 1938, the Manistee Purchase Unit was designated as new Forest Service lands. Located on the west side of Michigan’s lower peninsula, this represented a 460,000-acre addition of land deemed to be denuded and unproductive. Most of this environmentally exhausted landscape had yet to recover from mass lumbering operations or extensive farming and failed agricultural endeavors of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. The agency’s intentional efforts to conserve natural resources and build sustainable forests was manifest in the development of nurseries (Campbell 2021). Restoration efforts included the employment of thousands of young men under New Deal programs such as the Conservation Civilian Corps (ibid.). On the Huron National Forest, the management operations were expanded and centralized to Cadillac, with leadership functioning under the new name of the Huron-Manistee National Forests. The historical makeup of the forest is reflected in its archaeology: over 1,000 sites represent the lifeways of past Indigenous peoples. Yet hundreds more sites reflect the more recent acts of nineteenth and twentieth century homesteading, farming, forestry, and recreation. Most of these sites remain uninterpreted.

Cultural Sites on Forest Service Managed Land

From its inception until relatively recently, the agency had little regard for cultural sites and history located on and adjacent to federally managed lands. Many sites were lost to forestry management tactics including reforestation or restoration, wildfire suppression, and the development of infrastructure or recreational opportunities. Laws promoting historic preservation came in to play with the Antiquities Act in 1906. This Act
gave the President the ability to designate lands and provide for the general legal protection of cultural and natural resources of historic or scientific interest on Federal lands. After a generation-long effort, President Theodore Roosevelt signed the Antiquities Act on June 8, 1906. The Antiquities Act set an important precedent by asserting a broad public interest in the preservation of these resources on Federal lands.

With the passage of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA), all federal agencies became accountable to identify and evaluate archaeological and historical sites, prior to undertakings with the potential to affect cultural resources. Moreover, federal agency programs were required to have heritage programs, and manage those programs to an acceptable standard. The NHPA became the impetus for the US Forest Service (and other land management agencies) to hire archaeologists and heritage staff nationwide to be stewards of thousands of sites located on Forest Service managed lands.

Most of these thousands of cultural sites have not been evaluated for their potential inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. Many sites represent past people’s pursuit of civil rights, which are the entitlements of citizens to political and social freedom and equality. The Civil Rights movements of 1954-1968 in the United States was built on a nearly 400-year long struggle by African Americans and People of Color to end legalized and standardized discrimination, disenfranchisement, and racial segregation in the United States.

Expressions of civil rights and resistance to racism, enslavement, and disenfranchisement took many forms. Oppressed people’s insistence on freedom and
persistence in securing that freedom led to acts of resistance. Subtle but intentional acts of resistance occurred daily and took the shape of political conversations, work slowdowns, demonstrations, fundraising, or sabotaging acts against enslavers or slavery supporters (Hudson 2002; LaRoche 2014; Weik 2012). Active resistance took the form of public lectures, relocation or resettlement, rebellion, murder, suicide, infanticide, and self- or group-liberation (Weik 2012).

The Underground Railroad is seen as one of the most significant expressions of American civil rights during its evolution over more than three centuries (National Park Service 2021). Individuals or groups resisted human bondage by engaging in this loosely organized movement. The persistent actions of participants in the Underground Railroad were considered furtive, often leading to recidivistic behavior by liberators, enablers and abolitionists who supported the cause. Given the secretive nature of the Underground Railroad movement, sites of resistor encampments are either hidden or at the very least not discussed in historical documents or recorded on maps. Archaeology, therefore, provides a means of uncovering some of these habitation sites and a significant way to substantiate oral testimony and contribute additional layers to the telling of these stories.

Forest Service archaeologists and historians in the eastern United States are seeking to conduct meaningful research into African American heritage sites. These sites demonstrate elements of resistance and the insistent pursuit of civil rights, represented by rural African American homesteads and farmsteads, Underground Railroad sites, industrial sites (such as mining and logging communities, furnaces, factories), churches, depression era relief efforts, and late nineteenth and early
twentieth century resettlement communities. The occasion and responsibility to conduct historical and archaeological research, consult descendants, develop management plans, and interpret and provide access to these sites will amplify the voices of all communities and demonstrate the pursuit of American civil rights.

Federal Management and Interpretation of Cultural Resources

Federal land management agencies abound in the United States. The National Park Service, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Army Corps of Engineers manage and maintain 432 million acres of the 640 million acres of federal lands. The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) is the largest land management agency in the country, stewarding over 245 million acres of surface land and over 700 million acres subsurface, including 30% of the country’s minerals (Bureau of Land Management 2021). The BLM employs approximately 10,000 people.

The founding of the BLM was rooted in the early in the westward expansion, colonization, and the migration movement of the nineteenth century. The Government Land Office was established in 1812 to monitor and administer westward expansion, homesteading, and settlement regulations for predominately European and European American interests. This movement perpetuated and accelerated the systematic removal of Indigenous people from their ancestral lands, denying them basic civil and in many cases human rights. The GLO had acquired lands not necessarily out of a conservation perspective, but rather out of the government’s intent to provide lands for settlement. As the conservation movement swept across the country and settlement waned, perspectives towards public lands shifted. Congress merged the GLO and another agency, the U.S. Grazing Service, creating the Bureau of Land Management,
emphasizing management on land use and conservation. Like the Forest Service, their managed landscapes include arctic tundra, deserts, forests, mountains, rangelands, and rivers. The BLM is now managed by the Department of the Interior, which also manages the National Park Service. Today, the BLM is committed to a robust heritage and paleontology program rooted in NHPA compliance, usually directed by minerals-based projects such as mining operations and permitting.

The conservation movement also drove the designation of national parks and the formation of the National Park Service. In the late nineteenth century, naturalists and conservationists called for the federal government to protect and preserve the spectacular and unique landscapes across the United States. Yellowstone was established as the first national park in the United States in 1872. Congress established more than a dozen new national parks over the next several decades. Increased lobbying precipitated the American Antiquities Act, which gave the president the authority to preserve federal lands by designating them as national monuments. The condition and management of the parks as individual units was criticized in the early twentieth century. In 1916, President Woodrow Wilson signed into law the Organic Act that specifically conserved “the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and... leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.” The Organic Act created the NPS as a formal federal agency.

The NPS is responsible over 85 million acres across the United States. The NPS is the only federal agency with the mission to conserve the nation’s natural and cultural heritage (including national parks and monuments) for the benefit of current and future use. To accomplish their mission, the NPS employs over 20,000 employees and
engages with countless other institutions, companies, volunteers, and non-profits to manage the cultural and natural heritage of the United States. Since the mission of the park service is to conserve natural and cultural heritage, they acquire their lands through designation with the clear intention of preserving sites already known to be historically or naturally significant.

US Forest Service Opportunities

There is significant potential to create a sustainable agency program that leverages existing cultural resource sites in the identification, interpretation, and preservation of American Civil Rights activities. Sites of Civil Rights and Resistance is a heritage-based civil rights program designed to identify and amplify sites and histories that have been minimized or omitted from narratives of Forest Service managed lands. Through internship programs and partnerships with professional organizations and non-profits, the agency identifies these sites and develops appropriate interpretation. These interpretive measures engage the community and are designed to better serve the public, making the history accessible. Simultaneously, internal agency infrastructure is improved as the workforce becomes more diversified through internship programming. The ways in which the Forest Service conducts its heritage work is modified through this program, updating antiquated and exclusive processes. The following document serves as a manual to develop and implement the Sites of Civil Rights and Resistance program. This program outline is Forest Service specific but could and should be adapted to any state or federal land management agency. This proposal highlights a methodological approach through three historical sites located on the Hoosier National
Forest in Indiana, the Shawnee National Forest in Illinois, and the Mark Twain National Forest in Missouri.

The first site, Lick Creek, is located in Orange and Lawrence Counties, in southern Indiana. This site was a mid-nineteenth to early twentieth century African American settlement. It is representative of many of the African American settlements that were distributed across newly designated Northwest Ordinance Territory in the mid-nineteenth century. Indiana’s first constitution explicitly banned the practices of slavery and indentured servitude, which created an opportunity for African American homesteaders and those escaping slavery. The enactment of the Northwest Ordinance in 1837 presented an opportunity for legally free African Americans in southern states to go north in search of independence, land, status and even the opportunity to vote (Cox 2018). The migration of African Americans into Indiana led to the development of dozens of settlements during the nineteenth century, including the Lick Creek Settlement (Cox 2018). Throughout the settlement’s history, some residences insisted on freedom and social equity by leaving for Canada. Many settlers and their descendants were proud of the freedom they obtained and the ways in which they resisted the institution of enslavement and persisted in the nineteenth century.

The Miller Grove site is located on the Shawnee National Forest, in Pope County, Illinois. It was rural African American settlement of dispersed farmsteads founded by manumitted individuals and families resettling from Tennessee. The settlement was also home to former enslavers and abolitionists who used their resources to resist the institutions of slavery and racism. The community sought unity and equity in worship,
education, land ownership, and agricultural development. Residents hosted a school for children and adults and may have published anti-slavery materials in their homes.

The Celia Site was the home of a young, enslaved teenager in 1850 near Fulton, Missouri. Celia sustained years of physical, sexual, and emotional abuse at the hands of her enslaver, Robert Newsom. After four years and multiple pregnancies, Celia pleaded with Newsome’s daughters for intervention from assault. In June of 1853, a pregnant Celia defended herself during one of Newsome’s attacks, resulting in his death. Celia attempted to hide Newsome’s murder but confessed shortly after, having been coerced into a confession with threats to be separated from her children. The trial to prosecute Celia resulted in the acknowledgement that Newsome raped and assaulted Celia. Despite Missouri’s law empowering women to defend their honor, Celia was viewed as objectified property, not a woman. She was found guilty and sentenced to death. The trial remains one of Missouri’s most controversial cases regarding civil and human rights. The farmstead formerly owned by the Newsome family and home of Celia is located on the Mark Twain National Forest in Missouri.

Recommendations

Each site is unique and warrants interpretation and preservation that is as distinctive as the site itself. The recommendations for the Lick Creek site include community engagement and consultation with the development of a Project Management Plan (PMP) through the Forest Service. Relationship building with the community to develop and determine the best suited future preservation and
interpretation opportunities will enhance shared stewardship and promote long-term sustainability of the history for the community (Jones 2019). Moreover, the training facilitators will gain experience to implement similar programs in other agency units, thereby contributing to the agency in a broad manner.

The Miller Grove site is identified as a prime setting for an augmented reality (AR) recreation experience. This camera-based application uses the technology of a smart phone or handheld device to connect people to the outdoors and history. Similar to other AR programs, visitors hike to different locations and experience a visual and environmental immersion into a world that combines history, technology, and the natural landscape in a way that cannot be achieved otherwise. Recommendations include an artifact identification and a comparative analysis with a civil rights focused research design. Additionally, a state-wide curriculum with focus on civil rights in Illinois and the region would contribute to ongoing learning within the public school system. This would be in addition to and expansion on the existing Underground Railroad curriculum. Replicas of the Miller Grove artifacts (through 3D printing) could create learning kits for educator use.

The Celia Site has multiple recommendations that start with the completion of a National Register Nomination. This nomination would be the second nomination of African American history within US Forest Service management nominated to the National Register of Historic Places. Nominating sites of underrepresented or unrepresented populations is one measurement of success for the Sites of Civil Rights and Resistance Program since it recognizes their importance nationally.
A partnership with the Celia Project (a research collaborative hosted by the University of Michigan) would seek to vacate the legal judgement against Celia. While she was executed per her judgement in 1853, a formal recognition of the case would serve as a turning point for the rectification and reconciliation of the historic injustices sustained by People of Color in American history. For the Forest Service to lead an initiative of such scale would also demonstrate the agency’s intention to address historical wrongs and reiterate its stance as an agency of diversity, inclusion, and fair action. Lastly, a partnership with the Carter Center would focus on highlighting the Celia Site as a case study for curriculum and educator development.

In this thesis, I will demonstrate the need for a heritage based civil rights program in the United States Forest Service. The Sites of Civil Rights and Resistance program will identify and interpret sites and histories that have been overlooked on Forest Service managed lands through internships, community engagement, and partnerships to make these histories more accessible and at the same time contribute to diversifying the Forest Service. I will outline the methodology by which to implement such a program and propose an infrastructure to provide a sustainable foundation for the program. Three sites are well suited to serve as pilot sites. I will provide recommendations and a forward path to amplify and uplift the voices of historic communities and individuals that resisted against discriminatory social institutions and pursued their own civil rights.
CHAPTER II: BACKGROUND AND LITERATURE REVIEW

“Since wars begin in the minds of men and women, it is in the minds of men and women that the defenses of peace must be constructed.” - United Nations

This chapter analyzes the management of significant historic properties across the world that represent resistance, insistence, and the pursuit of civil rights and the connection between landscapes of the past and current populations. It demonstrates how various organizations, national governments, municipalities, educational institutions, and federal agencies manage and interpret such sites.

The following review and analysis of site management reveals three important points. First, that settlements, homesteads, and the daily lives that people lead in their space demonstrate their pursuit of civil rights and their resistance to forces that might compromise their civil liberties. In short, people resist within their space to protect it. Secondly, site management and site interpretation vary across the world. The management of sites and the development of interpretive experiences are dependent on dynamic factors such as location, environment, intended audience, support, and threats. Therefore, management and interpretation methodologies for each site are also dynamic, unique to the site and the elements that shape it. Lastly, most of the sites reviewed in this chapter reveal the vital role that community engagement can play in addressing narratives and building meaningful interpretation experiences. This analysis also provides a knowledgeable context by which to frame the Sites of Civil Rights and Resistance Program.
Cultural Resource Management Around the World

The following sites share a common bond in that they either represent sites of resistance or the pursuit of civil rights, including settlements, military forts, or trading posts for human trafficking. Two of the three Sites of Civil Rights and Resistance pilot sites discussed later in this thesis are settlement sites. Throughout history, settlements embody resistance and the pursuit of civil rights. They are sites of communal gathering, stratification of labor, governmental and political organization, militarization, and ebbs and flow of civilization, representing civil rights. Significant settlement sites in the U.S. and abroad may be singled out for special protection by UNESCO, a division of the United Nations.

The United Nations (UN) was chartered in 1945, as nations were moved by the global devastation of World War II. The shared desire for peace and humanity brought multiple countries together. The UN provides a platform where the world’s nations can strategize, collaborate, and identify solutions that provide global benefit. Today, the UN system is 193 nations strong and consists of several specialized and international agencies, including the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. UNESCO pursues peace by building cooperative relationships that support education, the sciences, and culture. Their goals are to innovate and share educational tools to empower people to live as global citizens free of hate and intolerance. UNESCO also promotes cultural heritage and awareness, assigning equal dignity and respect to all cultures and the freedom to express culture to all people. Scientific programs and opportunities are leveraged by UNESCO to provide collaborative experiences and education globally.
UNESCO developed an operational concept of designated places that hold outstanding universal value to humanity. These natural or cultural places are deemed World Heritage sites of outstanding value, worthy of protection for future generations to experience and learn from. Countries nominate their own sites that they believe are significant. Similar to the National Register for Historic Places process in the U.S., a World Heritage nomination is lengthy with justifications and testimony to the site’s significance. Site nominations are reviewed and verified by a UNESCO panel and then put to a vote. There are over 1,100 World Heritage sites, and nearly 900 of those sites are considered cultural. Two of the international sites considered in this review have been deemed World Heritage Sites by UNESCO.

