

**EXAMINING THE DISPARITY BETWEEN TOURIST DEVELOPMENT AND CULTURAL
RESOURCE PRESERVATION ON BARBADOS**

SCOTT M. FITZPATRICK

Department of Anthropology and Historic Preservation Program

University of Oregon

**EXAMINING THE DISPARITY BETWEEN TOURIST DEVELOPMENT AND CULTURAL
RESOURCE PRESERVATION ON BARBADOS**

ABSTRACT

How best to go about preserving and managing cultural resources when confronted with tourist development is becoming an increasingly important question for archaeologists and developers everywhere. In this paper I discuss issues related to the development of the Port St. Charles Marina at the Heywoods archaeological site in Barbados, West Indies. Past archaeological investigations conducted at Heywoods have revealed substantial evidence of prehistoric settlement from the earliest preceramic period (c. 2000 B.C.) through ceramic periods (200 B.C. - A.D. 1500), as well as historic use as a plantation. Despite strong evidence for past human settlement, the Environmental Impact Assessment completed for the site prior to development barely mentions cultural impacts. This presents an unusual and difficult situation for both archaeologists on one side who are interested in reconstructing past lifeways through material culture, and developers on the other who may have interest in this vestige but who are not required to consider the impacts or mitigate the effects to cultural remains.

To better understand the reasons surrounding development at Heywoods, I explore the thesis that a lack of cultural ties by the present-day population to once-present indigenous Amerindians, and a need for tourist development as a sustaining economic force, have influenced the decision to build the marina at this location. This regional case study serves as an indicator of how present-day cultural beliefs and the strong desire for tourist development can differentially affect cultural resource site preservation strategies. The issues presented here suggest a need for close communication and cooperation between archaeologists, developers, and other social scientists in coming to a mutual consensus concerning site preservation. Looking at the preservation of archaeological sites from an applied perspective may hold promise for successfully preserving and managing cultural resources on Barbados at sites similar to Heywoods.

INTRODUCTION

The island of Barbados in the West Indies has a long record of colonization beginning with its first known settlement by Amerindians around 4,000 B.P., its first written reference in A.D. 1518 by the Spanish, and subsequent colonization by the British in the early 1600s. No indigenous Amerindian peoples were present on Barbados when European colonization began, and none were documented by previous explorers. This is in contrast to many other Caribbean islands where indigenous peoples were encountered by Europeans. As a result, there are no references for Barbados in the ethnohistoric literature with which to interpret prehistoric peoples on the island. Archaeological investigations during the last 30 years, however, have demonstrated that indigenous peoples occupied the island continuously from at least 200 B.C. to around A.D. 1500 (Boomert 1987; Drewett 1987, 1989, 1991; Hackenberger 1987, 1988) and as early as 1600 B.C. (Drewett 1993).

During colonization by the British, the island became heavily populated with African slaves who were brought in to work in the sugarcane industry. With the increased demand for sugar and its derivatives (mainly molasses and rum), the slave population steadily rose throughout the 17th and 18th centuries. Presently 98% of the island's 260,000 inhabitants are descendants of African slaves. This population replacement raises some questions about how the present-day population view the existence of indigenous peoples with only archaeological data serving as a source of information.

In this paper I use the development of the Port St. Charles marina at the Heywoods site as a case study for examining cultural resource preservation ideology on Barbados. I suggest that a lack of cultural ties by present-day peoples to previous indigenous populations and a need for economic development (i.e., tourism) helped promote site development by government and investing agencies. As a result the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) completed for the site did not have to include mitigation procedures for cultural resource impacts because there was no national legislation in place that required developers to do so. It is likely that these factors, and possibly others, played a role in the decision to build the marina, revolving around policy meant to assure development of prime real estate in coastal areas such as this. The Heywoods site case study has implications for understanding how coastal development and history have worked together to form political and economic policies on Barbados, and represents the conflict between desired economic growth and the preservation of cultural resources in a country which has been affected by one form of cultural discontinuity. With the only evidence for Native peoples on the island residing in the archaeological record, and a lack of any ethnohistoric documentation to help aid in interpretation, the archaeology, for many reasons, becomes crucial if we are interested in understanding who these inhabitants were. Approaching these issues from an applied perspective with a focus toward public education may enable Barbadians to more effectively achieve their goals of tourist development while at the same time preserving the past.

THE HEYWOODS SITE

Background

The island of Barbados is the easternmost island in the chain of islands that comprise the Lesser Antilles (Figure 1). It is located approximately 2400 km southeast of Florida, 500 km north of Venezuela, and about 100 km east of St. Vincent, the nearest island. The island is 34 km long, 23 km wide, and is 430 km² in area (Figure 1). The cultural contexts for Barbados are divided into five main time periods: 1) preceramic period (1850-200 B.C.); 2) Saladoid period (Cedrosan: 200 B.C.-A.D. 350; Secan: A.D. 350-650); 3) Troumassoid period (A.D. 650-1100); 4) Suazoid period (A.D. 1100-1500); and 5) Historic period (A.D. 1518-present; Drewett 1989, 1991; Allaire 1997).