Christiansborg Castle: Ghana

The first site represents an occupation and enslavement location for Africans imprisoned by Europeans and has been interpreted to highlight the complex social systems that rose from the multiple ethnic groups that interacted and inter-married there. Europeans began formally trading with West African peoples in the last quarter of the fifteenth century, nearly 200 years prior to the construction of Christiansborg Castle. From 1482 to nearly 1800, European nations (including Portugal, the Netherlands, England, France, Spain, Sweden, and Denmark) would construct 80 structures (castles, forts, trading posts) within the borders of what is now Ghana (Brown 2020). This area is only a fraction of the entire West African region where Europeans built and maintained a trade network with African groups to capture and enslave millions of individuals.
Christiansborg Castle was built in 1659 along a stretch of the West African coast that was central to the Transatlantic slave trade for over three centuries. The structure today is known as Osu Castle and is located in the city of Accra, Ghana (Brown 2021). Throughout its existence, the castle has been claimed by a variety of countries and governments, including Sweden, Denmark, Portugal, England, and Ghana. Bound in their own cultural biases, fifteenth century European explorers and merchants were surprised by the highly sophisticated civilizations and complex government systems they encountered there. In the seventeenth century, the castle and adjacent grounds were occupied by Danish governors, and a Euro-African community comprised African women, the Danish soldiers or laborers they married, and their children. The landscape presented cultures and societies so diverse that socially taboo customs of Europe, such as cross culture and cross ethnicity marriages were commonplace (Brown 2021). At least 100,000 enslaved men, women, and children were held captive and transported at the Castle during the Danish transatlantic slave trade.

The castle itself was constructed to support a school, a dungeon for holding the soon to be enslaved, a chapel, warehouses to store trade goods, and residential quarters for the governor’s immediate family and most trusted staff. The archaeological and documentary record of the castle reflects the diverse purchase and use of trade goods from around the world. Engmann (2021) discovered that the trade network that enveloped Christiansborg was an ever changing one, but it was likely fully developed by the seventeenth century. European trade goods such as fine textiles (silk and satin), tapestries, glass beads, and bangle jewelry and later American goods such as weaponry, tobacco and rum were common commodities traded for captive Africans. The
market was competitive and violent, as evident by the castle’s cannons which pointed both inland and out to the sea, suggesting that the castle was in a constant defensive posture.

The research, preservation, and dissemination of history at Christiansborg Castle is unique in that the lead researcher (Rachel Ama Asaa Engmann) is the great-great-great-great-great-granddaughter of Carl Gustav Engmann, a governor of Christiansborg Castle (1752–1757) and Ashiokai, an Osu Chief’s daughter. Furthermore, Engmann’s team of researchers is comprised of Danish-Ga descendants who historically worked in the castle and lived close by. Descendant community members are employed to lead out the project. Their perspectives are including in the project’s research design. This brings a meaningful richness and provides a contemporary context to an often-silenced historical narrative about the complex relationships between Europeans and Ga. The rich storytelling also contributes to the deconstruction of Eurocentric narratives that omitted the Ga history and their local perspective (Engmann 2021). The narratives now include the contributions of Ga women, parentage, and Ga customs. Interpretation at the site today shows tangible evidence for the pursuit of civil rights and provides a sense of place, identity, and awareness to locals, descendants, and visitors alike.

Today, Christiansborg Castle serves as the governmental seat for Ghana and houses the President’s offices. Continued archaeological research by the descendant community and interpretation of the material culture onsite provides insight into the pursuit of civil rights of the people and their region. Visitors can tour the spaces and interact with the vistas that previously embodied enslavement and resistance as well as colonization and liberation. The Presidential Museum is also housed in the Castle,
which showcases the Ghana presidents and their personal effects, and interprets the story of Ghana’s pursuit for independence and self-governance.

Le Morne Brabant Cultural Landscape, Mauritius

Mauritius is an island located in the Indian Ocean, 700 miles east of central Madagascar. Le Morne, a mountain on the southwest tip of the island, was also the site of settlements created by those resisting colonial slavery. Though in this case the communities were formed by those who emancipated themselves. It is less obvious on the landscape than Christiansburg castle because it was intentionally hidden, and in an inhospitable location. The island witnessed extensive bouts of occupation and colonization from 1638 until the mid-twentieth century as Dutch, French, and British forces claimed the island as their own. Early colonizers exploited the bountiful ebony trees that grew native on the island by removing their bark for international markets. Colonizers settled in more hospitable locations, such as the current day location of Port Louis, about 30 miles from the Le Morne summit. An extensive list of governors also conquered the island and introduced sugar plantations and enslaved individuals to work the cane fields. Resistance in the form of escape and marronage took place immediately upon the introduction of enslaved individuals to the landscape. The men and women that resisted in that landscape insisted on freedom and whatever cost. Over the years, liberators from Africa, India, and Madagascar found freedom in this community and it eventually became known as a Maroon republic. These individuals banded together in the harsh environment, creating collective community for several
generations. They faced a lack of food and shelter, fear of recapture and enslavement, or harsh punishment.

With Le Morne Brabant Mountain as the backdrop, British forces chose a large, abandoned brick building to serve as an immigrant processing facility. Aapravasi Ghat (Hindi for “immigrant depot”) served as a sort of immigration stop for the nearly 500,000 indentured or enslaved individuals being transported from India to Mauritius as cane plantation laborers or to be transportees to other parts of the world (Mauritius Attractions 2022). As a result, the population of residents at the quasi-maroon settlement grew to include self-emancipators not only from the African mainland, but also India, Madagascar, and Southeast Asia. Upon the legal end of the slave trade, British officials embarked on an experiment to replace and supplement the enslaved labor force with indentured men and women from India.

Le Morne (French for “small mountain) is a jagged and inhospitable mountain on Mauritius that juts into the Indian Ocean. The isolated and unwelcoming location provided refuge to hundreds of self-emancipators that resisted enslavement and fled to the protective communities that formed on the barely accessible mountain. Between the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, nearly 1,200 individuals sought solace and freedom among a maroon settlement at Le Morne. The summit of the mountain was marked with a series of caves and communities that provided natural and human protection from would-be enslavers seeking to recapture and recover their human capital investment (Weik 2012).

Le Morne is rich in documentary sources and oral history and is supported by a strong descendent community. In 2008, UNESCO appointed the Le Morne Cultural
Landscape a World Heritage Site, calling for its commemoration and protection, citing the landscape as an “exceptional testimony to maroonage or resistance to slavery in terms of the mountain being used as a fortress to shelter escaped slaves, with physical and oral evidence to support that use” (UNESCO 2008). In 2016, UNESCO announced the opening of a foot trail to the Le Morne summit to increase preservation and conservation, management and tourism, and descendant community connection (UNESCO 2016). The summit had not been accessible previously. Since the opening of the trail, nearly 7,500 visitors traveled to the summit, and over 70% of these visitors express a lineage or emotional connection to the history of Le Morne (UNESCO 2018). The trail serves as a prime example of effective interpretation of a large-scale landscape, making its history accessible and enabling an impactful and multi-sensory experience for the thousands that walk it.

Oss, Markthal, and Zwammerdam: Netherlands

The following three sites are examples of creative incorporation of cultural heritage into a modern context or a unique approach to involving local residents to research and interpret past sites. They are not particularly sites where civil rights were being negotiated, but they offer examples of heritage interpretation that are unique. One such site is located in a modern subdivision where local residents participate in the archaeology. Oss-Horzac is a residential area located in the Netherlands, comprised of approximately 250 homes, predominantly of younger (20–40-year-old) families. Prior to the home construction, Leiden University excavated there and found Bronze Age and Iron Age remains, a Roman settlement, as well as a medieval town. The University
surveyed the local residents to assess their interest level in participating in public archaeology opportunities. The response was overwhelming in that indeed, the residents were interested in the archaeology of their own back yards (van den Dries 2019). The university opened the excavations and survey to the public on a “dig day” in where neighbors participated in all phases of research. Visitors and participants shared their experiences and thoughts, and their reflections were combined into a brochure that discussed the heritage of the sites and history of the landscape. Besides the educational value, many participants noted a significant social bonding with their neighbors as part of the experience. Furthermore, they reiterated the importance of knowing the history of land they resided upon and said their involvement had given them a newfound sense of responsibility to local heritage (van den Dries 2019).

Markthal (Market Place) is a massive indoor market located in Rotterdam that sells food and artisan goods, yet also incorporates archaeology. It houses restaurants, shops, a parking garage, apartments, and serves as a gathering place. During its construction, municipal archaeologists discovered remnants of 10\textsuperscript{th} and 11\textsuperscript{th} century medieval ruins (van den Dries 2019). Markthal now incorporates the material culture, Old Dutch language, and medieval Rotterdam customs into an exhibit called “Tijdtrap” or TimeStairs. Fittingly, the exhibit commences at a descending escalator as you are transported through time into the exhibit and the lower level of Markthal. Studies were conducted to assess the effectiveness of the exhibit and determine why people might not engage with it (van den Dries 2019). Interestingly enough, it was predominantly women that stopped to observe and engage in the exhibit, contrary to past data which were interpreted to mean that heritage tourists are typically retired, educated males with
leisure time (van den Dries 2019). The new data might also be a testimony to women’s roles in social situations versus individuals seeking out heritage experiences (ibid.).

Heritage management and history dissemination at Zwammerdam, Netherlands also leverages local participation but in a unique way. The village is home to a Roman military site named Nigrum Pullum and other historical sites, near a modern care facility (Lendering 2020). The estate of Ipse de Bruggen serves as a care home to over 500 developmentally disabled individuals or people with a range of mental health issues.

The history of Zwammerdam is managed in unique fashion. Ipse de Bruggen chooses to engage their clients and local citizens through living history experiences and exhibits. Since the estate is so rural, the opportunity to interact with outside visitors or tourists is limited to guests visiting the estate clients. The estate has developed a heritage management plan which includes heritage tourism and marketing to the local community and would be tourists. Estate clients and residents work in the visitor center and the Roman-era themed restaurant or create Roman themed products to sell in the gift shop. The estate management staff offer drama, writing, and language classes for the residents, and many take classes in Roman classics to produce or star in Roman inspired plays. The Ipse de Bruggen residents benefit from a sense of inclusion given their role in interpreting the history. Likewise, the heritage management staff has made the local history accessible and leverages it as a tool to learn and teach life, communication, and social skills (van den Dries 2019).

The involvement of contemporary and local community in public archaeology, combined with the unique interpretive experiences at these three sites provide previously unconsidered concepts that might be applicable in the United States and with
the Sites of Civil Rights and Resistance programming. Involving the community in public archaeological experiences provides a connection between the landscape, the history, and the modern participant. Surveys data of those seeking out the interpretive or interactive experiences at these sites could also inform interpretive planning at the sites managed by the US Forest Service.

Buxton, Canada

Southern Ontario served as the destination for many African Americans resisting enslavement in the United States. Distance from restrictive social codes against African Americans and the Canadian abolishment of slavery made Ontario an attainable and often more attractive place. The settlements of Oro, Wilburforce, Dawn, and Sandwich Mission represent communities of rural black settlement. The community of Elgin (later known as Buxton) was plotted and planned for the mid-nineteenth century influx of free and self-emancipated African Americans. It was planned by Rev. William King, who had emigrated to the United States from Scotland. He married and settled in Louisiana, inheriting enslaved men and women from his wife’s estate. After becoming a Presbyterian minister, abolitionist, and missionary to Canada, King established the Elgin Association. With the support of the Presbyterian Synod, he purchased 9,000 acres of land between Lake Erie and the Great Western Railway in southwestern Ontario (Landon 1918).

King moved to Elgin in November of 1849 with many of the individuals he had formerly enslaved serving as Buxton’s first residents (Landon 1918). Prior to the establishment of the settlement, some White Chatham residents had proposed
excessive taxation and the reduction of civil liberties for black settlers. King rallied against those who opposed the town. He developed community rules including an alcohol ban, a required cabin size, land purchase only by Blacks, and a requirement for residents to remain for at least 10 years (Buxton Museum 2021). African Americans fleeing enslavement and restrictive or racist social codes found safety in Buxton and the town became known across Canada and the United States as a community of opportunity, support, and freedom. Residents cleared and maintained land, prioritized education, and began mail service to connect the settlement with the wider world. A sense of community, ownership, and connection grew in the community’s residents. Residents of the Lick Creek settlement in Indiana, which will be explored in Chapter IV, migrated en masse to Buxton in 1862.

Today, the settlement’s population has dwindled from 2000 residents at its peak to 250, with over 50% of the residents African Canadians and descendants of the original settlers. The community’s history is interpreted by two museums. The Raleigh Township Centennial Museum was officially opened in 1967 as part of the township's Centennial celebrations. The Museum collects, preserves, and interprets historical artifacts related to Buxton. The Buxton National Historic Site and Museum also gathers and provides personal histories of residents and relatives, and genealogies of the original settlers and their descendants through on-going historical research. The museum is managed by the municipality of Chatham through a board of directors and employs two curators. Volunteers, docents, researchers, actors, historic preservationists, and community members donate time, goods, and specialties to advance the heritage offering and preservation of Buxton’s unique history.
Bryan and Shannon Prince are lifelong Buxton residents and sixth generation descendants of freedom seekers who arrived at Buxton via the Underground Railroad. The Princes maintain a historic farm at the settlement, serve on the board and at the museum, research and write, and interpret Underground Railroad history. Through their authorship, storytelling, research, and community work, they have brought to light histories that were on the brink of being lost. The story of the nineteenth century Weems family spans multiple international boundaries and demonstrates the guttural and devastating yet common place threat that many enslaved families experienced, that of separation (Prince 2012).

The landscape of Buxton still reflects the culture and heritage of its African Canadian settlers. Visitors to the Buxton National Historic Site can tour the museum and several community buildings preserved for interpretation. The Buxton School #13 served the African Canadian students of Buxton and tells the story of education, its teachers, and the students that once graced the large, one room schoolhouse. A log home built by Henry Colbert in 1850 reflects the strict building standards placed on settlers, including the picket fence around the yard. The home was meticulously preserved and has been staged with exhibits and displays of nineteenth century life in the town. The Shadd Barn is located nearby and interprets the role of agriculture in the settlement, as well as historic tools commonly used by past residents. Local churches still serve generational congregations and visitors, maintain the history of the community, and participate in homecoming events and reunions to celebrate the settlement’s history.
Cultural Resource Management in the United States

In the United States, management of significant historic properties takes place either within institutions in the private realm, primarily non-profit organizations and other private companies, or through the Federal government. Such organizations range from those with a narrow scope such as administering one property, to those managing multiple properties within a particular region or park or across the country. Charitable non-profit 501(c)3 organizations have tax exempt status in the view of the federal government. A variety of these non-profits and site-specific organizations are given as examples of site management below, especially focusing on those where slavery was prominent and where there were struggles for civil rights of African Americans.

Non-profit and Private Site Management

The Archaeological Conservancy is a 501(c)3 non-profit organization that promotes the preservation of significant heritage sites across the United States by seeking to purchase endangered sites and convert them into cultural preserves. The Albuquerque-based organization was formed in 1979 and now owns or manages over 500 sites across the country (Archaeological Conservancy 2022). These sites may vary in size from only a few acres to over 1000. The sites under conservancy management reflect a diverse cultural history of the United States, including 1,000-year-old sites of indigenous importance, to nineteenth century sites of military occupation. The Conservancy is managed by a board and the sites are managed by paid staff. Funds to support the Conservancy come from donations, merchandise, and sales of the American Archaeology journal. Support also comes from membership dues, corporations or foundations, and bequests.
Other organizations such as Archaeology Southwest serve similar purposes but accomplish their mission in diverse ways. Through community and tribal partnerships, educational programs, and virtual learning experiences, they aim to preserve irreplaceable cultural histories in the Southwest United States (Archaeology Southwest 2020). Archaeology Southwest focuses on adaptable site protection measures to preserve sites in perpetuity. They rely on traditional ecological knowledge, innovation in interpretation, and dissemination of archaeological findings to engage and drive further research. They often search for non-invasive investigative measures as a preservation tactic.

The Archaeological Institute of America (AIA) is the oldest archaeological non-profit in the country, established in 1879. Harvard professor Charles Eliot Norton formed the group to preserve sites and advance the study of archaeology. Within the first two years of its existence, the group aided archaeologists in Mexico and the American Southwest in site research and preservation. Within five years, the AIA created a network of local societies where researchers and academics could collaborate. Lecture programs and research initiatives founded and formalized the by AIA surfaced in Greece, Rome, Palestine and later Egypt. The AIA was chartered by Congress in 1906 and proposed the first archaeological legislation in the U.S., the American Antiquities Act.

The AIA contributes to the sharing of knowledge and data by providing scholarships, grants, and funding to research projects. Archaeology magazine is a publication of the AIA that disseminates scholarly information worldwide, while their American Journal of Archaeology is similar but more academic. The AIA is managed by
a council, governed by a board, and accomplishes its work through thirty different committees and interest groups concerned with the organization’s policies and current issues facing the study of archaeology. While this is an American-based organization, the mission is to support ethical archaeological practices and an appreciation for the material culture of humanity worldwide (AIA 2022).

Several plantations in private ownership include the history of slavery in their interpretation of their properties, though in some cases this story has been overlooked until recently. The most famous plantation visited by tourists today is likely Thomas Jefferson’s Monticello, his home from 1770 until his death in 1826. Over the course of his lifetime, Jefferson enslaved over 600 men, women, and children, 400 of them living at Monticello. Today, Monticello is owned and operated by the Thomas Jefferson Foundation, a non-profit 501(c)3 corporation that manages 2,500 acres of the original plantation. Monticello has been a designated UNESCO Cultural Site for its neo-classical architecture (UNESCO 1987).

Thomas Jefferson inherited the 5000-acre plot of land from his father, Peter Jefferson, upon his passing, when the former was only 14 years old (Verell 2014). Thomas followed in his father’s footsteps and established himself as a member of the Virginia planter elite, enslaving laborers and building his own plantation. While tobacco was the original starter crop, Jefferson later shifted to more lucrative grain production and also constructed a small nailery to make nails as supplemental income (Thomas Jefferson’s Monticello 2020). Enslaved laborers conducted all the crop harvest and production, construction, blacksmithing, food preservation and preparation, animal husbandry, washing, and daily domestic service (ibid.). Jefferson controlled his
enslaved population through overseers, punishment, sexual exploitation, the threat of sale, and by regulating their living standards. He purchased, sold, gifted, or traded enslaved people to meet his labor or social needs.

Today, the house and grounds of Monticello are open to visitors, researchers, and the descendent communities. In the early interpretive years of Monticello, its African and African American history was not necessarily researched or interpreted. Jefferson’s relationship with and sexual exploitation of the young, enslaved Sally Hemings had produced four children whose freedom Hemmings negotiated upon their reaching adulthood (Monticello 2022). Interest in Hemmings and the other enslaved people that made Monticello possible led to the eventual inclusion of African Americans in the interpretation of the site.

In the late 1990s and early 2000’s research efforts focused on identifying and interpreting the cemetery that was the final resting grounds for many of Monticello’s enslaved population (Figure 1). The identification of the cemetery and inclusion of the Black Jefferson in the annual Jefferson Family Reunion were early but important steps to the interpretation of African Americans at Monticello. Today, visitors can experience a variety of public history programs that focus on the African American history of Monticello. Tours (virtual or in person) take guests through the spaces and exhibits while humanizing the historic characters that lived and worked at the plantation. Oral history projects continue to provide connection, understanding, healing, and preservation of histories that have been marginalized over time. The site hosts events such as cook-offs, sewing sessions, book clubs, and hands on learning experiences to highlight historic African American lifeways of Monticello.
Media interpretation includes podcasts and videos that present the complex and conflicting history of one of America’s founding fathers, and the community he enslaved. These interpretive experiences discuss the terror, threat, and punishment many faced, as well as the sexual exploitation, roles of skilled laborers, the pursuit of civil rights, and people’s personal and everyday moments. Oral history and ongoing genealogical research projects document and amplify the histories of the enslaved families of Monticello, including the Fossetts, Grangers, Hemings, Herns, Gillettes, the Hubbard brothers, and many others. These initiatives seek to include descendant community participation as part of Monticello’s interpretive program (Thomas Jefferson’s Monticello 2021).
Another plantation that seeks to educate visitors on the history of African Americans and slavery in the South is Boone Hall. The plantation was founded in the late seventeenth century outside Charleston, South Carolina by Englishman John Boone (Gibbs 2001). Boone enslaved 85 men, women, and children during his lifetime and his descendants would continue to enslave hundreds of individuals. Eventually, the plantation came to be known as the largest and most lucrative in South Carolina and is now a top tourist destination (Boone Hall 2021). The extensive gardens, barns, fields, and utility areas are displayed to interpret early American plantation life.

During its early life, the plantation produced cotton and tobacco. The enslaved workforce produced bricks and construction materials for local building projects in the first quarter of the nineteenth century. Before the Civil War, the majority of the area’s African American population were enslaved by or labored for Boone Hall or the neighboring Laurel Hill and Snee Farm plantations. By 1900, Boone Hall became one of the largest producers of pecans in South Carolina, with over 600 acres in production (Gibbs 2001). While slavery was over, African Americans were still the primary labor force. In the 1940s, the site became a living farm to educate visitors on historical farming practices.

One of the most prominent remaining features of the original plantation is an in-situ brick street that provides access to nine brick homes constructed between 1790 and 1810 as dwellings for the enslaved laborers at the plantation. The small homes are a stark contrast to the mansion on Boone Hall Plantation today, which was built in the 1940s and illustrates a Georgian-designed home set to the plantation’s productive era. In 1983, the site was nominated to the National Register of Historic Places.
Since its original purchase, the Boone Hall plantation has remained in private ownership. The McRae family purchased the site in the 1950s and passed ownership through the family, operating an agricultural and historical tourism business on the grounds until 2020. Boone Plantation remains in a McRae family conservatorship for its preservation and conservation. Financial support for the maintenance and programming at the plantation includes fee-based tours or experience, endowments, fees for events like weddings or parties, and donations. Interpretation and conservation education includes “Exploring the Gullah Culture” a program which employs a living history component through the local Gullah descendant community. Interpreters share their language, song and dance, artistic customs, food, and historical knowledge of Gullah lifeways through storytelling.

The plantation also hosts the “Our Black History in America Exhibit”. The exhibit occurs within the nine cabins and has been adapted to interpret specific themes in American history including worship, the heritage of sweetgrass baskets, archaeological investigations on the plantation, the family unit, and the work of Africans and African Americans on the plantation. Emancipation and freedom, civil rights, prominent figures, and Gullah culture are also themes of the exhibit. The plantation staff maintains that while the conversation and interpretation of slavery is complex and uncomfortable, it is crucial that it be discussed as an open and transparent topic. The plantation management has publicly committed to honoring and uplifting African American heritage at the plantation.

Though the plantation includes the story of African Americans in its exhibits and is open about its history, recently plantations in general have come under scrutiny for
romanticizing slavery and the depiction of one-sided narratives through events such as weddings (Hosken 2020). Dr. Joy Banner of the Whitney Plantation Museum in Louisiana points out that “a plantation is an economic system, a business, in which its profitability is linked to the forced labor of enslaved people” (Hosken 2020). Banner’s protest was one component of many movements that between 2019 and 2021 tried to stop the promotion of plantations as sites for weddings. Many advocates stated that the use of plantations as wedding venues continues to affect African Americans to this day by minimizing a critical and traumatic history and emphasizing a racist viewpoint.

The impact and efficacy of public archaeology and interpretation at Boone Hall Plantation was recently analyzed in the context of racist and violent crime. Mullins (2015) described a tourist visit to Boone Hall Plantation by Dylann Roof in April of 2015. During his tour, Roof took multiple photos of himself in front of several structures and interpretive panels associated with enslaved men, women, and children. Roof then posted his photos in his blog. Though he apparently felt compelled to visit plantations and civil war sites throughout the South, we cannot determine if or how the interpretation at these places impacted him. Mullins (2015) wonders about a sense of “placeless-ness” that historic landscapes have in a racist’s imagination. Despite being physically present at the sites and experiencing the interpretive exhibits at Boone Hall, Roof’s interaction with the site did not move him towards compassion. Roof murdered nine African Americans at a Charleston Church less than two months after his plantation tour. The plantation’s attempt to educate through testimony, interpretation, and material culture did not apparently produce a thought-provoking change of heart. Perhaps even
sensitively built interpretive exhibits cannot bring all visitors towards greater intercultural understanding. Like Monticello, though, Boone Hall is trying to do so.

Federal Site Management

While the above properties are small in scale, the U.S. Federal Government owns a massive amount of property, much of which contains often overlooked African American, Native American, Latinx, and Asian American Pacific Islander sites. There are four Federal Land Management Agencies in the United States: the National Park Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and the United States Forest Service. Together, these agencies and bureaus manage over 606 million acres of lands. Most lands under federal management were home, sacred space, and battlegrounds to indigenous peoples for thousands of years. European exploration brought colonialism, human trafficking and bondage, settlement, expansion, industrialization, and war. Past cultural landscapes are still visible today not only as historical and archaeological sites but known through their descendant communities via oral tradition and generations of knowledge. The following sites managed by the National Park Service and the Fish and Wildlife Service represent sites of civil rights and resistance and provide possible examples of site interpretation which can serve as models for the Forest Service.

The National Park Service’s mission is to preserve natural and cultural resources of the public lands they manage for the enjoyment, education, and inspiration of all generations. The National Park Service is an agency of the U.S. Department of the Interior and cooperates with partners to extend the benefits of natural and cultural resource conservation and outdoor recreation nationally and globally.
The National Park Service maintains several programs that represent efforts like the Sites of Civil Rights and Resistance program. The Network to Freedom Program (NTFP) was established by the Park Service in 1998 to collaborate with other government entities, as well as individuals and organizations, to honor, preserve and promote the persistence of past peoples and the history of resistance to enslavement through self or group liberation and abolitionist acts. Through its mission, the Network to Freedom helps to advance the idea that all human beings should be able to embrace the right to self-determination and freedom from oppression. The African American Civil Rights Grant Program (AACRGP) was established in 2018 to tell the history of the African American struggle to gain equal rights. In 2006, Congress established the Japanese American Confinement Sites (JACS) grant program (Public Law 109-441, 120 Stat. 3288) for the preservation and interpretation of U.S. confinement sites during World War II. The structure of the AACRGP and JACS mimics that of the earlier created NTFP. All programs serve to document, interpret, and preserve sites and stories representative of unrepresented peoples’ histories. The National Park Service has noted the connection between the various eras of their programs and has developed a “Civil Rights Across Time” initiative to highlight and recognize the history of civil rights in the United States.

As an example of a site-specific preservation program, the Presidio is a 1,500-acre National Park honoring a historic military post, complete with recreation trails, a view of the Golden Gate Bridge, a golf course, and a public beach. The expansive landscape is also designated and managed as the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. The Presidio (originally known as El Presidio Real de San Francisco or The Royal
Fortress of Saint Francis) was built by the Spanish in 1776 as a fortified military post. It remained an active military post until 1989 (Curtis 2015). In 1994, the National Park Service assumed management of the post and began to account for the significant cultural, natural, historical, and public values present at the Presidio.

Prior to the arrival of the Spanish, the Indigenous peoples of the Bay living here were predominately Ohlone. The religious and cultural assimilation as well as exposure to European disease brought on by Spanish explorers, missionaries, and colonialists left an everlasting impact on the eighteenth century Ohlone landscape and the Bay area. In the nineteenth century, war, westward expansion, the Gold Rush, and the sanctioned killing of Indigenous peoples decimated the population so that less than 1,000 Ohlone remained by 1852 (Bay Area Equality Atlas 2021).

After 300 years, the Bay area represented conflicting and intertwined narratives of intertwined histories, people, and cultures. The National Park Service stewards the complex history, landscape, and material culture through exhibits, a visitor center, tours, public events, and an archaeological program (Jones 2019). The agency desired to make the cultural heritage a transformative one for visitors, but struggled as it often seemed a one-sided, singular type of experience where visitors consumed the information and then did not necessarily return. Experiences were also collateral, in that visitors experienced the archaeological opportunities simply as passersby who came to engage in a different activity at the Presidio.

The National Park Service noted that their methods of community involvement at the Presidio were a one-way process of performing archaeology that lacked informative feedback (Jones 2019). In this method, they have presented the archaeology for the
visitor’s consumption without interaction or engagement, much like a patron at a cinema would watch a movie. The National Park Service desires to build management practices informed by visitor feedback and the descendant community and driven by community interest like the Ohlone programs of making ceremonial clothes, sharing stories for exhibits, and providing an Indigenous perspective to counter the military history at the site. Community members work in tandem with experts and professionals regarding exhibit design and content.

The National Park Service seeks to use public archaeology at the Presidio as a transformative medium through education. Programming focuses on archaeological experiences for kindergarten through 12th grade students. Students experience archaeology through analytical and tactile experiences that are grade appropriate. Participants make connections between themselves and their current environment, and past peoples and their environment. For example, one program requires participants consider their own personal recycling and refuse and compare it with artifacts of the Presidio that entered the archaeological record as garbage, such as broken items or bones from food remains. Over 1,200 students K-12 participate in the Presidio’s programming annually.

The National Park Service has designed programing to invite discourse on the uncomfortable narratives of all histories at the Presidio (Jones 2019: 187). Events are planned to honor traditional Ohlone, colonist, and military traditions. These events are well attended and have grown into multi-day, multi-faceted events. Musical performances, lectures, and theme-based tours also engage visitors, seeking to provide something for everyone.
The Presidio’s all-encompassing archaeological program is titled *Levantar*, the active Spanish verb that translates to “rise up or awaken” (Presidio Trust 2012). The *Levantar* program is an inclusive approach that makes archaeology and history accessible to everyone and counters the one-sided, passive archaeology experience. The Presidio is a strong example of how a Federal Agency has approached a complex native and colonial history in one particular site.

The National Park Service also administers Camp Nelson, a military post situated in central Kentucky, near the Kentucky River and adjacent to the historic transportation route, the Lexington-Danville Turnpike (US-27). The camp served as a Civil War military hospital, supply depot, and as an enlistment and training center for African American soldiers. Many soldiers arrived with their families in tow. The officers administering the camp were conflicted, as caring for or supporting a community of dependent wives, children, and family members was not their responsibility. The feeding, clothing, and housing of these dependents posed a moral and financial dilemma. While military service men were emancipated upon enlistment, their family members (children, partners, or parents) were not. Many of these families arrived with no more than the clothes on their backs. A refugee camp of family members formed at the Camp. Between June and November of 1864, camp officers banished refugees from the Camp Nelson grounds on eight separate occasions. The final expulsion occurred during a November winter storm as over 400 African American refugees, mostly women and children, were rounded up and removed from the Camp (McBride 2013). Their temporary structures and tents were burned to prevent their return. Many were already compromised from exposure or suffering from starvation, resulting in the death of at
least 102 people (ibid.). The social backlash from the event propelled the construction of a home for refugees at the camp just south of the industrial center of the camp.

Some refugees refused to leave when the camp was demobilized in the summer of 1866. The dispersed community of Ariel was born at the refugee home site. The Freedman's Bureau funded the construction of a school at Ariel in 1868 (NKAA 2017). The community is now known as Hall. Some refugee descendants remain in the area and hold close ties to their Camp Nelson history.

Between 1864 and 1865, over 10,000 formerly enslaved African American men became soldiers through Camp Nelson (McBride 2013). Camp Nelson became an attractive epicenter for individuals resisting enslavement though self-liberation via the Underground Railroad. At its apex, Camp Nelson included 300 buildings spread out over an 800-acre work area, surrounded by an additional 3,200-acre expanse of land managed by the camp (Lobell 2020).

The role of Camp Nelson and the contributions of African American soldiers has often been omitted from or marginalized in Civil War history. In the aftermath of the War, the public memory became rooted a series of accomplishments by military officers or state heroes. The traumatic split of the country was more prevalent than the recognition and reconciliation of what really drove the war, the institutions of racism and slavery. Kentucky did not ratify its stance on the Thirteenth Amendment (passed by Congress in 1865) until 1976, demonstrating its reluctance to support civil rights for African Americans (McBride 2013).