The prehistoric component of the Heywoods site was first identified during Drewett's field survey of 1985-86 (Drewett 1987). It was initially excavated in 1985/86 and revealed a mostly Suazoid (A.D. 1200-1500) period settlement. The original known site boundary covered about 300 m² just north of what was once the Heywoods Holiday Village (today it has been renamed the Almond Beach Resort), but has since been expanded. The 1985/86 excavations revealed prehistoric pottery sherds and radiocarbon dates of A.D. 830 +/- 80 and A.D. 1040 +/- 80 (Drewett 1991: 27). Continuing investigation of the site by Drewett took place during the 1990/91 field season, and revealed an extensive prehistoric occupation (Drewett 1993). Ceramic distributions were concentrated from the Troumassoid (A.D. 650-1100) period to the later Suazoid (A.D. 1100-1500) period, but included earlier Saladoid (200 B.C.-A.D. 650) activity as well. Over 7,500 pottery sherds and ceramic pieces were recovered from 40 excavated trenches including adornos (figurines placed around the rims of vessels), animal-head lugs, spindle whorls, and other decorated sherds. Other artifactual remains from the site included over 40 shell tools and fragments of polished sandstone imported from the Scotland district (located along the

northeast portion of the island). A total of 1284 marine shells from over 20 different species, bones from a large number of fish species consisting mostly of pelagic fishes (especially flyingfishes and tuna), and a number of other faunal remains such as land crabs were also found (see Drewett 1993 for further discussion). Perhaps the most significant find was of two chipped conch (*Strombus gigas*) lip adzes of preceramic type found at the base of Trench 39 in marsh clay at a depth of 1.5 meters (Drewett 1993). These were found in association with unmodified conch shells, one of which was radiocarbon dated at 3900 +/- 100 B.P., and when corrected for the marine reservoir effect, gave a date of 1630 B.C. This is the first and only evidence for a preceramic occupation of Barbados and pushes the date of initial colonization back almost 1500 years from what was known previously. The prehistoric Heywoods site also lies within the boundaries of the former Heywoods Plantation, with sugarcane having been grown on the site during early historic times. Pottery and clay pipes dating to the middle of the 17th century attest to its use during the Historic period (Drewett 1991, 1993). Evidence of cultivation can be seen in varying depths around the site ranging from about 20-40 cm.

During July and August 1995, with the cooperation of the Port St. Charles development team, a salvage excavation was conducted at the site. This salvage project, although rudimentary and insufficient due to the time frame (4 weeks), the number of people involved (4), and the methods used (a backhoe), revealed numerous cultural remains. These included a large number of pottery sherds, faunal material, some adornos, and two human burials, one identified as being historic (at a depth of about 40 cm), and the other prehistoric (at a depth of about 80 cm; Fitzpatrick, n.d.). An additional attempt by Drewett has been made to investigate the site prior to final phases of marina development, and initial results have revealed a great number of artifactual materials, faunal and shell refuse, round houses with waterlogged posts, pot and wood-lined wells, and numerous burials (Drewett 1999 pers. comm.; Hackenberger 1998, pers. comm.). A more detailed report will be published at a later date (Drewett, in press).

Port St. Charles Development Project

The Port St. Charles Development project involves the construction of an inland marina that encompasses 22 acres of land including the whole known boundary of the Heywoods site. The proposal is to construct a marina and an inland lagoon that serve residential and commercial facilities which can be privately owned but publicly operated. As suggested in the main development proposal, Port St. Charles will utilize the 22 acre site to create: 1) an inland lagoon of 2.8 ha (7.1 acres); 2) an offshore breakwater linked to the mainland by a 60 meter long bridge supported on piles and the dredging of an access canal to the lagoon; 3) apartment units, comprising 48 one-bedroomed apartments, 49 two-bedroomed apartments, and 56 three-bedroomed apartments; 4) berths for home-owner yachts; 5) berths for guest yachts; 6) a yacht club and restaurant; 7) ancillary service buildings, providing services and shopping; 8) access roads and parking areas; 9) landscaped areas; and 10) an enlarged beach on the southern side of the marina channel for turtle pond protection (Richard Gill Associates Ltd. 1995).

According to the EIA, the marina plan emphasizes a development that attracts upper income sections of the tourism market. It is to provide new high standard accommodations within existing tourism zones "in proximity of the prime beach attractions" (Richard Gill Associates Ltd. 1995: 2). The "Extensions of Tourism Development Plan" states that this site was specifically allocated for tourism and

recreational uses. The 1994 Manifesto of the Government of Barbados provides a means for achieving maximum tourist potential to earn foreign exchange and create jobs, and is the political prelude for allowing such development.

It is suggested that the project will attract a resident population of 668 persons plus a staff of 300 in order to maintain the facilities year round. Some of the major benefits of the project are proposed as being: 1) significant net foreign exchange to Barbados over the 20 year period of monitoring; 2) permanent employment of around 300 people; 3) increased economic activity in Speightstown and the surrounding area; 4) significant employment during the construction stage; 5) the creation of a substantial body of inland water with the potential to improve nursery conditions for fisheries; 6) provision of a new habitat for reef fish on off-shore structures; and 7) the satisfaction of the government's development planning policy for the area (Richard Gill Associates Ltd. 1995).