The National Park Service attempts to highlight the narratives and advances brought by soldiers, families, and staff of Camp Nelson. Some of the preservation and
management efforts have focused on the acquisition of additional lands historically associated with the camp. In 2021, the Park Service acquired Glass Farm, which during the Civil War made up the center of the camp, bringing the site to encompass nearly 465 acres. It consisted of more than a dozen buildings including warehouses, shops, offices, and a bakery. After the Civil War and Camp Nelson closed, this acreage had reverted to farmland.

As part of its efforts to highlight heritage, the National Park Service has created nearly three miles of interpretive trails and signage that guide visitors through the heart and to the boundaries of the historic camp site. Onsite programming provides interpretive experiences, exhibits, and opportunities to interact with artifacts recovered from past archaeological investigations. Visitors can participate in current archaeology programs and can experience all aspects of archaeological excavation.

Recent historical research efforts have focused on identifying the names and stories of the hundreds of women and children that passed away from exposure and hunger in the refugee camp and were subsequently buried on site (McBride 2013). The camp serves as an example of a potential interpretive experience: an actively managed site with interpretive trails and a complex with exhibits provides a destination for visitors seeking onsite experiences.

The United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) manages several landscapes that hold rich histories of settlement resistance and insistence. One example, the childhood home of ardent Underground Railroad agent Harriette Tubman, is located on public land now managed by this federal agency. In 1840 Harriet’s father, Ben Ross, was granted his freedom and ten acres upon the death of his enslaver
(Condon 2021). These ten acres are situated in an area known as Pete’s Neck, now the Blackwater National Wildlife Refuge on Maryland’s eastern shore. The USFWS purchased the land in 2020 for environmental conservation purposes. Archaeological testing identified the Ross homesite, which was also the childhood home of his daughter Araminta Ross. Araminta was enslaved from birth in 1820. As child and young adult, she worked on the local farms and in the timber and trapping industry on lands now part of the Blackwater Refuge area. When she was approximately 29 years old, Araminta self-liberated to freedom, changed her name to Harriet Tubman and left the area. She would return a dozen times to liberate over 70 family members and other enslaved individuals as an agent of the Underground Railroad. Her persistence aid freedom seekers turned her into one of the most well-known freedom fighters in American history. The refuge plays an important role in the management and protection of the historic landscape of an American hero who risked her life to help many escape to freedom.

The site of Ross’s house was overlooked for years because of its remote location in a non-desirable area for modern farming or industry. Land that was deemed unproductive or too difficult to manage was passed up by European Americans and left for People of Color to settle and try to farm. LaRoche (2012) notes that marginalized people often seek out marginalized landscapes. In modern times, these landscapes often became incorporated into federal land management, such as the USFWS.

The USFWS manages these aspects of American history through a variety of means. The Ben Ross home is located on the Harriet Tubman Byway. This heritage tourism route passes through Maryland, Delaware, and Pennsylvania and is the only
place that connects and interprets the sites associated with Tubman’s birth, life, and work (Fish and Wildlife Service 2021). Additionally, the agency is partnered with other state and federal agencies to acquire and preserve Journey’s End, the homestead of Alexander and Daisy Turner in Vermont. The Turners used the Underground Railroad network to travel to Vermont and establish a home there. Once acquired, the land will become part of a new wildlife management area and the cultural history will also be preserved and interpreted. The USFWS also hosts an Underground Railroad Education Pavilion at the Great Dismal Swamp Refuge, in Virginia. The agency participates in the NPS Network to Freedom Program by nominating sites to this program that promotes, preserves, and interprets recognized UGRR sites throughout the United States. All sites managed by the USFWS that have cultural history components are interpreted through signage if not buildings or visitor centers like the one at the Blackwater National Wildlife Refuge in Cambridge, Maryland.

United States Forest Service

The US Forest Service has not managed any significant sites to the extent of the aforementioned agencies. The mission of the US Forest Service is “to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the Nation's forests and grasslands to meet the needs of present and future generations.” The Forest Service manages 193 million acres of public lands which were home to innumerable indigenous people before European contact. Eventually, the exhaustion of natural resources, conservation efforts and the economic fallout of the nineteenth century, followed by the Great Depression, prompted the need for proactive and restorative forestry management. In practice, the
Forest Service began with a primary concern for preserving forests, not necessarily culture or history.

In 1876 Congress created the office of Special Agent within the US Department of Agriculture (USDA). Their initial mission was to assess the health of forests across the country. In 1891, Congress passed the Forest Reserve Act, which authorized the President to designate public lands in the West as “forest reserves.” These reserves were managed by the Department of the Interior until 1905 when President Theodore Roosevelt transferred the operations to the USDA’s new Forest Service. After the Great Depression, the Forest Service also came to manage lands where private landowners had defaulted ownership. Many of these landscapes were depleted from aggressive deforestation, failed farming ventures, or abandoned land claims. From its inception until approximately 1966, the agency had little regard for cultural sites and history. Many sites were lost to forestry management tactics including reforestation or restoration, wildfire suppression, and the development of infrastructure or recreational opportunities. Sections 106 and Sections 110 of the NHPA were created in direct response to the decades-long criticism of many land management agencies for mismanaging or damaging sites and omitting histories. The Forest Service adopted the policies slowly after the act took effect in 1966.

The Forest Service began to hire archaeologists to conduct surveys and undertake Section 106 compliance work in the late 1970s. However, these surveys, reports, and any subsequent mitigation measures were funded by the resource that required the work. Agency-wide timber sales were the resource that generated the greatest revenue for the agency and therefore heritage compliance work for Forest
Service projects was funded by timber. An inadvertent pressure was placed on the heritage staff to conduct surveys and author reports as quickly and cheaply as possible, while the agency simultaneously cleared large swaths of land for timber treatment. As a result of the pressure to cut costs, heritage staff and programs rushed to respond and usually lacked lead time and funding to develop research designs, conduct background research on sites, or even coordinate surveys. Staffing was not commensurate with the work expectations, despite the nearly 400 archaeologists employed by the agency.

A site management practice called “flag and avoid” gradually developed in the Forest Service in the eastern US as a result of this pressure to act quickly and prioritize timber. In this practice, sites were “flagged” or marked for avoidance during forest treatment projects. In effect, heritage professionals left pockets of forest untreated or fully investigated if they believed the area included cultural remains. A site’s physical presence on the landscape was essentially the criteria for its protective measures. In theory, the flag and avoid practice allowed heritage professionals more time after initial survey to research the site, determine the site’s context or relation to other sites on the forest, and evaluate it for National Register eligibility. Despite best intentions, sites were rarely revisited or researched further because of the backlog of higher priority compliance work. The sites became protected in perpetuity, being flagged and avoided for numerous iterations of forest management treatments.

The “flag and avoid” action leaves cultural sites vulnerable to adverse effect by neglect, vandalism, and poor site stewardship (Goldwyn 1995). The number of sites affected is large – in the northeastern U.S. alone, National Forests evaluate only about 10% of the sites they manage, leaving 2000-3000 unevaluated “avoided” sites per
forest. Even though up to 70% of unevaluated sites would likely be ineligible for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places, the remaining 30% would have the potential for nomination (Campbell and Cain 2019). Even when sites are noted as part of the flag and avoid measures, they were frequently not investigated further for National Register potential. For example, traces of the Lick Creek Settlement are first mentioned in Section 106 reports from the mid-1980’s, when surveys were conducted for timber sales proposed in the area (Campbell et al. 2018). The mitigation procedure for these sites at the time was to avoid them during timbering, and so Lick Creek was not assessed (ibid.).

In the Forest Service, research into archaeological or historical sites has been driven by mandatory legal compliance for Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. An agency administrator will determine a timber or construction project’s likelihood to potentially impact cultural resources. Given the cost and time necessary to conduct archaeological investigations, Section 106 surveys for cultural resources were typically limited to the project area footprint. As a result, the landscape that is physically inspected for material culture is often pieced and parcelled, and only the patches of forest avoided (that remain) are inspected. A greater context for the site is lost, however, when only the patch is evaluated. Also, pre-survey background research is usually limited to a historical records search such as historic plat maps, land grants, or legal transactions. On rare occasion, a large-scale forest history or context was researched to be used as an aide to evaluate the historical significance of sites found. A large-scale history is beneficial because it is more comprehensive, informed by
ethnohistoric studies, oral interviews, or specialized research focused on specific events, locations, or themes occurring on the National Forest.

Forest Service staff noted the attention placed on compliance work and the lack of emphasis placed on Section 110 of the NHPA – to maintain a heritage program. In response, the Agency developed the Heritage Program “Managed to Standard” metrics between 2010 and 2015, of which Section 106 accomplishments like acres surveyed or sites avoided, carried no value. Instead, forest heritage programs could earn points by evaluating sites, monitoring high priority sites, and engaging volunteers and community groups. Yearly reporting of the points earned resulted in the potential for additional funding, and so an incentive to evaluate the sites instead of continuing to avoid them.

The Managed to Standard measurement has led to more sites being evaluated.

Since the operational practices of the agency encourage site and program management on a project-by-project basis, sites are located and recorded on a case-by-case basis. The practice lacks an overarching or global perspective, failing to provide broader context or discussion of the histories. Furthermore, research and investigation into sites is rarely carried out beyond identification. As a result, the contributions of People of Color are rarely considered, especially if their settlement sites are more ephemeral and difficult to identify. Many sites in the upland south demonstrate aspects of African American heritage and may be managed by USFWS or NPS. Comparable sites may very well exist on National Forest lands, but additional research would be necessary to identify them. Some previously identified sites, like Lick Creek, Miller Grove, and the Celia Site required additional research and interpretation. The Forest
Service Heritage Program is underutilized in this respect and could serve as a public service tool to promote the heritage of diversity on public lands.

The organizational structure of the US Forest Service is such that heritage and volunteer services are managed under an umbrella of Recreation. Funding from Congress or revenue earned from timber sales and recreation fees funds heritage programming and site stewardship. Forest Service research that involves the public in recreation or education, such as the Passport in Time (PIT) program, is therefore more likely to be supported. The PIT program engages volunteers or community members in high value archaeological or ethnohistoric work. The site management and interpretation programs proposed in Chapter IV all fit within this wider umbrella of engaging the public in cultural heritage and could be seen as “recreation,” to fit within the current limits of how such programs are funded in the Forest Service.
CHAPTER III: METHODS

Program Mission and Goals

The last chapter highlighted how some private organizations, federal agencies, and non-profits manage significant sites. It also identified the US Forest Service’s strengths in conducting surveys and compliance with the Section 106 process of the National Historic Preservation Act. The opportunity and responsibility to manage significant sites and develop a heritage based civil rights program in the agency has not existed previously but is direly needed. Currently, the agency directives suggest that:

*The Forest Service supports special emphasis programs to educate the public about the accomplishments of America’s diverse, minority populations. Heritage public education programs can contribute to these efforts through projects that explore cultural resources related to minority groups such as PIT projects to locate and record Basque tree carvings, Underground Railroad features, or early agrarian sites in the Southwest. Heritage public programs can also contribute by drawing in minority populations as volunteers or visitors to heritage interpretive projects and developments that highlight a group’s contribution to the Nation’s history.*

- Forest Service Handbook (FSH) 2365.29 – Civil Rights

Overall, the agency recognizes the need to identify, preserve, and interpret the histories and sites of the people that once occupied the very landscape they manage. The Forest Service can better serve the public, interpret history and sites, and change its own agency culture by implementing the Sites of Civil Rights and Resistance initiative. To accomplish this, the Sites of Civil Rights and Resistance Program has four overarching goals which aim to:

1. Develop increased and diversified recreation opportunities around significant sites and their histories. Improve access to services and recreation opportunities.

2. Identify projects that focus on interpretation and preservation of significant sites.
3. Positively affect agency culture, diversity, and inclusion by connecting opportunities and experiences for 1890 Scholars, Resource Assistants, Thurgood Marshall Scholars, and other internship programs.

4. Use existing platforms and develop new ones to identify and interpret sites and histories of underserved and underrepresented communities.

Recreation Opportunities and Accessibility

Since the Forest Service is a federal land management agency, it has the paramount responsibility of making those lands (and the culture history associated with them) accessible to the public. This accessibility is often presented in designated hiking, biking, or ski trails, and equine or motorized recreational vehicle trails. The visiting public is diverse: fishing, hunting, picnicking, camping, birding or wildlife watching, and boating are all common experiences that sought by outdoor enthusiasts. The Forest Service aims to address these multiple needs of its visitors. Some forest goers look for heritage tourism opportunities at visitor or interpretive centers, while others enjoy conservation education activities where they learn about and engage in the natural environment. Many also seek out volunteer opportunities to conduct meaningful and valuable work such as restoration efforts, trail maintenance, river cleanup, and research.

Engaging in culture history in the outdoors instead of an indoor venue like a museum offers different opportunities and benefits. Learning about history through outdoor recreation enhances the mind, body, and nature connection. Emphasis on mindfulness, developing healthy habits, and building relationships on shared experiences with friends and family are some of the many benefits of recreation.
Wagner 2013. Spiritual well-being, economic benefits to surrounding communities, and increased knowledge regarding historical and natural elements are also gained through such experiences. For Black and Brown populations and those wishing to experience their history in the U.S., outdoor opportunities offer a chance to engage with all the senses in the environment where the history took place, which can be meaningful and moving.

Recreation opportunities in the form of heritage tourism provide a means by which to interpret and access the history of the millions of past peoples that historically lived in or traveled through lands now managed by the US Forest Service. The National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP) defines heritage tourism as “traveling to experience the places, artifacts, and activities that authentically represent the stories and people of the past and present” (ACHP 2021). Visitors to Forest Service sites tend to interact with the landscape as a destination rather than a pass through. Increasing visitor use of public lands generates revenue, interprets historical and environmental information, and places heritage sites in their natural context. A sense of association, identity, and pride is instilled in the local communities adjacent to these heritage tourism opportunities and national forests. The Forest Service can partner with other agencies like the ACHP (Advisory Council on Historic Preservation), NPS, state forestry agencies, and local organizations or stakeholders to develop historic preservation opportunities.

In 2021, the ACHP announced their intention to diversify the Federal work force by building a more inclusive preservation program. By including current actions with past initiatives (such as the Preserve American Initiative), the ACHP is intentionally
engaging with diverse and descendent communities regarding significant histories that have been neglected in heritage tourism and interpretation experiences. Given the mandated partnership between the Forest Service and the ACHP, the Forest Service can participate in these activities and develop recreation and heritage tourism opportunities based on community engagement. Recognizing and involving the descendent communities in these efforts brings ownership and richness to the interpretive experiences and further connects people to the physical landscape and the history of their culture. By including genealogical research, like that conducted at the Lick Creek interpretive trail on the Hoosier National Forest, the Forest Service validates and personalizes history, and enhances an undeniable pride for descendants and community members (Mull 2010, LaRoche 2014, Matthews 2020).

Historically, and in modern times, the Forest Service underserved People of Color were, due in part to antiquated and segregationist policy that intentionally prohibited them from accessing public lands. For example, in 1963 the Green Pastures campground located on the George Washington Jefferson National Forest in Virginia was promoted as a premier day use and campground for African Americans. This was a segregationist campground and African Americans were not allowed to use other White campgrounds on National Forest system lands (Queen 2020). While public lands are no longer segregated, the historic patterns of use by Whites, and the lack of public land use by People of Color, perpetuates (Flores et al. 2019). Furthermore, many recreation experiences on public lands were designed by white people, for white people. The experiences and interpretation on public lands also fail to honor the contribution of
historical African Americans on the landscape prior to it coming into federal management. (Gosolvez 2020).

Reinvigorated recreation opportunities for the Sites of Civil Rights and Resistance Program could focus on experiences surrounding historical or archaeological resources like augmented reality tours, trails, online tours, and outdoor gaming experiences. Hiking, biking, camping, and picnicking are classic recreation activities for public lands. It is common for hikers and bikers to trail through public lands with interpretive signage marking past cultural and historical activities. They may wind their bikes through the foundations of homes and structures long gone, see historically planted trees like lilacs or apple trees, camp in the midst of teepee rings used hundreds of years ago, or traverse trails that have been in use for generations.

Modernized recreation experiences create new ways to connect forest goers with history and the outdoors. Even though a site may be lacking structures or material culture, meaning it is not visible on the ground, it may still significant and worthy of interpretation. Technology can help interpret stories of marginalized groups whose heritage lacks preserved architecture or identifiable artifacts. Augmented reality (AR) is a unique way to influence a forest goer’s experience when touring sites. By combining 3D historical renderings with archaeological and landscape data, visitors (with the assistance of their personal device), can view representation of historic structures and space as they maybe have appeared hundreds of years ago. Such technologies especially serve underrepresented groups whose histories are either omitted in their entirety, or not well interpreted through traditional methods of historic preservation such as signage or other programming. Traditional interpretive signage that is installed on a
site or trail remains the most common and a highly effective form of visitor engagement. Virtual interpretation experiences provide more equitable access to sites that might be remote or difficult to access for people with various physical limitations.

Technologically enhanced ways to interact with the outdoors also include AR applications like Agents of Discovery. This Canadian based application is privately owned but operated under agreement with many municipal, state, and federal land management agencies. The application encourages kids and families to sleuth through geo-triggered AR challenges in public spaces such as parks and forests (Agents of Discovery 2020). The educational content of the app is represented through a gaming perspective, and therefore appealing to an audience that might otherwise not be interested in the outdoors. Like the Pokémon Go app that swept the nation in 2017, Agents of Discovery can only be experienced if the user is physically present in the geo-referenced space. Users move through the space catching clues, learning by engaging in the outdoors in a sort of scavenger hunt-meets-natural investigative detective manner (Agents of Discovery 2020).

To date, the Forest Service has not had a remarkable success rate in attracting people of all backgrounds to public lands, presenting another opportunity for future programming. Studies conducted by the Rocky Mountain Research Station of the US Forest Service reveals that African Americans represent 13% of the US population, but only 1% of the visitors to national forests. Likewise, Latinx populations make up 17% of the national population, but less than 6% of the national forest visitor base. Non-Hispanic Whites make up 63% of the U.S. Population, but 90% of the national forest visitors (Flores et al. 2019). The study recognizes the possibility for errors in recording.
However, the US Forest Service tries to counter these methods by developing monitoring measures geared to account for unconscious biases (Amanda Walker 2021, pers. comm.). Clearly, there is an opportunity to serve an underserved population and encourage People of Color engage in outdoor activities at Forest Service sites.

An additional element of making historical sites accessible is by removing offensive or derogatory terms from the names of landmarks, features, or historical sites. In November of 2021, Executive Order 3405 was signed into effect to address the reconciliation of derogatory names assigned to American landmarks and locations. In 2016, the U.S. Board on Geographic Names officially changed the name of the highest peak in the Black Hills National Forest of South Dakota to Black Elk Peak. This peak has served as a sacred site for centuries, especially for the Sioux. However, a fire lookout tower built there in the early twentieth century has resulted in the peak becoming one of the most visited sites in the Black Hills. The process to determine a site name offensive requires extensive review and coordination between multiple federal, state, and local governments. The process of community consultation followed by communication and planning and finally designation to transform the name can take several months to years to complete. The identity of these places is then renamed on maps, social media, signage, and interpretive materials.

Project Identification, Documentation, and National Register Nominations

Three sites have been identified for the pilot phase of this project and the ultimate program goals for the future include identifying additional significant sites on Forest Service managed lands. The criteria used to choose these initial three sites are discussed in the section on Program Criteria below. There are several steps to identify a
potential site for inclusion in the program. Forest Heritage Program Managers should seek out sites through screening of forest hard copy site records; consultation with other employees, local communities, and historical societies; and a review of the agency’s Natural Resource Management (NRM) database. The NRM database is a bank of all known archaeological site and survey data on Forest Service managed lands. The database has evolved over the last two decades and data entry has not been consistent. As a result, staff are encouraged to search under multiple fields beyond “Ethnic Affiliation”. A recent wildcard search of the database using a term such as “slavery” revealed dozens more hits than using the term “African American” in the Ethnic Affiliation field. An additional wildcard search using the term “Black” yielded over 1,000 unique results, but most of them were associated with the proper names of geographical locations or geological formations, such as “Black Hills” or “Black Granite.”

Partnering the results of an exhaustive database search with hard copy site records and the corroboration of local or corporate knowledge will provide locations of additional sites of civil rights and resistance. Next, a physical survey should be undertaken to confirm the presence and condition of these sites followed by updating site records and the addition to or updating of the NRM database. It is at this time that a site should be evaluated for the National Register of Historic Places.

National Register nominations are the desired format by which to document and capture significant histories and identify historic properties, and the Forest Service has used this approach in the past. The National Register of Historic Places is the official register of the country’s historic properties and one component of a national initiative to coordinate and support efforts to identify, evaluate, and protect historic resources.
National Register evaluations are a complex and complicated documentation processes that require research into primary and secondary resources, photographs, maps, and oral histories. Currently only 2% of the nearly 100,000 National Register sites in the United States are African American heritage sites (Greco 2021), and only one of these sites is on land managed by the US Forest Service, Prospect Bluff/Fort Gadsden in Florida. An additional site, the community of Idlewild, is partially located on National Forest system lands in Michigan. Obtaining National Register status is the first step in developing interpretation plans, securing funding, receiving historic preservation credits, or accreditation from the National Park Service. The process serves as a tool to evaluate sites on a series of factors. When sites maintain the seven components of integrity and meet one of the associations listed in A) through D) below, they have the potential to be listed on the National Register of Historic places, after the significance is demonstrated.

Enacted in 1966, the National Historic Preservation Act drastically changed the treatment of cultural resources across all federal agencies. The NHPA especially changed how most land management agencies identified, consulted upon, managed, and preserved historic properties. In Section 106 of the NHPA, federal agencies are responsible to determine if an undertaking has the potential to affect historic properties. In Section 110 of the NHPA, federal agencies are required to maintain a heritage program. Historic properties are defined as sites eligible or potentially eligible to be on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The agency, group, or individual seeking a listing submits a completed application to the respective State Historic Preservation Office for review and recommendation. The last step requires the State
Historic Preservation Officer to submit a recommendation packet to the Keeper of the National Register of the Historic Places, at the National Park Service. In order for a site to be eligible for the National Register, it must meet at least one of the four criteria:

A. The property must be associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.

B. The property must be associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.

C. The property must embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, represent the work of a master, possess high artistic values, or represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.

D. The property must show, or may be likely to yield, information important to history or prehistory.

In addition to meeting at least one of the four criteria, a historic property must also maintain a high degree of integrity. A site has high integrity if it possesses characteristics that convey its historical significance through its setting, materials, design, location, workmanship, feeling, and association. The site must retain, to a significant degree, at least five of the following seven characteristics from its original design (NPS 1995):

1. Location: Location is the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred.
2. Design: Design is the combination of elements that create the historic form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property.

3. Setting: Setting is the physical environment of a historic property.

4. Materials: The physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property.

5. Workmanship: The physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history.

6. Feeling: The property’s expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time.

7. Association: the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property.

The National Register of Historic Places is a long-standing program, but it has been criticized for lacking representation of diverse sites. Barile (2004) suggests that a heavier emphasis is placed on the interpretations of a site’s significance and integrity while historical context of a site is ignored. Multidisciplinary research of sites is typically not conducted on historic sites. Such an imbalance results in an abundance of single-sided nominations to the National Register that represent a biased history of national sites of significance. For example, historical records may be consulted almost exclusively, and oral histories may be neglected (Barile 2004). Yet others suggest that the underrepresentation of diverse communities is due to the highly technical and academic approach necessary to determine if a site indeed is significant or retains integrity, and the elitist review that nominations undergo (Bronin 2020). Suggestions to
counter this bias includes the acceptance of cultural and oral narratives, an application that is not as technically complex, and the creation of a broader definition of integrity (Bronin 2020).

Designation programs exist to highlight historic properties that meet a specialized theme in history. For example, the National Park Service’s Network to Freedom Program and the Civil Rights Grants Program open the door for historic properties to qualify for specialized coordination and grant opportunities. These program nominations mimic the National Register nomination process and require the applicant to demonstrate beyond a preponderance of doubt the significant connection between the site/history and the UGRR, or civil rights movement. Nominating a site for these programs is easier when a site is already listed on the National Register of Historic Places since much of the research and documentation has already been completed.

The development of interpretive and management plans can be an intuitive process that may organically become apparent through the documentation process. A National Register nomination may be more appropriate for some sites than others. Once a site is fully documented and determined to be significant, management plans can be developed to steward the site. Plans also serve as prescriptions or recommendations and may include partnership agreements with local resources to provide services or maintenance, educational programming, design additional research initiatives or preserve the site in perpetuity.

Agency Culture, Diversity, and Inclusion

The US Forest Service employs about 30,000 permanent employees (USDA 2021). The workforce expands significantly in the summer months to accommodate
seasonal work like firefighting, recreation support, natural resource surveys, and timber management. The agency is committed to a diverse workforce that represents the diversity of the communities they serve. Outreach and recruitment programs have been effective to increase the diversity of the workforce. However, a recent study reviewed employment data from 1995 to 2017 (Westphal et al. 2022). The results suggest that while the overall workforce had decreased by 24%, the diversity of leadership level positions increased, but the number of African American employees decreased (ibid.). The same report suggests that what is at stake by the lack of diversity is a loss of public trust and a reduction in agency effectiveness if it fails to represent the people it serves (ibid). The Sites of Civil Rights and Resistance can positively affect agency culture, diversity, and inclusion by connecting projects with internships under the 1890 Scholars, Resource Assistants, Thurgood Marshall Scholars, and other internship programs.

The Forest Service already attempts to diversify its workforce by partnering with Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) to employ interns to research significant sites and develop heritage tourism recreation opportunities. To diversify the workforce and promote an inclusive culture, the ACHP offers scholarships to place HBCU interns with other agencies conducting historically significant work and research, providing job opportunities after the internship. The principles of the Sites of Civil Rights and Resistance Program fit well with the existing ACHP scholarship program.

The Thurgood Marshall College Fund (TMCF) is an additional employment and mentoring partnership opportunity within the US Department of Agriculture that is available to the Forest Service. The program focuses on inclusion, innovation, and investment in academically exemplary students. The program seeks out and further
develops leaders with a passion or shared values for the vision and mission of the agency. Financial assistance is offered to outstanding applicants attending one of the 47 publicly supported Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Predominantly Black Institutions within the Thurgood Marshall College Fund member-school network.

The Forest Service’s Resource Assistants Program (RAP) is a rigorous, immersive, and paid internship for individuals who are interested in conservation, natural and cultural resources, environmental management, research and development, or other career opportunities with land management agencies. The program emphasizes the engagement of current students, recent graduates, and underrepresented populations in natural and cultural resources work. Resource Assistants receive intense career experience lasting six to eight months. They are coached and mentored, offered financial assistance, networking opportunities, and given potential hiring preference within the agency.

The 1890 National Scholars Program was established as part of the partnership between the 1890 land-grant universities and the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The program focuses on agricultural research, education, and extension programs to produce skilled graduates in agricultural sciences. The USDA partners with the 19 historically black universities that were established under the Second Morrill Act of 1890. This act provided for annual appropriations to each state to support its land grant college. The Second Morrill Act forbade racial discrimination in admissions policies for colleges receiving these federal funds.

To diversify the Sites of Civil Rights and Resistance program, these interns will conduct the research, documentation and nomination, community collaboration, site
management planning, and recreational opportunity development necessary to amplify sites and histories. The approach to identifying sites should maximize the data and information sources available. Reaching out to individual forests about sites and histories in their jurisdiction helps first to build a relationship and identify additional individuals or networks that might know more about sites and history. Engaging with locals and descendent communities creates connection and value through relationship building, consultation, and shared knowledge. Descendant communities and locals tend to be the most informed individuals regarding local history and sites.

There are several reasons why interns are not always employed in particular programs. Forest Service staff demonstrate a hesitance to use available internship programs because of the perceived administrative burden that accompanies the internship application process and subsequent mentoring of selected interns. Others are just unaware of the programs and associated benefits from employing interns. Many in the Forest Service hope that partnering a more diverse workforce with the local workforce will contribute to a culture of learning and awareness. Some of the internship programs offer hiring incentives or ways in which to obtain permanent employment, which would help the intern and directly and permanently affect the agency workforce.

There is also an opportunity to positively affect the agency culture simply by sharing the site histories as they are documented and investigated. Many employees may interact with, drive by, or have some connection to these sites on a regular basis. Becoming aware of their powerful history and recognizing the agency’s responsibility of site stewardship may also contribute to a longer lasting and impactful culture shift towards inclusivity within the agency.
Platforms and Programming

Platforms and programming are additional ways to actualize goals of the Sites of Civil Rights and Resistance (SCRR) program. The Forest Service has several existing platforms that align with the program’s goals to identify and interpret sites, help underserved communities, and increase the diversity and cultural competency of the agency’s workforce. Furthermore, other agencies, departments, and organizations also have programs and purposes that overlap with the SCRR goals. Forest Service leadership encourages the canvassing of existing programs to determine shared values, collaborative partnerships, and efficiencies. Identifying the shared values with existing programs and opportunities will assist in the execution of the program goals.

The agency’s Office of Civil Rights division ensures equality, inclusion, diversity, cooperation, collaboration, respect, and fairness in the execution of statutes, regulations and directives that govern the agency. Traditionally, this program resolves disputes, promotes civil rights, ensures that diverse and qualified talent pools are contacted during hiring practices, provides civil rights training, and holds accountable any policy or person that may prohibit others from pursuing and achieving their civil rights. While the program’s focus is the present, they recognize that past actions and policy influences the modern-day behaviors. Partnership between the Office of Civil Rights and the Sites of Civil Rights and Resistance Program could result in information sharing on histories and antiquated policies, the investigation of legal cases, and could influence current policies.

The US Forest Service’s Work Environment and Performance Office (WEPO) is an internal program charged with work environment health. The agency recognizes the
link between an employee’s performance and work environment. WEPO provides employees with ideas, resources, and tools that support healthy workplaces. At the core of the program is the concept that employees build and maintain a sense of belonging in their work environment when they are treated with respect and dignity. The program offers employees education, conflict resolution, tools to have difficult conversations regarding social topics, mindfulness training, and discussion platforms and forums. Upon the murder of George Floyd in 2019, the office offered conversation forums for employees to discuss racism and civil unrest. While WEPO’s mission is focused on work environment and performance, their programming could influence SCRR’s goals of affecting agency culture. Presentations, forums, initiatives, online learning sessions, and their publication “Inside the Agency” all provide numerous ways to share the stories associated with SCRR and bring awareness to employees.

Besides internal programs and offices, the Forest Service relies heavily on partnerships and agreements with organizations outside the Federal government, such as schools, tribes, volunteer groups, and public agencies to successfully manage natural and cultural resources. Working together with various groups help to accomplish projects, engages specialized skillsets or offerings found outside the agency, connects people to the outdoors, and stimulates various economies. Project work associated with the Sites of Civil Rights and Resistance could benefit from the collaboration with groups like Mobilize Green, Greening Youth, the Association for Black Women Historians, or local historical societies.

Through partnerships and volunteer experiences, the Forest Service also operates various outreach programs that could be incorporated into the SCRR. For
example, Urban Connections serves as a conduit connecting urban communities to the outdoors and forested lands. The program provides conservation education, natural resource awareness, outdoor experiences, and even recruitment for conservation careers. The agency's Passport in Time program engages volunteers in high value archaeological or ethnohistoric work on Forest Service managed lands (Reed 2022). Some volunteers travel across the country to conduct archaeological investigation, do documentary research, clean and record artifacts, conduct oral interviews, and even serve as a camp cook.

Programming within the National Park Service could assist both agencies in achieving shared goals. The NPS Network to Freedom Program and Civil Rights Grants program offer opportunities for sites nominated to their various registers. The Network to Freedom program requires that sites and stories of the UGRR be verified and vetted through their nomination process. The nomination form mimics National Register of Historic Places nominations and requires significant investigation, scholarship, and documentation. The Civil Rights Grants Program is similar and was designed to mirror the Network to Freedom program. The documentation for the Civil Rights Grants Program requires that the connection between a site, event, or story is clearly drawn to the pursuit of civil rights.