Other benefits that are listed which will result from specific mitigation measures include: 1) a significant reduction of stormwater sediment reaching the sea, with benefit to existing reef conditions; 2) the widening of the beach on the north side of the marina; and 3) improved parking and other beach facilities for the public to the north and south of the marina.

The main foci of inquiry for the EIA were coastal and marine impacts and stormwater, wastewater, and groundwater management. The EIA is detailed regarding these impacts. The mitigation procedures provide an adequate means for protecting and/or manipulating the coastal area to minimize disturbance to flora, fauna, and human recreation areas. Perhaps most noteworthy is one of the three principal impacts that are identified under the section "Landscape and the Environment." This impact lists the "*Potential loss of Arawak remains,*" and suggests the possibility that an indigenous Arawak settlement existed on or near the site. "However, the previous cultivation of the land reduces any potential archaeological importance" (Richard Gill Associates Ltd. 1995:15). This expressed view is counter to evidence already collected. The Heywoods site has revealed numerous prehistoric cultural remains as well as human burials, much of which lies below the cultivation area (Drewett 1993). Mitigation procedures for these impacts suggested only that "[t]he Barbados Museum and Historical Society has been invited to undertake an archaeological excavation of the site over a three month period" (Richard Gill Associates Ltd. 1995:15). This invitation, however, did not include funding for archaeologists, survey and mapping equipment, cultural remains analysis, or radiocarbon dating, some of the fundamental necessities for conducting a professional archaeological survey and excavation. The 1995 salvage excavation conducted by myself and a small field team under the direction of the Barbados Museum and Historical Society, took place only with the developer's cooperation and only because we were already on-island completing another project.

So what factors have played a role in determining site development? In order to adequately analyze what these factors may be, we must look at Barbados in an historical context as well as viewing current economic needs and desires.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Barbados was visited by both the Portuguese and the Spanish in the 1500s but there were no observations of any indigenous peoples living there during these visitations (Barton 1979). Rouse (1992) has suggested that a Carib migration from the mainland around A.D. 1450 succeeded in driving the existing populations out, although it is equally plausible that disease contracted from European explorers, slavery, and inter-ethnic warfare helped to wipe out the populations (Wilson 1997; see also Davis and Goodwin 1990, Siegel 1989 for discussions of alternative hypotheses regarding separate waves of Amerindian migrations). Later on, in the period between 1623 and 1632, large portions of the Lesser Antilles such as St. Kitts, Nevis, Antigua, and Montserrat, were being settled by the English, and it was in 1625 that an English mariner party arrived and formally claimed Barbados. The subsequent arrival of permanent settlers in 1627 began full-blown colonization.

It was soon after this initial settlement that the colonists began growing tobacco, one of the most lucrative New World crops on the European markets (Beckles 1990). During this early period, tobacco and cotton were the primary staples of the trade economy in the Atlantic triangle. The production of tobacco and other crops such as indigo and cotton, however, required a large labor force. Unlike the Spanish and Portuguese, the English could not use Amerindians as slaves due to their decimation at the hands of both disease and enslavers. Instead, they began to rely on indentured servants during the early plantation economy. During the mid 1630s, sugarcane was introduced to the economy and soon became the major export. Sugar quickly came to dominate Caribbean agriculture, and started to be seriously cultivated around 1640 (Klein 1986). High European sugar prices combined with falling tobacco prices effectively induced the need for an increasing labor pool for cultivation. In the late 1670s Barbados contained the majority of English settlers in the Caribbean and remained the dominant British sugar producing unit until the end of the 17th century (Levy 1980).

It is fairly clear that the total production of sugar and much of the production of tobacco, their cheapness, and their elasticity of supply were dependent upon the continuing flow of the productive labor of slaves to the colonies (Solow 1985, 1987). The 18th century saw the full expansion of this trade network. Total trade increased dramatically and the Atlantic became filled with ships carrying manufactured goods to Africa, the West Indies, Brazil, Portugal, and British North America. Every one of these flows depended on the product of slave labor. The slave institution increased economic activity in the Atlantic economy - it did not merely direct economic activity from alternative, equally productive channels (Bean 1971). Slavery introduced a more elastic supply of labor into the colonial system, counteracting the diminishing productivity of investment, thus permitting a period of constant returns to colonial investment.

Slavery was abolished on Barbados in 1807. At this time the island had a population of almost 600 people per square mile (Beckles 1990:41). At the time of independence from the British in 1966 there were over 200,000 people on Barbados, providing a large labor force with which to industrialize, almost all of whom were descendants of these African slaves.

TOURIST DEVELOPMENT AND CULTURAL RESOURCE PRESERVATION

The focus of economic development for Barbados just prior to independence was economic expansion based on industrialization, rather than a plantation economy. This was a significant departure from the previous development strategy (Beckles 1990:200). The government began to revise the expanding legislative provisions to encourage and promote tourism and agriculture. "Tourism was promoted as a major industrial sector during the first 4 years of the regime, and government revenues earned from this sector increased at a remarkable rate" (Beckles 1990:200). Along with the passage of the Industrial Development Act and the Export Industries Act of 1963 which provided over 2,000 jobs in 44 industrial plants, Barbados was well on its way to becoming a major economic force in the Caribbean.