Sites listed on the Network to Freedom or Civil Rights Grants Program registers can use the respective NPS program logo and funding support which could possibly be incorporated into Forest Service programs. The grants fund educational or tourism programming, research, interpretation, or structural stabilization and rehabilitation. In particular, the NPS programming is well suited to the Sites of Civil Rights and
Resistance program in that once sites are documented on their respective registers, the Park Service could conceivably assist the Forest Service with public programming, interpretation, community engagement, and public service. The National Park Service has always had the distinction of excelling at historical interpretation and preservation. Leveraging the strengths of National Park Service programming and their specialist staff including exhibit specialists, curators, historians, and interpreters would greatly benefit the forest-going public. Lastly, using existing programming and platforms allows the Forest Service to accomplish more on reduced budgets.

At a greater scale than the National Park Service, the Cooperative Ecosystem Studies Units (CESU) Network is a consortium of federal agencies, tribes, academic institutions, state and local governments, and conservation organizations working together to support public trust resource stewardship. The networks serve to strategically support research, provide technical assistance, education, and accomplish additional work that is responsive to resource management priorities. Collaborative and interdisciplinary projects are developed to address natural and cultural heritage resource issues. Traditionally, CESU projects are natural resource and environmentally based. Many CESUs are now seeking projects that align cultural or historical resource management with the public, underserved communities, or have a human dimension. CESU projects often connect natural resource management agencies with expertise and skill sets not present in federal service. While a CESU project has not been developed yet, the network has been identified as a potential partner to complete site documentation efforts, identify potential projects regarding environmental justice, and provide expertise.
The programs listed above are several existing platforms that can be used to achieve the goals of the Sites of Civil Rights and Resistance Program. Maximizing the use of these programs would assist in site identification, documentation, and interpretation; developing a diverse workforce; public and community service; and developing recreational activities.

Program Criteria

Three pilot sites were chosen for the commencement of the Sites of Civil Rights and Resistance Program. These sites were selected based on previous research and investment, support and interest, and practicality of future management plans. The Celia Site, Lick Creek, and Miller Grove are distinctive in that they have been the subject of considerable investigation since the mid-1990s. Likewise, the Forest Service heritage staff have advocated for these sites, making progressive site management and interpretation decisions. The three sites described in the following chapter serve as an example and guidelines for forest managers seeking to identify sites and engage the Sites of Civil Rights and Resistance Program.

Interest and support into a site at the unit level impacts site selection. District Rangers, District or Zone Heritage staff, Forest Supervisors, Heritage Program Managers, and Recreation Staff Officers all plays a role in the management decisions and daily operations of a national forest. These individuals serve as budget advocates for specialized funding or program emphasis in the agency. Through coordination and planning with other resource groups, an annual program of work is developed to prioritize staff efforts and direct daily workflow. Engaging forest management early and
often in the site selection process provides time and space for the project to be planned and funded.

Interest in a specific site or site theme may also be initiated by organizations, descendant communities, or local groups. Seeking out stakeholders that have a shared interest may also drive partnerships or projects with mutual benefit. For example, individuals or groups conducting genealogical research, or local historical societies interested in thematic histories may contribute to or benefit from the site narrative. Providing an opportunity for stakeholders to participate in the site identification and information collection creates a two-way interaction with long term impacts, similar to the management plans of the Presidio, as seen in Jones (2019) and mentioned earlier in the Chapter II.

The level of previous research into a site should play a role in site selection. Sites may have been the point of past investigation, documentation, or interpretation efforts. Past research (even when extensive) is rarely exhaustive and inquiring into it may reveal opportunities that were not fully realized, such as unfinished National Register Nominations, artifact analysis, or predetermined narratives that would benefit from updated perspectives. As one example, ethnohistoric investigations at Miller Grove and Lick Creek have been ongoing since the late 1990s. This research has generated significant primary and secondary source material, as well as artifact assemblages. As a result, there are additional analysis questions that could be asked of the artifacts. The source material from the sites could be compiled and organized not only to be made accessible, but to identify any information gaps in developing the site narratives.
Likewise, sites that contribute knowledge on a thematic level may provide indicators of additional site types in the research area. Using existing site knowledge to look for additional similar or related sites in a contextual sense could provide information that contributes to the larger body of knowledge. The Lick Creek and Miller Grove settlements are just a few of the scores of African American settlements across Indiana, Illinois, Ohio, and Michigan that tell a much larger story about African American migration and settlement in the nineteenth and twentieth century (Campbell Crawford 2022, Campbell and Nassaney 2005, Cox 2018, LaRoche 2014, Rotman et al. 1998, Shackle 2010).

The Lick Creek, Miller Grove, and Celia sites were chosen for the pilot phase of this project based on the practicality and applicability of future management plans. All three sites are stewarded by the local national forest units interested in building interdisciplinary interpretive projects that continue beyond the project’s life cycle. The management plans are realistic to implement within one to two years and with a quick return on investment. The projects associated with each site continue to contribute beyond the lifecycle of the project either by providing educational, recreational, or research value to the public; or they provide an avenue by which to affect agency culture.

On some national forests, it is likely that a site will not necessarily meet one or more of the suggested criteria above. It may not be considered because of a bias or gap in past research or a lack of site type awareness. This should not preclude a site from being considered or included in the Sites of Civil Rights and Resistance program; rather it might imply that the site should be elevated as a priority amongst site candidates.
extra emphasis on that deficient criterion during project planning and research would likely mitigate any issues. One site not chosen during the pilot phase of this research for such an issue is Poke Patch and Payne’s Crossing, early nineteenth century settlements of African Americans in Southern Ohio. It was comprised of the laborers and their families that worked in the dangerous extraction industry of that region. The familial and social connections between Poke Patch, Payne’s Crossing and other African American settlements indicate that it was an important hub in the migration and settlement of African Americans of the era and possibly established for the sole purpose of aiding freedom seekers on the Underground Railroad. The high value and compelling narrative of the settlement made it a significant candidate for the pilot phase. However, gathering site information was more efficient with the other three sites, since historical information was centralized and available. Furthermore, the other three sites were represented by heritage program staff that have worked on the sites for several years. This does not diminish the significance of the Poke Patch or Payne’s Crossing Settlement. Rather, it raises the site to the top of the list of sites to consider when the pilot phase is over.
CHAPTER IV: SITE NARRATIVES

Forest Service or partner managed programming has the potential to interpret sites in multiple ways. Interpretation can develop into meaningful opportunities to engage underserved communities though site identification and challenging narratives. Three pilot sites located on Forest Service managed land have been identified following the criteria outlined in the previous chapter. These sites are geographically located in the Forest Service’s Region 9, which includes the northeastern United States and Midwest (Figure 2). Historically, the people at the pilot sites were African Americans asserting landownership, pursuing education and religious rights, and resisting social, legal, and environmental restrictions that hinder rights and equality. The following site narratives summarize each of the sites’ histories as well as summarize Forest Service activities to date to interpret the property. Recommendations for each site are then proposed.

Lick Creek Settlement

Narrative

The Lick Creek Settlement was a nineteenth and early twentieth century integrated settlement located in Orange and Lawrence Counties Indiana, in what is now the Hoosier National Forest. African Americans had already established a presence on isolated farmsteads and in rural communities by the time Indiana obtained statehood in 1816. Indiana’s first constitution of 1816 explicitly banned the practices of slavery and indentured servitude, which created an opportunity and destination for self-liberators, pioneers, and individuals or families looking for a fresh start (Cox 2018). The enactment
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Figure 2. Sites of Civil Rights and Resistance Pilot Sites Location Map.
of the Northwest Ordinance in 1837 brought free African Americans to the area in search of independence, land, status, and the opportunity to vote (Cox 2018). Migration of African Americans into Indiana led to the development of dozens of settlements during the nineteenth century, including Lick Creek (Cox 2018, FS Report).

Many of the individuals who settled in Indiana and at Lick Creek came from North Carolina. Following the Revolutionary War, North Carolina passed legislation that permitted emancipation under a variety of means, but it also required the emancipated person(s) to leave the state within 90 days or face arrest and re-enslavement. The Slavers and Free Persons of Color Act of 1830 (1830 c. 9 s 2) and others restricted African Americans from migrating, being manumitted, dancing, working for compensation, seeking education, preaching or even gathering in public or private. These restrictions on all African Americans (free or enslaved) made daily life difficult and unsafe – even free African Americans risked enslavement if they were accused of violating these restrictions.

The abolitionist activities of the religious groups, including the Society of Friends played a role in the settlement of Indiana and Illinois. Over 200 individuals migrated to the Indiana and the Lick Creek region from North Carolina, accompanied by Quaker abolitionist and North Carolina legislator Johnathan Lindley, fleeing racial persecution (LaRoche 2014). Amongst the party were Elias and Nancy Roberts, in possession of their free papers. Despite both of their fathers serving in the Revolutionary War, Elias and Nancy were required to have several white citizens of good standing vouch for their integrity in their petition to move from Chatham County, NC, to Indiana. People of Color
were regularly required to provide surety and demonstrate values of good citizenship (Milteer 2020).

Research conducted into the settlement provides the names of several individuals and families that settled at Lick Creek (Robbins 1994, LaRoche 2014). Mathew Thomas was born on October 8, 1808, as a free person of color. At the age of 13 years old, his mother Lucy requested that Mathew become indentured to Quaker Zachariah Lindley. Upon completion of his indenture in 1831, Mathew Thomas purchased eight acres of land, one of the first people to purchase property in what would become the Lick Creek settlement. In 1833, he proved his status as a free person in Indiana and secured his free papers (Robbins 1994). Mr. Thomas eventually became a prominent member of the community and a trustee of the African Methodist Episcopal Church.

Lick Creek resident Martin Scott moved from North Carolina prior to 1830. He purchased land in 1835 and eventually owned 80 acres. Martin had a son named Henry whose registered occupation was wagon maker. Martin’s grandson (also named Martin) fought for the Union in the Civil War. During his service, he was captured as a prisoner of war and sent to Andersonville Prison in Georgia (LaRoche 2014). After his release, he resided in Spencer, Indiana, approximately 15 miles north of Lick Creek. It is believed Martin Scott moved back to Lick Creek later with his wife, Almira.

Besides establishing homes, African Americans created places of worship in Lick Creek. In 1837, settlement residents David Dugged and Martin Scott were named trustees to oversee the construction of a Union Meeting House. Ishmael and Lucretia Roberts donated an acre of land for the church. The Union Meeting house was used
until at least 1843. Shortly after, Thomas and Matilda Roberts deeded a parcel of land for the erection of an African Methodist Episcopal Church in 1844. This church was in operation until 1869 (LaRoche 2014).

Although some African American residents were able to own land, others living at Lick Creek were likely sharecroppers or tenant farmers. Quaker landowner David Thompson owned a parcel of land that was likely occupied from 1860 to 1930, based on the artifact assemblage. Thompson purchased the land from the government in 1845 as a parcel to own while he lived on and farmed another (Welper et al. 2001). The residence of a possible unknown tenant farmer introduces the concept and likelihood of many unidentified people living on the landscape on lands owned by others. Many names are therefore missing from land records – those of the tenant farmers.

In 1840, there were ten African Americans who owned over 700 acres of land in the settlement. By 1855, the settlement peaked at 1550 acres (LaRoche 2014). Land records and oral tradition indicate it was a racially integrated community. The rural community boasted places of worship, home and farmsteads, a school, and a cemetery. The nearby community of Chambersburg had a store, tavern, blacksmith shop, postal office, and a wagon maker (likely Martin’s son, Henry).

The hasty departure of seven families in September of 1862 implies a driving force that compelled them to leave in unison. The sudden sale of their land at an economic loss and removal to Buxton, Canada might indicate their insistence and persistence to live free and without social restriction. Solomon Newby sold his home quickly, receiving less than half of what he paid for it and what it was worth. Their departure may have been precipitated by the forced conscription of men for the war
effort (Walker 2019). It may have also been a reaction to increasing social discomfort in the area, with an increase in free People of Color being violently kidnapped and enslaved. A better explanation might be gained by research into their arrival in Canada. Buxton became a haven for many free and self-emancipating African Americans. Individuals and families could live in Buxton with a minimized fear of recapture and fewer restrictive and unpredictable black codes.

A draft registration from 1863 reveals James Newby joined the Union army in Pennsylvania. His father (Solomon Newby) and family were among the settlers who fled to Canada a year earlier. Solomon constructed a beautiful hinged wooden box to keep his valuable certificate of freedom. After the war, James moved to Buxton to be with family. He purchased land, married, and built a farm, where he lived until his passing in 1924. His home is now the site of the Buxton Museum, mentioned in Chapter II. His father’s handcrafted box is on display at the museum.

The pursuit of civil rights at Lick Creek is demonstrated in the material culture discovered during investigations and the primary and secondary sources associated with the site. Despite both of their fathers serving in the Revolutionary War, Elias and Nancy Roberts were required to have citizens vouch for them in their petition to move from Chatham County, NC, to Indiana, in February 1823. Their freedom papers state “There can be no doubt that the bearers of this certificate, Elias and Nancy, although persons of color, are free and entitled to all the rights and privileges of white persons” (Figure 3).
In 1851, however, the Indiana General Assembly restricted further migrations and inflicted additional black codes by enacting a second state constitution, making it illegal for African Americans to enter or settle in the state thereafter. Every person of color that resided in Indiana prior to November 1, 1851 had to register with the county Circuit Court. Complying with the register requirements suggests they wanted to maintain their residency, despite the growing restrictions and persecutions aimed at African Americans (Negroes and Mulattoes Register 1851). The physical registrations of Elias Roberts and Mathew Thomas provide physical descriptive information, including the phrase “quite dark” for Mr. Thomas (Figure 4).
Besides being denied the opportunity to settle easily where they wished, African Americans were denied education throughout American history and even today (George 2019). In most slaveholding states, it was illegal to teach African Americans to read, regardless of whether they were free or enslaved. Research conducted at Lick Creek suggests that a school was run by Elias and Nancy Roberts out of their home with approximately 20 students present in 1840. The same data suggests that Elias and his wife Nancy were unable to read or write as their names are signed with a mark. All of their Indiana born children could sign their names – an indicator that Elias and Nancy valued education and insisted their children received one. The unwavering pursuit for
literacy and education remains an expression of civil rights to this day, and a marker of freedom.

Agency Actions

Extensive documentary research and archaeological investigations have been conducted at Lick Creek over the past 20 years. In 1998, the Hoosier National Forest engaged with local grassroots researchers and members of the descendant community interested in Indiana’s UGRR history and in Lick Creek. In 2000, the Hoosier National Forest hosted a Passport in Time Project to conduct archaeological investigations of farmsteads. Simultaneously, the Hoosier National Forest hired students from Lincoln University and University of Tennessee through the agency’s partnership with Historically Black Colleges and Universities program. This crew conducted the first subsurface archaeological investigation at the site, at the Elias Roberts homestead. Archaeological investigations were conducted at the Mathew Thomas homestead in 2001. Additional investigations were conducted in 2002 at the homestead of an unknown occupant but possible tenant farmer. This homestead was located on land historically registered to David Thompson, a known abolitionist and Quaker thought to have tenant farmers. The cemetery at the Lick Creek Settlement was also metal detected in 2002 and found to contain the graves of 13 individuals with inscribed headstones. An additional 21 graves may be represented by unmarked stones and depressions. Inscriptions allow us to determine that the first burial was Samuel Thomas in 1856, and the last was Simon Locust in 1891. In 2019, agency staff conducted archaeological investigation of the Solomon Newby and later Ishmael Roberts home, and of the Union Meeting House.
In 2004, the Forest Service drafted an Interpretive Management Plan. This plan was focused on the theme of the Underground Railroad and served to connect stories of resistance between the Shawnee (Illinois), Wayne (Ohio), and Hoosier National Forests (Indiana), as well as the Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie located near Chicago. The Hoosier National Forest also participated in and hosted community education and outreach programs. Artifacts excavated from the sites were incorporated into exhibits in local and university museums.