From about 1955 on into the following decade, sugar continued to dominate the economy despite an increase in other areas including construction, retail trade, tourism, livestock, poultry, and vegetables. Continuing into the 1970s there was, however, a trend of decreasing sugar exports as a total of domestic exports, and an increasing tourist industry. During the 1980s, the economy became somewhat stagnant. Between 1965-1979 the island had become one of the fastest growing economies, moving up from 11th to 3rd place among Caribbean island states (Hoyos 1978). But since 1980, Barbados has become one of the fastest borrowing nations in the Americas, its external debt reaching upwards of US\$600 million (Hoyos 1978:34). 1987 unemployment figures stood at 17.9%, and per capita income was around US\$4500.

Overall, Barbados has been a significant part of the Caribbean communities' efforts to increase industrialization in the region, but a lack of natural resources has led to the development of tourism as a sustaining economic force. An increasing number of tourists, predominantly from Canada, England, and the United States, have created a multi-million dollar tourist industry on the island. This has led to both local and foreign investment in hotels, resorts, and other tourist site areas. The construction of a deep-water harbor in the 1960s made it possible for cruise ships to dock and the increased air traffic from major cities like Miami, New York, London, and Toronto have made it easier for tourists to visit the island in a shorter period of time. These factors have led to a steady increase in the number of tourists who are able to venture to the island annually. Although the main sectors of development like tourism, manufacturing, and sugar bring in the majority of foreign money, they only provide jobs for about one-third of the work force. With a lack of natural resources Barbados has found it difficult to become self-sustaining. Tourism is seen as superseding the sugar industry, and development which promotes

tourism is seen as perhaps the most viable, if not the only alternative for gaining foreign revenue.

This scenario has been repeated in many other areas of the world where island communities, lacking in raw materials, cannot rely on self-sufficiency for total economic stability (Charle 1986; Connell 1991; Dolman 1985; Dommen and Hein 1985; Fairbairn 1985, 1987; Momsen 1986; McDonald 1989; Nason 1984). Oftentimes, other avenues such as tourism become the norm (Lea 1980; Britton 1987). With a need to increase productivity, employment, and foreign currency in Barbados, a new era of investing for tourist development is taking place. It appears that the current need for jobs and foreign investment has been a major factor in facilitating support for the tourist industry, and as a consequence, a lack of support in other areas such as cultural resource preservation (see Krause 1992 for some examples in Micronesia).

Economic development on Barbados up until the present (especially within the last 30 years) has been quite extensive, taking up huge areas of land for agriculture and encompassing a large number of capital improvement projects for infrastructure and tourist areas. These land-use methods have left both material culture remains and an archaeologically identifiable impact on the environment, thus increasing the need to develop strong cultural resource preservation strategies.

The study of effective preservation tactics has been a common theme in archaeology, and efforts to explain their role within various cultural frameworks are abundant (e.g., Ayres and Mauricio 1999; Beller et al. 1990; Burley 1993; Krause 1992; Monroe 1995; National Park Service n.d.; Schmidt and McIntosh 1996; Stoffle and Evans 1990). In many countries cultural resource preservation has taken on many different meanings and forcefulness as a result of Western colonization, cultural transformations, and economic, social, and political desires. In extreme circumstances the lack of governmental involvement and international cooperation, for example, has resulted in vandalism and looting of cultural resources (Monroe 1995; Schmidt and McIntosh 1996). In Barbados, as in many other countries, it is quite evident that economic interests can and do conflict with the protection of cultural resources (Schmidt 1995: 24). The Port St. Charles marina and waterfront development, although much needed in Barbados in economic terms, has involved the destruction of a major portion of the Heywoods archaeological site which spans a large portion of the area set aside for development. Although one cannot argue with the need for this project as economically advantageous, the absence of mechanisms to evaluate and mitigate negative impacts on cultural resources is regrettable.

DISCUSSION

The Port St. Charles marina on the Heywoods site is an example of how development is allowed to occur in the face of evidence supporting archaeological significance of a site. The archaeological evidence suggests that the Heywoods site was an important settlement area during both prehistoric and historic times. The recent finding of preceramic artifacts reinforces the importance of this site for understanding indigenous lifeways on Barbados and the Caribbean. So, what factors have caused this development to occur and why might prehistoric sites be less likely preserved? I suggest that a key reason is a lack of cultural ties between the present-day, mostly African population and the indigenous Amerindian

inhabitants. Obviously there are economic needs for an expanding tourist industry to maintain and increase cash flow. Taken together, these have discouraged legislative action which would preserve or protect cultural resources.

Simmons and Mitchell (1984:4) suggest that “when people (i.e., politicians in this case) make a decision they weigh the expected costs and benefits of the alternatives and select the option that offers them the most satisfactory payoff in terms of the things they value.” Under the premise of these conditions using the Heywoods site case study, the “alternatives” can be seen as the discouraging of the tourist industry and the possible economic downfall as a result, and the “satisfactory payoff” as continued political support, the reelection of public officials who support economic development, the preservation of cultural resources mostly historical in nature, and ultimate economic growth for the country as a whole. For both the political constituents and the majority population, the choice is obvious. The high value placed upon economic growth (especially without the influence of cultural ties to indigenous peoples that reinforces commitment to one’s ancestry), seems then to have affected the organization of cultural resource preservation strategies on Barbados.

I do not want to suggest that there has been a complete lack of cultural resource preservation on Barbados. Barbadians have a clear sense of their own past and ways of preserving it. There have been numerous efforts by the Barbados government and private interests to restore, reconstruct, or protect many historically significant resources. These include the English Garrison that the Barbados Museum now occupies, Codrington College (a theological school), English signal stations (one of which, Grenade Hall, has been reconstructed and turned into a small museum display with artifacts found during archaeological excavations there), and various other historical structures. A testament to the desire to preserve their past is the placement of the Morgan Lewis windmill on the World Monuments Fund which lists those structures or properties that have significant value in the local cultural context.

Today, the Morgan Lewis Sugar Mill is one of the few windmills intact from that period, and the largest of its kind in the region; it symbolizes a period in the history of Barbados and the whole Caribbean. The nominator of this site to the World Monuments Watch stated that Barbados did not have previously any internationally listed historic sites, and the inclusion of the Morgan Lewis Sugar Mill on the World Monuments Watch “offers profound encouragement to the local preservationists” and would help the government to recognize the “need to preserve our heritage sites” (World Monuments Fund 1998:10).

The placement of this windmill on the World Monuments Fund is a significant and proactive step by Barbados preservationists to protect, preserve, and conserve their past, while at the same time gaining revenue and, I presume, allowing them to define their own national sense of being. This is an interesting perspective that has not yet been fully researched -- how Barbadians themselves construct their own national identity and how this might affect their perceptions of prehistory. It is possible that a desire by Barbadians to construct a post-colonial national identity (especially since their recent independence from England in 1966) has fueled the preservation of those things they see as being important to them historically. To my knowledge, no anthropological research has addressed this question on Barbados. However, a goal among those interested in preserving and utilizing a cultural heritage is to clearly assign research involving national identity, especially in states where there exists a variety of tribes or ethnic groups, “a category into which the majority of colonial countries falls,” although this mostly pertains to

places where “the material cultural heritage is particularly suited to helping to develop the population’s awareness of a shared historical identity” (Herrmann 1989:35). Unfortunately, this is not the case for Barbados. Ethnological data on this subject would surely illuminate a number of other variables related to cultural resource preservation and the formation of national identities here, helping to better understand this issue.

Overall, the Barbados Museum and Historical Society has been quite active in supporting research and professional archaeological work since its opening in 1934. It is extremely difficult, as many archaeologists and preservationists know, however, to promote archaeology as being important in situations where people have an historical attachment to the artifacts, let alone a situation where people do not. And as Lewis (1994:52) has aptly put it, “[t]he subsidy of culture is as much a matter of public relations as anything else, inasmuch as it will always be difficult to persuade people to spend public money on something new.” It is quite common for national heritage management services (e.g., museums, historic preservation offices) to be compelled by “legal, political, or financial constraints that operate some form of selectivity in respect to monuments, protection, and management” (Cleere 1989:11). But, if the selections are to be “valid in academic and cultural terms, then they must be representative, and a representative sample can only be decided on the basis of knowledge of something approaching the total stock...” (Cleere 1989:11).

Luckily, numerous creative avenues exist for protecting, preserving, and promoting all types of cultural resources. The most common examples are the use of museums to display tangible and intangible cultural resources to the public. The Barbados Museum and Historical Society has done an impressive job of displaying prehistoric and historic artifacts from the region, especially given the lack of financial support which many smaller island nations grapple with here and elsewhere. Most archaeologists and preservationists are keenly aware of how important museums are in helping to preserve the past. Many worldwide examples in the literature of museums and special programs being used to educate people about the past, however, deal with issues of people preserving remnants of their own past and not that of others (Nzewunwa 1994; Foanaota 1994; Mturi 1996). This issue has been increasingly addressed by archaeologists in the United States, most of whom are Euro-Americans, but nonetheless have become advocates for the preservation of Native American cultural remains with which they have no cultural or historical attachment (Anyon et al. 1997; Bruseth et al. 1994; Zimmerman 1997).

Mturi (1996:187) notes that public understanding, support, and involvement are essential in the conservation of any national heritage because threats can arise from a weak socioeconomic base, attitudes of policymakers, administrators, professionals, and the public at large, and the absence of good policies and programs. And as Mturi (1996:173) suggests, using Tanzanian rock art as one example, “...any successful conservation strategy must resolve the two main issues: regenerating the economic base ...and educating the present owners and users, whose socio-cultural link with the heritage is ambiguous, to ensure their involvement in conservation and management.”