Recommendations

The Lick Creek site presents a unique opportunity for preservation and interpretation given its history of excavation and the interest of community. The descendant community of historic Lick Creek is proud of their ancestors and history. Consultation with the community on desired recreation and interpretive opportunities, combined with specialist input should inform future preservation and interpretation efforts (Matthews 2020). The concept of consultation is not new to the Forest Service - it engages regularly in tribal consultation and public scoping as part of its mission. However, the concept of working with the community to determine which heritage values should be emphasized and how, is not widely practiced in the agency. While agency officials are responsible for consultation, a community engagement team of specialists (planners, historians, archaeologists, landscape archaeologists) led by a trained facilitator would build stronger relationships. The goal of this community consultation is to develop options or proposals for further interpretation and preservation. The results of the consultation may be publications, research, educational
experiences, developed recreation opportunities, heritage tourism, programming, or a possibility yet unrealized.

An additional benefit to descendent community consultation is the ability to decolonize historical narratives of Lick Creek and develop inclusive interpretation. Interpretative experiences should reflect the voices of the historic inhabitants. The agency’s interpretive efforts may be rooted in colonial or Eurocentric perspectives just by nature of the agency’s history, past policies, and lack of diversity. Incorporating perspectives, traditions, priorities, and input from the descendent community can decolonize interpretative platforms. Engaging experiences that transcend time and provide meaning or inspire thought help to make historical events relevant and relatable. Descendant community consultation and input can decolonize narratives and interpretive experiences by reminding us that while the history of Lick Creek is over 150 years old, the people, customs, and history of the settlement are alive and well today in the descendants.

Employing Resource Assistants to develop heritage programs at Lick Creek would impact agency culture. Securing students skilled and interested in community engagement and the human dimension with the ability to work with key community consulting parties, local groups and organizations, members of the descendent community, and agency officials would enhance and enrich the relationship building process. Furthermore, the purpose of the Resource Assistant Program is to train and educate participants for conversion into full time positions in the agency. The Resource Assistant that works to facilitate this project will have the opportunity to take their unique
Miller Grove Settlement

Narrative

The pursuit of civil rights is visible in the nineteenth century African American settlement known as Miller Grove, located in Pope County, Illinois. Today this remote woodland is managed by the Shawnee National Forest. The community was settled in 1844 by four families recently manumitted from Tennessee plantations owned by the Dabbs, Sides, Miller, and Singleton families. Tennessee law required manumitted or freed individuals to leave the state immediately or risk re-enslavement or incarceration. Illinois law required a $1,000 bond of African Americans entering the state. Former enslaver Henry Sides migrated with the original four families and supplied the bonds for many, serving as an advocate on their behalf (SIU Morris Library 2022).

Harrison Miller, community founder and patriarch, settled first in the wilderness with his wife Lucinda and their three children. His and other families had migrated to Illinois in seek of opportunity, land ownership, and a safer social environment than that of Tennessee. Miller Grove became a small community of rural and successful farmsteads, engaging in cottage industries and likely Underground Railroad activity (SIU Morris Library 2022). The settlement was geographically isolated and the landscape difficult to traverse. Landscape features like Crow’s Knob and Sand Cave were reportedly used to protect and hide self-liberators. LaRoche (2014) suggests that this was desirable for the settlers, who were looking to live a life unencumbered by
outsiders. The close distance to slave holding states and the social threats of racial hostility made an isolated landscape desirable.

In addition to owning his own land, Harrison and his family eventually deeded the land that was used for the Mt. Gilead African Methodist Episcopal Church, which served as both a church and a school. While Harrison and Lucinda could not read or write, education was important to the community of Miller Grove. In 1860, the settlement employed an African American female teacher, Julia Singleton, to educate the Miller Grove children and adults. Julia had moved to the settlement from Tennessee after she was awarded her freedom.

Harrison and Lucinda’s eldest son, Bedford, arrived in Southern Illinois as a child and continued to live in the Miller Grove community until his death in 1911. Bedford and his wife Abby had four daughters (Figure 5). Bedford and Abby are both buried in the Miller Grove Cemetery, which remains one of the few vestiges of the community. The Millers’ descendants had deeded an acre of land for the cemetery in the second half of the nineteenth century (findagrave.com).

In addition to the supportive assistance of the Sides family, other White abolitionists also settled in the area of today’s Shawnee National Forest. James M. West resided about three miles south of Miller Grove and interacted frequently with the community. Much of what is known or speculated about the community’s involvement in the Underground Railroad comes from a collection of West’s letters. The letters are mostly correspondence between himself and members of the American Missionary Association. The letters have been transcribed for the research and genealogical
community, and are available through Genealogy Trails, an online search tool (http://genealogytrails.com/ill/washington/bios/bio_west_jm.html).

Figure 5. Abby Gill Miller (Center, Wife of Bedford Miller), and Their Four Daughters. circa 1860-1870.

James West was a strident abolitionist, preacher, and advocate for the American Missionary Association. He was well connected with the abolitionist movement and engaged in Underground Railroad activities. West passed out Bibles, preached Sunday sermons, and shared his antislavery ideology. Originally from Kentucky, West eventually moved his wife Sarah and their children north to Illinois after he was also persecuted and abused in his hometown for his abolitionist work. In 1856, the West family settled into Pope County, Illinois. While in the county, West also taught school for a brief time. In a letter to the American Missionary Association, he recognized the irony
of being the only radical abolitionist teacher employed in the region that although a free state continued to express vehement hostility towards African Americans.

Despite these hostilities in Illinois, West continued to preach throughout the county for people to reject slavery, promote equity, and accept African Americans into typically White societies. He worked out of the Broad Oak Post Office to receive and send abolitionist literature. Broad Oak also served the Miller Grove community and was the most likely way West provided the members of Miller Grove their antislavery literature. In his letters to the American Missionary Association board and members, West mentioned his “friends” in the region which most likely refers to the African American community at Miller Grove (LaRoche 2014).

Violence seemed to be a constant threat to those living near Miller Grove or supporting antislavery beliefs. In 1860, James reported to American Missionary Association that colporteurs (those who distribute religious or similar literature) were in danger in the region, mostly in regard to aiding fugitive slaves. West noted in the report that “persecution is raging here to an alarming extent” and those in the area who defied the Fugitive Slave Act were often threatened with tar and feathering (West, March 22, 1860). Fourteen years prior, Henry Sides and his wife Barbara were the victims of a violent assault, in which Barbara lost an eye. The attack was likely premeditated and based on the Sides’ antislavery beliefs. West, along with another local American Missionary Association colporteur, James Scott Davis, received death threats. Davis arrived in Pope County in 1860 and played a vital role in disseminating antislavery literature to Miller Grove, often staying with Henry and Barbara Sides. In 1862, West’s
father was murdered in Kentucky. While the murder was never solved, local newspapers had speculated it was due to West’s antislavery sentiments (West 1862).

Agency Actions

Forest Service involvement in the Underground Railroad and the Miller Grove settlement began in 1997 with the interest of local historical societies in the site. In 2000, the agency employed an anthropology intern to coordinate and collaborate investigations at national, inter-agency, and interdepartmental levels. The Forest Service met with the NPS’s Network to Freedom program administrators, representatives from the Boston National Historic African American Site, and staff from the NPS Underground Railroad Project to establish inter-agency collaboration. The Forest Service and the Park Service set out to create the National Underground Railroad Education and Preservation Initiative through a Memorandum of Agreement. The agency also participated on the National Underground Railroad Millennium Trail Advisory Board along with Department of Transportation, NPS, as well as local and state (Ohio, Illinois, West Virginia, Kentucky, New York, Massachusetts, Indiana) agencies and organizations. The products of this collaboration were never fully realized for the Forest Service. These products were to be an interagency managed trail system that highlighted Underground Railroad sites across the upper and eastern Midwest.

As part of the Historic Black College and University Comprehensive Program, the Shawnee National Forest sought to expand career opportunities for African American students enrolled at Tennessee State University. The hired students were involved in all aspects of research on the Forest, including primary and secondary archival research,
and research paper preparation and presentation. They also participated in Forest Service outreach activities, such as Passport in Time, and conservation education activities, such as the “Camp I, too, am America” program, Fishtales, and Arborwild. “Camp I too, Am America” was a history-based day camp for youth. The forest hosted this camp for 75 days with new and some repeat visitors. Camp content focused on archaeological excavation and Underground Railroad education, food and nutrition, and local history. The camps consisted of 1195 K-12 youth: 27% African American; 1% Hispanic or multi-racial and 72% Euro-American. Approximately 200 adults joined the experience of which 21% were African American and 1% Hispanic and 78% Euro-American.

The students also conducted historical research and archeological excavation on three farmstead sites at Miller Grove. The intention of the work was to nominate properties for the National Register of Historic Places based on their affiliation with the Underground Railroad; National Register placement would recognize and celebrate their national significance. Results of this work would also inform and initiate the development of necessary Underground Railroad thematic contexts for evaluation of similar sites in the Eastern United States. Such a context would provide a summary of the circumstances and setting for the Underground Railroad movement locally, regionally, and nationally. This context would provide the terms by which sites could be evaluated for the National Register and the movement could be better understood. The Miller Grove National Register nomination was never completed, unfortunately.

Forest agency staff recognized the lack of Underground Railroad specific curriculum for grades K-12 and desired to develop curriculum that could serve as a
national model for other regions which also lacked these teaching resources. The desire was to build awareness of the UGRR through this region-wide program, and to identify additional surviving Underground Railroad sites. Various lesson plans were developed and are still in circulation today. The agency partnered with the University of Illinois Extension to develop an elementary curriculum entitled "A Special Place." The curriculum incorporated several important sites in southern Illinois and the Shawnee National Forest, including Miller Grove and the Underground Railroad, the Mounds City Civil War Marine Ways, and the Mounds City National Cemetery. “A Special Place” was presented by University of Illinois students and faculty at various teachers' workshops.

Between 1999 and 2007, the Shawnee National Forest hosted 15 Passport in Time projects attracting 202 volunteers from across the county, volunteering 6,064 hours, worth over $134,000 in 2022 economic terms. Projects included Underground Railroad research and brochure development; public outreach through hobby classes such as research, genealogy, and quilting; and excavations and artifact processing at two Miller Grove farmsteads. Volunteers included descendants interested in reconnecting with their family histories or historic landscapes, local public, and retirees.

Partnerships, initiatives, and programs have promoted knowledge of the Miller Grove settlement and major themes in American history. The artifact assemblage associated with the settlement is a unique dataset in that the early Miller Grove residents were making consumer choices for the first time since legally receiving freedom. Prior to their arrival at Miller Grove, they were enslaved and likely without the ability to exert personal choice over the personal effects, domestic wares, or tools they used. The stories of manumission, migration, abolitionism, resistance, and the pursuit of
civil rights in nineteenth century Illinois can be interpreted not only through the programs, but also through the artifactual remains and documentary sources of the Miller Grove residents.

Recommendations

Fortunately, Miller Grove is located within the project boundaries of the Shawnee National Forest’s ongoing Trails Designation Project. Given this designation, the current funding and priority of the Great American Outdoors Act, and physical setting of the site, the Miller Grove site is uniquely situated for updated and expanded developed recreation opportunities. In addition to the many programs and interpretive opportunities, the Shawnee National Forest has also maintained the sites and conducted cemetery clean ups. Descendant and local communities should be consulted to gain interpretive ideas and understand values of those who use the public lands. Likewise, canvassing potential users, or those that do not currently visit public lands but might be encouraged to do so, should be consulted to determine what type of experiences they would appreciate.

A trail through the settlement could serve not only to interpret Miller Grove, but to connect the settlement to other sites of civil rights in the region. Civil rights-based heritage tourism opportunities such as virtual tours, theme-based camps or workshops (such as nineteenth century farming, gardening, cooking) would continue the disseminate the histories of Miller Grove lifeways. Additional on-site features such as parking and a vault toilet would create a day hiking destination for individuals, families, and groups looking to experience the outdoors while learning history. The Forest
Service should install interpretive signage at a trailhead and picnic area that would lead to further immersion in the outdoors while experiencing the historical landscape. Handicap parking and a barrier free trail to at least one site would provide accessibility.

The combined layout, archaeological remains, and history of Miller Grove create an ideal environment for another program, an augmented reality tour experience. Augmented reality is typically experienced in a GPS or with camera-based applications. In the case of Miller Grove, the technology would be best implemented through a camera-based application relying on smartphone or handheld device technology. Using image recognition software, alternative reality applications can overlay a historic photo or simulation over the current landscape, using the camera screen (Charr 2020).

At Miller Grove, recreationists would hold their smart phone up to the physical remains of a nineteenth century homestead (foundations, ruins, or marker), to see either what the structure looked like historically, or a generated and generalized depiction of it. A virtual reconstruction of the houses, outbuildings, and barns would help visitors imagine them since only foundations or depressions remain visible today. The historic landscape of Miller Grove could be depicted through this digital medium and accessed via maintained hiking trails. Such an AR experience connects people simultaneously with the outdoors and history. Additional stops along the trail could interpret the people, events, lifeways, and history of Miller Grove’s residents. Similar to a “choose your own mystery” adventure, individuals experiencing the augmented reality could have the option to explore themes and topics at a greater depth on the application or through other hosted websites. If the Forest Service made the information also accessible via a website, it would reach a greater audience. One example of how such a program would
work is the application developed for the similar and historic site New Philadelphia, the first town founded and platted by an African American (Shackle 2010).

Past archaeological investigations at Miller Grove have yielded an extensive artifact assemblage; yet to date, this collection of cultural materials has not been thoroughly examined or analyzed. Analysis of the objects, digitization of the artifacts through photography, duplication through 3-D printing, and examination through a lens of civil rights would yield information about the expressions of nineteenth century lifeways at Miller Grove. Furthermore, a comparative analysis that considers the Miller Grove and Lick Creek assemblages together, or assemblages of comparable sites in the region, would help archaeologists and historians learn how to improve research methods and questions. Recent interpretation efforts at Boone Hall, as noted in Chapter II, use cultural materials to engage communities in stimulating discourse. Employing the material culture, combined with experiences like augmented reality facilitates a greater understanding and ability to navigate the complex conflicts of history (Barry 2019).

Celia Site

Narrative

The story of the Celia Site is one of heartbreak and trauma that highlights resistance and the fraught and complex relationships between the enslaved and enslaver. The Celia Site is located on Forest Service managed lands on the Mark Twain National Forest (Figure 6). Between 1850 and 1852, a young teenage girl known as Celia was purchased by Missouri farmer Robert Newsom. Within hours of the transaction, he assaulted and raped Celia. Newsom’s violent physical and emotional
abuse became habitual until June 23, 1855, when a pregnant Celia murdered him purportedly in self-defense. Celia was executed for her crime just six months later, after the birth of her stillborn child and after one of Missouri’s most well remembered and disputed trials.

Figure 6: Celia Site Location Courtesy of James Halpern 2015, pp16.

The nineteenth century landscape near Fulton, Missouri would have been marked by rural farmsteads, owned predominately by White men. Most of the labor on these farmsteads was performed by family members and a small number of enslaved men, women, and children. For efficiency, enslaved individuals lived in structures near
the main house, as was the case with Celia. The Newsom farm was considered average but successful, being 800 acres in size in 1850 (Linder 2019). The 1830 U.S. Census for Callaway County, Missouri suggests that Robert Newsom and his wife, Elizabeth, and their children lived in a log cabin on their property. In that same year, records indicate that Newsom was in the possession of three bondspeople, two males and one female (Halpern 2015). By 1840, the Newsom family lived in a brick hall-and-parlor style home where they raised at least nine children that survived into adulthood.

Newsom also enslaved nine individuals (male and female) ranging in age from childhood to mid-thirties. In 1850, Newsom’s 830-acre farm was valued at $3,550 and he had five enslaved men and one child (Halpern 2015). Just two short years later only enslaved males George and Milton remained, with an additional female bondsperson, Celia (Halpern 2015).