The Barbados case study, similar to some U.S. examples, puts a twist on how to best preserve and protect cultural resources which are not obvious (usually subsurface), have no indigenous or legislative advocate, and little economic potential at the present. Although not an immediate concern, the absence of laws to protect cultural resources has implications for protecting sites against looters and pot hunters. Excavations on Barbados have produced finds worthy of notice by archaeologists and amateur and professional collectors. On more than one occasion I was approached by local residents who brought pottery and shell tools to our excavation sites in buckets with little information about provenience. It is

unlikely that the collection of artifacts would ever reach the extent that is seen in other parts of the world such as Africa (Schmidt and McIntosh 1996) or Asia (Monroe 1995), but the possibility exists that if someone were collecting artifacts anywhere on Barbados without applying rigorous professional standards to ensure provenience and proper curation, that little could be done to prevent it (or to punish those responsible).

It remains to be seen how the local population should best be convinced that sites like Heywoods deserve protection and/or data recovery. The inclusion of the Morgan Lewis sugar mill on the World Monuments Fund should eventually serve as a gauge of future public reaction and activism. It is generally agreed that greater sensitivity and successful protection of archaeological sites lies in the level of public education and awareness about what cultural resources consist of and their significance to the people who left them behind (Hoffman 1991; Jameson 1994; Mturi 1996; Renker and Greig 1988; Vitelli 1996). Ayres' and Mauricio's (1994:316) study on Pohnpei in Micronesia expresses the need for this, noting that "the resident's inquiries reflected differing perceptions of such fundamental historic preservation concepts as development, historic and cultural properties, and ownership of land and the resources on it," and that "[o]ther questions from the community show the need for better explanations of preservation and utilization of cultural and historic sites." It is important to keep in mind that these Pohnpeian issues are accounts recorded from an indigenous population, not one which has replaced another on the landscape. In general, it is apparent that the success of cultural resource preservation relies on educating the public and for archaeologists, museum administrators, and preservationists, to become advocates of cooperative and sustainable research and development.

The Heywoods case study shows how impacts to a site can be on the order of catastrophic when one considers the amount of information lost archaeologically and environmentally. But, the Heywoods salvage project can also serve as an example of a cooperative effort between developers and archaeologists to collect archaeological data (although, as I've explained, not under the best of circumstances). It is hoped, however, that preservation and protection of prehistoric cultural resources on Barbados in the future can be effectively achieved under the rubric of strict legislation and without enormous expense, thus laying the groundwork for simultaneously conducting research, preserving cultural resources, educating the public, and aiding economic growth. So as not to repeat what has happened to Heywoods at other sites on Barbados, the government should develop and continue to develop a nationally-based preservation policy that includes an inventory and database of cultural resources, good management plans, laws to protect sites, and a means for fostering multi-interest cooperation. But the question remains -- with what has happened at Heywoods, how can public education, community awareness, cultural resource preservation, academic research, and tourist development all be promoted satisfactorily?

AN APPLIED PERSPECTIVE

Downum and Price (1999) provide some clues on how to answer this question. They note that "[f]or many decades, archaeologists have put little effort into convincing the outside world that their methods

are superior for certain tasks” (Downum and Price 1999:232). These tasks include methods for cultural resource management projects, “contributing knowledge and perspectives to the public regarding the major events, transitions, and processes in long-term human history,” providing stratigraphic information on the “composition of local floral and faunal assemblages during specific periods,” “contributing the expertise needed to ensure that cultural resources are promoted and interpreted in ways that are theoretically sound and culturally appropriate,” and the application of traditional tool manufacture and agricultural methods (Downum and Price 1999:229-231), to name a few.

To best overcome the problems faced at Heywoods in the future, I believe that archaeologists, anthropologists, environmental and historic preservationists, and others interested in “preserving the past,” should step forward with their intimate knowledge of culture to promote some of these ideas in an applied manner. The increasing popularity of tourist visitations to historic and archaeological sites in the U.S. and elsewhere demonstrates that this could be a viable option for Barbados (Blundell 1997; Harrell 1994; Herscher and McManamon 1995). One example is the *in situ* or open-air museum exhibit where “the public can view artifacts, deposits, living surfaces, rock art, architecture, pictographs, and other features in their original setting” (Downum and Price 1999:229; see also Corzo and Hodges 1986). These have proved to be popular attractions for locals and visitors alike in Mexico (Lorenzo 1984), Japan (Tanaka 1984) and Canada (Brink 1989) for example. Cultural tourism, whether it is focused on *in situ* exhibits, museums, or historical reconstructions, provides a way for communities, states, or nations to “seek specialized alternatives to mass tourism” (Downum and Price 1999:231). Compared to other types of development, “tourism . . . is one of the few development activities which could be used in a positive way for the archaeological heritage” (Trotzig 1989:62).

Education also can play a prominent role in protecting cultural resources and has been widely used all over the world for teaching history and science. “The teaching of national history is universal, and modern teaching methods call for the use of aids of many kinds” (Cleere 1989:9). Cleere (1989:9) notes that with younger children, site visits and tours of cultural resources can effectively stimulate the mind much more than formal classroom teaching methods. The value of archaeological sites has been recognized by many (Cracknell and Corbishley 1986; PACT 1985; Council of Europe 1988, after Cleere 1989) to be an incomparable teaching aid. The best part of using education as a tool for cultural resource preservation is that it is applicable for all ages. Although education already fits into the design of many cultural tourism projects and museum outreach programs, it is still the crux of effectively conveying information to the public. In addition, archaeologists are now becoming more aware of the importance of preparing research reports for a broad audience and translating data into layman terms (Watkins et. al. 1995:33-34) to increase public interest and facilitate the educational process. Barbados historically has had an excellent public education system (Schomburgk 1998: 104-110) and its current literacy level of 98% is one of the worlds highest, making it amenable for introducing methods of archaeology, historic preservation, and concepts of a shared history.

Promoting natural resources and environmental sustainability together with cultural resources is another way for archaeological sites to become an educative tool. It is regrettable that government management strategies worldwide have rarely connected natural and cultural resources (see Ayres and Mauricio 1999:300). With 80% of the indigenous flora from Barbados having been replaced historically by sugarcane, and more recently by infrastructure and tourist development, documenting the environment through archaeology has potential benefits for better understanding local and regional climatic and environmental changes through time (McManamon 1995). This has shown great promise in Taiwan where aspects of archaeology and landscape have been fused into the plan for a National Scenic area

(Blundell 1997), and in Venezuela where the development of an ecological museum stresses the need to preserve natural ecosystems and cultural resources together (Sanoja and Vargas 1989). “It is often forgotten – not least by archaeologists – that the sites and monuments of antiquity constitute the historical dimension of their global environment, and that those interests are intimately bound with those of the wildlife and aesthetic dimensions” (Cleere 1989:13). King (1987:264) notes too that “[a]rchaeological emphasis on understanding the past in the context of larger physiographic regions and the natural environment supports the idea that preservation should take a broad, comprehensive view of the subject matter.” The Heywoods Case represents a need for coupling environmental protection policies with cultural resource preservation.

The focus of my argument regarding cultural resource preservation on Barbados revolves around issues related to a lack of shared history by the present-day, mostly African population, with an extinct Amerindian population. But as Wilson (1997:212) notes, many Caribbean people of African descent can and do identify with Amerindians either directly through mixed ancestry (especially in the Greater Antilles) or through similar colonial experiences of slavery and exploitation. A small reserve on Dominica is where most of the once populous Carib Indians of the Lesser Antilles now live, though numbering only a few thousand (Layng 1983). Wilson (1997:213) writes that because of a shared history, that indigenous people in the Caribbean “play an important symbolic role as representations of unity for diverse people.” One way for encouraging the preservation of prehistoric and historic cultural resources and in facilitating public support of these issues in Barbados may lie in the acknowledgement that indigenous people have been important “symbols of resistance to external domination” (Wilson 1997:213).

In a region that is acutely sensitive to colonialist domination, the Indians stand as symbols of resistance because they were the first to fight against colonialism and the first to fall victim to it. Thus, the indigenous people are one of the most powerful symbols of defiance against colonialist oppression. In the modern Caribbean, this sentiment is also shared by the majority and strengthens the sense of national cohesion (Wilson 1997:213).

Amerindian descendents, observing the issues at play in Barbados, may find interest in initiating dialogue with locals, developers, and government officials in regards to their cultural history on Barbados. This may be but one of many avenues that indigenous peoples could pursue in preserving aspects of their history along with that of Barbadians. In the long run these groups could stand to benefit greatly from working together on cultural resource preservation projects that encompass the unique and broad spectrum of one another’s history, linked together by the specter of colonial oppression. Consultation with indigenous peoples is already an important and fundamental part of doing archaeology in countries such as Australia.

Gone are the days when archaeologists could dig away and pose their theoretical problems without dealing with living people or concerning themselves with social or ethical problems. The need both to consult and to involve Aborigines in archaeology is very clear, and the ethical, philosophical, legal, social, and political arguments in favour are overwhelming. In addition, archaeological research has

much to gain from consultation, and most archaeologists should see the benefits and relevance of consultation from the point of view of self-interest, if nothing else (Flood 1989:83).

Incorporating indigenous peoples into active archaeological field programs in Barbados would only serve to heighten public awareness of Amerindian peoples, legitimize their association with cultural remains found there, and provide both archaeologists and Barbadians numerous educational and research opportunities that are now altogether absent.

During the course of several field projects I have worked on in Barbados, locals, mostly schoolchildren, have visited the work sites and even helped to excavate or wash finds. Their hands-on participation in archaeological fieldwork allowed them to observe Amerindian cultural remains and hopefully better understand their cultural context. It would be a great opportunity for them to participate in field programs on a regular basis in which they learned about their culture and history (for example, documenting slavery and colonial vernacular architecture (e.g., slave quarters, plantations) through archaeology or historic preservation, restoration, and reconstruction projects. Local involvement and media attention of archaeological excavations conducted at the Sandy Ground site in Anguilla, quite similar to Barbados in regards to population replacement of Amerindians by Europeans and Africans, suggests that these sorts of projects can be done successfully in similar cases if policies and good management plans are put into action (Petersen 1998).