Celia was likely brought on to assist Newsom’s daughters Virginia and Polly and Virginia’s four children. Celia’s duties included cooking, taking care of children, housekeeping, and farm work. She resided in a small cabin about “60 steps” from the back door of the Newsom house, ready to meet the demands and needs of the family (Figure 7) (Halpern 2015). The close quarters and daily living situation of such families produced complex relationship dynamics. Enslaved children were often the same age range as the children of their enslavers, as was the case with Newsome’s children and some of their bondsmen.
Figure 7: Celia Site and Robert Newsom Farmstead Overview Map. Courtesy of James Halpern.
At some point Celia established an intimate relationship with George. In the spring of 1855, George became frustrated at Newsom’s advances on a now pregnant Celia. George must have felt that Celia had some control over the situation as he told Celia to “quit” Newsom (Linder 2019). Celia made it clear that she had little choice in the matter. We are unsure if Celia ever approached the situation with Newsom or if she even had the ability to do so. She did ask Newsom’s daughters if they would intervene on their father’s poor behavior, even if only until her pregnancy was through. It is unknown if they ever breached the subject with their father (Linder 2019).

In June of 1855, Celia was experiencing morning sickness. Virginia would later testify that Celia was unable to cook and fulfill regular duties on account of her illness (Halpern 2015). On June 23, Newsom told Celia that he would be at her cabin that evening. Celia begged Newsom not to, suggesting that she was too sick, or to wait until after the child had been born. Celia had placed a piece of wood in the corner of the cabin. Around 10:00 pm, Newsom left the bedroom that he shared with his 12-year-old grandson, Coffee Waynscott and made his way outside to Celia’s cabin. When Newsom approached her, she tried to verbally thwart his advances. When that did not work and he continued his assault, she struck him once with the piece of wood. He fell to the floor but tried to stand up, lunging at Celia. She struck him again, which was the killing blow. Celia dismembered Newsom’s body and burnt it in the fireplace in her cabin and hid his personal effects under bricks in the fireplace.

A search party ensued the next day, led by family members and neighbors, including William Powell, who owned the adjacent farm. George provided information to Powell, implicating Celia. Powell questioned Celia for several hours, repeatedly
threatening or coercing her into an admission. Celia was threatened with the loss of her children, execution, and was even offered bribes. Eventually, Celia requested that Newsom’s adult children Harry and David leave the room while she relayed her truth. Celia maintained that she did not intend to kill Newsom, rather she was hoping to stop his advances (Halpern 2015). Newsom’s remains were burnt bone fragments that had been scattered about the yard that morning or stashed in the fireplace bricks with his personal effects. Newsom’s remains were recovered for burial in the family cemetery.

When the trial ensued in July, a public defender was appointed for Celia. Despite the outcome of guilty being predetermined (and her execution). Her pro-slavery public defender gave a convincing performance. Celia was not allowed to testify. One witness, Jefferson Jones, said that Newsom raped Celia on the day her purchased her, and he had raped her frequently since then (Linder 2019). In Missouri it was legal for a woman to defend her honor. At the conclusion of the trial, it was determined that Celia, while a female and despite being raped, was not entitled to defend herself since she was property (Halpern 2015). She was sentenced to hanging. A stay of execution was issued for after her unborn child was delivered because it was considered innocent of its mother’s crime and a value to the Newsom estate. An appeal was also filed with the Missouri State Supreme court on Celia’s behalf. Celia was liberated out of jail by local abolitionists and sympathizers and taken into hiding, in hopes of her safety until her appeal could be heard. Unfortunately, her baby was stillborn. After the Missouri State Supreme court refused to hear her case, Celia was returned to jail. She was executed on December 23rd, 1855, and was buried in an unmarked grave in a pauper’s cemetery.
in Jefferson City (Halpern 2015). Celia was likely 19 years old and had sustained Newsom’s assaults for five years.

Remains of the Newsom farmstead and site include features consisting of depressions, a well, arranged field stones or foundations, and orchard trees. There are no standing structures remaining (Figure 8), but artifacts found around the site include construction materials such as limestone, brick fragments, nails, staples, window glass, and other construction materials. Artifacts representing kitchen or dining materials included medicine bottle glass, various glass containers, canning jar fragments, and ceramic wares of distinct types. Utilitarian vessels used for food storage or processing were also found, made of coarse stone wares in glazed or unglazed varieties. Several artifacts associated with the household or personal effects were discovered. They included furniture components, lamp parts, clothing accessories like zippers and buttons, sewing pins, an iron, and even a tortoiseshell comb.

Agency Actions

In 1985, the US Forest Service employed Heritage Preservation Associates to record the site and develop tactics for site protection against pending forest actions. These measures included full archaeological recording as well as some historical background research. The site was protected from subsequent activities that may have damaged its remains. In 2002, the Mark Twain National Forest partnered with the University of Tennessee to conduct additional site recording and site mapping. Another site investigation occurred in 2012, when Missouri State University updated the site
mapping. Forest Service archaeologist James Halpern studied the site extensively for his master's thesis at Missouri State University and used Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) to determine subsurface deposits. In 2019, the Forest Service requested the development of a National Register Nomination for the site, which is currently in process.

Recommendations

The Celia Site has many stories to tell and still resonates nationally and locally. Being well known, Celia’s story remains a point of contention in local discourse and the community’s narrative. Some community members encourage discussion around the subject, while others express a desire to quiet the story, either out of it being an
embarrassment or a redundant topic. Continued social, historical, and archaeological research regarding themes of the Celia Site would contribute to its preservation and interpretation. An opportunity exists with the interpretive process to decolonize and decriminalize this site’s history.

Completing the National Register Nomination for the Celia Site will increase the number of African American heritage sites on the National Register of Historic Places, something that is greatly needed (Greco 2021). The nomination also provides contextual information on important and often overlooked themes in American history and archaeology, including the contributions of African Americans and the historically complex relationships between African Americans and European Americans in the Upland South (McKelway 1994). The Celia Site nomination is also the cornerstone for the development of educational curriculum and interpretive measures for recreation experiences.

Various local partnerships with organizations like the Carter Center for K-12 Black History Education would lead to the development of school curricula on slavery and civil rights. The Carter Center is a program of University of Missouri’s College of Education and Human Development that aims to improve Black history curriculum and instruction for K-12 students. They recognize the limitations that many history and humanities teachers face with the content, accessibility, and delivery of curricula. The Center empowers educators by providing professional development, advanced knowledge of Black history, digital media resources, and appropriate methods associated with teaching Black history (Carter Center 2019). In particular, the Center
supports research on efficacy in legal policy regarding curriculum and pedagogy, and the psychological and sociological influences of teachers, learners, and community.

Some resources already exist for curriculum development and engaging experience. Much of the discourse and interpretive experiences about Celia’s story revolve around the legal case against her. For example, the Celia Project by PBS provides students with a way to familiarize themselves with primary sources and conduct mock trials around the Celia case based on the historic court records (WNET 2022). The court and trial records are the only known surviving documentary sources associated with Celia and have been studied extensively, possibly limiting the scope of some learning experiences. A risk and result of the focus on these materials is further criminalizing Celia based on the historic racist laws that prohibited her from freedom, self-defense, and civil rights.

The Forest Service has an opportunity to decriminalize and decolonize Celia’s narrative by partnering with the Carter Center to develop a research and curriculum project about Celia. Historical and archaeological research and subsequent curricula should involve the history of the site as a case study of the power of resistance, persistence, and insistence, as well as the injustices of slavery. Other themes include the complex relationships between enslaver and enslaved, the violation of human and civil rights that Blacks faced in historic Missouri, and the connections that history has to modern society. The material culture and spatial analysis of the site should be tools of learning and interpretation for these themes. This research would also inform the conservation education efforts put forth by the Forest Service.
The Celia story is impactful and should be shared in local, state, and national curricula. The site itself is unmarked, located in an open field, adjacent to a country road. A National Register nomination is currently underway, with the intention of a listing under criteria A, B, and D. The nomination will provide an example of a contextual analysis and way to train agency employees (archaeologists and historians) in recording and evaluating sites of complex themes and social inequalities. This nomination will serve as the foundation for further interpretation opportunities.

Lastly, the Forest Service should support the legal vacating of Celia’s case. A vacated judgment is both canceled and annulled. While the process of vacating the legal decision is cumbersome, it would demonstrate the agency’s commitment and mission to equality. In 2012, a group of researchers through University of Michigan’s College of Literature, Science, and the Arts formed “The Celia Project: A Research Collaboration on the History of Slavery and Sexual Violence”. Their collaborative group investigated the legal case of “The State of Missouri v. Celia, A Slave” and its implications throughout America. Additionally, they explored the institution of slavery and the associated sexual violence through primary and secondary resources. They engaged with artists, educators, historians, scholars, and legal analysts to fully consider the ways in which Celia and women like her persisted throughout history oration of the legacy of slavery (Celia Project 2016).

The Celia Project began a research case to vacate the legal decision, but the collaboration seemed to stalemate in 2017. As stewards and managers of the site and its history, the Forest Service should engage with the Celia Project, or with the Office of General Counsel, to advance the vacating of Celia’s judgment. The agency has a long
history of racist and exclusionist policies and regulations throughout time. Such a legal action would also set precedence for other land management agencies that steward sites of similar social and historical importance.
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION

The United States Forest Service manages over 193,000,000 acres of land across the country. Prior to coming into federal land management, these landscapes were the home to millions of people for over thousands of years. As a result, the Forest Service is responsible for sites and history of the people who lived on these lands. The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 was passed to identify and preserve sites of significant historical value, many of which were in danger from mass timbering and land management tactics across the country in the first half of the twentieth century. The Forest Service responded in the 1980’s by employing archaeologists to survey lands, identify sites, and draft reports in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Most archaeological work conducted was solely for the purpose of meeting and accelerating timber harvest or resource targets, not necessarily for the management of historic properties. In the 1990s, employees of the Forest Service at National Forests in Missouri, Indiana and Illinois became interested in three sites within their local management. Extra research emphasis was placed on each of these three sites, beyond typical Section 106 investigation.

The social and civil unrest of 2019 encouraged the agency to double down on Diversity and Inclusion efforts and serve underserved communities in a stronger manner. In the early 2000s, I participated in and led archaeological investigations for academic or private ventures that researched the histories and sites of silenced or underrepresented individuals. Having worked as an archaeologist in the Forest Service since 2003, I witnessed the responsibility and opportunity to research and interpret comparable sites that embody the pursuit of civil rights and resistance to social, judicial,
and environmental injustice, beyond the standard Section 106 site identification procedures. This thesis proposes that the agency leverage the expertise of employees to identify and research existing sites. The agency should engage with communities and partners to develop meaningful interpretive experiences that challenge stale, silent, or uninformed historic narratives about the landscapes we manage. Through the act of public service and using existing platforms the agency can positively affect its own culture while amplifying the history of underrepresented communities.

The three sites located on the Mark Twain, Shawnee, and Hoosier National Forests serve as pilot sites to test and hone the program goals and implementation methods. Each site uniquely expresses a historic pursuit of civil rights and resistance through different material culture and history. The potential interpretation measures for the sites demonstrate a variety of methods ranging from traditional hiking trails to virtual touring experiences, K-12 curriculum, community engagement, and legal reconciliation. The level of previous agency investment and community interest in these sites played a role in their selection as pilot sites.

Frequent program and project review will determine success and drive future actions. This review consists of the implementation of professional project management practices; an assessment process called After-Action Review (AAR); and future program and project planning. These three components allow for monitored but flexible project boundaries, a feedback loop to serve as a system of checks and balances, and developmental brainstorming and planning for future opportunities.

Professional project management commences with an intentional and well-developed Project Management Plan. The program goals should be woven into the
construction of the Plan to establish project context. Important questions to ask in creating the goals include: Does the project increase, diversify, or make recreation opportunities accessible? Does the project identify significant sites or serve to interpret or preserve them? Does the project positively affect agency culture? Or is the project using existing platforms or developing to identify and interpret sites and histories of underserved and underrepresented communities? Using these four program goals to root the project management plan builds a solid foundation by which to monitor success, build relationships, and conduct meaningful work.

The Project Management plan also explains the timelines, milestones, modifications, expectations, communication plans, context of the work, and roles and responsibilities, and essentially is a guide to managing the project. An effective Plan should be reviewed by all involved parties to ensure commitment and transparency. An example of a Sites of Civil Rights and Resistance project is development of a National Register Nomination for the Celia Site. The Plan for this project would outline important key points such as who is responsible for conducting the research and development of the nomination; anticipated expenses such as field visits; due dates and review periods; consulting parties; and measures for issues like employee turn-over. Once a Plan is formalized, project managers and participants will consult the agreement frequently to ensure that the project is on track with achievable outcomes and goals. Project management is also the agency’s commitment to seeing a project completed from start to finish without diverging from a scope of work or letting projects languish when other priorities or opportunities arise.
Upon completion of the project, an After-Action Review (AAR) should be conducted to assess and analyze the successes of the program, project, as well as elements for improvement. This review serves as the feedback loop which will inform the next steps of the program including the identification of additional sites and development of interpretation and preservation measures for sites newly identified or considered. These feedback loops are important, as they make the interpretation process transformative, as seen at the Presidio program management mentioned in Chapter II (Jones 2019). In an open forum format, the AAR should revisit the program goals again to determine if indeed the original program goal questions asked in the Project Management Plan were met. All that participated in the project, including the benefiting public, should be included in the Review. Opening up the process provides an opportunity for participants to be involved in most steps of the process, similar to the local residents that participated in excavations in their community of Oss (discussed in Chapter II). Program and project successes as well as weaknesses should be discussed, and considerations of the intended audience. The value of the project should be reiterated, as well as the long-term maintenance (if necessary). The AAR also fuels the third and decisive step, which is planning for the future.

Future program and project planning should combine the feedback received during the AAR with a review of the program goals to envision future projects. Similar to the Park Service and Fish and Wildlife Service, the agency should consider the history of the landscapes they manage as well as well as the information gleaned during projects. For example, after discovering the historical significance of the now private landholdings surrounding the current Camp Nelson, the National Park Service began to
interpret the history beyond federal landholdings. Likewise, the Fish and Wildlife service has recognized that much of the land historically deemed of little financial value was actually inhabited by marginalized people that were truly the makers of history, as in the childhood home of Harriet Tubman.

After the three pilot project site plans are underway, the agency should consider the best steps forward and the likelihood to serve different demographic histories. To challenge perspectives and truly be inclusive, the program can expand to include Indigenous, Latinx, and Asian American Pacific Islander, and other histories and sites. Such expansion may require a change in the platforms or the partners that are employed during site identification and interpretation design. For example, tribal consultation might also become the best collaborative tool in site identification and preservation of Indigenous sites of civil rights and resistance.

Eventually, project identification efforts should also include an improvement of labeling to enable searches in the Forest Service’s Natural Resource Management database. The agency recognizes the biases in the data collection process that lead to omitted sites and histories, directly hampering identification efforts. Since landownership often dictates history, many sites associated with the enslavement era are listed under the name and affiliation of White landowners which removes countless enslaved individuals. Identifying the biases associated with database development, data entry, and recording of sites would directly affect agency culture and assist in identifying sites in the future.

American history is full of everyday details and actions that may have seemed like major life events to the individuals involved but were also characteristic of wider
cultural shifts at the time. In 1836, Mathew Thomas worked in the rich soil of 80 acres in Indiana, knowing that it was his own. In 1844, Harrison Miller and his family moved to the wilds of an Illinois landscape seeking a fresh start after generations of enslavement. In 1860, an excited Julia Singleton taught other African Americans (who had also been enslaved in their distant past), how to read and write, something that was illegal in nearby states. And in 1853, an alone, young, and pregnant Celia resisted horrific and habitual assault from her enslaver. All of these moments and experiences were paramount to these people. But it is unlikely that any of them thought that they were making history, or that their space (their cabin, their school, their tools, their settlement), would become a landscape of civil rights or resistance. It is an honor and an opportunity for the Forest Service to uplift and share their story, to serve the public, and to preserve these moments and landscapes for generations to come.
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