Although substantially under-appreciated (and at times, unrecognized), the fact that Africans played a significant role in the growth and development of the United States and contributed to its history, is now being better addressed (Paynter 1994; Belgrave 1994). This had led to an increased involvement by Afro-Americans in projects related to understanding their past, and resulted in a more complete historical picture of a shared past with Euro-Americans. Organizing archaeology and historic preservation projects which are geared toward documenting the history of slavery and colonialism in Barbados, by Barbadians themselves, would have the effect of stimulating greater interest in their past and the past of Amerindians who though extinct, have shared with them some very similar historical experiences. One reaction from this scenario would hopefully be demand for comprehensive preservation legislation and public recognition of the need for cultural resource management programs. In Barbados, where tourist and infrastructure development take precedent, a legislative regime like that espoused by the International Council of Archaeological Heritage Management (ICAHM) would seem appropriate – one “that includes the principle that funding for the investigation of sites threatened by development projects be included in the costs of those projects “ (Article 3, after Elia 1993:426).

CONCLUSION

There are no quick and easy solutions to the issues confronted at Heywoods. But, these ideas, if put forth in long-term development plans on Barbados, have great potential for finding that all-too important middle-ground between archaeologists, anthropologists, developers, and the public. I agree with Price (1994:288-89) that achieving greater public awareness of archaeological sites can be done by focusing on

information, exhibition, and participation. Time spent engaging the public through local schools, museums, media, and outreach programs can greatly contribute to a community's awareness of archaeological excavations in-progress, and how they can view or participate in such work. Promoting archaeology to developers can be achieved by briefing planners and encouraging them to take cultural resources into account, conducting provisional surveys with teachers and schoolchildren, and even exploiting the romantic or 'glamorous' side of archaeology (Trotzig 1989:63). High-end developers could also be encouraged to voluntarily pay for mitigating adverse effects by pointing out not only the benefits of understanding the site's history and those peoples who occupied it, but stressing that the archaeology could be organized in such a way as to still allow developer's to keep their original plans. "[I]n lieu of legal remedies, archaeological stewards must appeal to the better nature of developers, dealers in artifacts, and others who may bear responsibility for destroying, or who are contemplating the destruction of archaeological properties. Failing in the appeal, negative publicity, perhaps, can yield positive results in historic preservation" (Hamilton 1995:58). Pyburn and Wilk (1995:71) note that 'Responsible Archaeology is Applied Anthropology,' – in other words, archaeologists can and should promote the applications of archaeology to a wider audience in formats specifically designed for their interests – whether they are students, local residents, the elderly, planners, developers, indigenous peoples, or other anthropologists.

It is not simply the case where laws can be enacted to keep Heywoods and other prehistoric sites safe forever. New Resource Economists point out that "any law can be revoked and that there is no refuge in politics for those who seriously advocate environmental (or in this case cultural resource) preservation" (Simmons and Mitchell 1984:9). But, it is a start. It remains the responsibility of applied social scientists to develop plans and research methods for these programs on Barbados, to present them to special interests, and then follow through with their implementation. "The question is not whether archaeology and political ideology can be separated – they cannot – but rather, how we can cope with the situation in a responsible way" (Kristiansen 1989:24).

In conclusion, we must ask the question: "Is the destruction of an archaeological site like Heywoods anything new, and if not why should we care?" It certainly is not new. There are many examples from all over the world of site destruction occurring daily, from Angkor Wat (Monroe 1995) to Africa (Schmidt and McIntosh 1995) to the United States (Lynott and Wylie 1995). But behind each of these scenarios are many forces and special interests at work - politically, economically, culturally, and historically, and in varying degrees of intensity. The Heywoods site is unique not only because it represents the conflict of these interests in an area that receives little attention within the archaeological and anthropological community, but because these conflicts have left a crucial gap in the archaeological, environmental, and historical record for both Barbados and the Caribbean region. Without any form of cultural resource management most of the world's archaeological sites and monuments would have rapidly disappeared under human and environmental degradation. The same goes for Barbados. Despite there having been population replacement of indigenous peoples, the preservation of all cultures should be of paramount importance to peoples now residing on the landscape (wherever and whoever they may be). Preserving contiguous elements of nature and society together holds many long-term benefits for Barbadians – preserving long-term settlement patterns of the island, contributing to local pride and appreciation of all cultural resources, and helping to achieve a comprehensive cultural heritage program that benefits the local economy. Not only can cultural resources and archaeological investigation be educational in nature, but sites such as Heywoods provide powerful clues into the prehistory of indigenous peoples here, of which there exists no written record.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would especially like to thank Thomas Herbert of the Port St. Charles Marina development project who was extremely helpful in providing me useful information over the past few years. His support and generosity during the first stages of the Heywoods salvage project, although not legally required, set the stage for what I hope will be a concerted effort by others to acknowledge the need for comprehensive cultural resource management legislation on Barbados. Jerry Medler, Jon Erlandson, and Madonna Moss provided very useful comments on previous drafts of this paper.

REFERENCES CITED

- Allaire, L. 1997. The Lesser Antilles Before Columbus. *In* The Indigenous Peoples of the Caribbean. S. Wilson, ed. Pp. 20-28. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.
- Anyon, R. , T. J. Ferguson, L. Jackson, L. Lane, and P Vicenti 1997. Native American Oral Tradition and Archaeology: Issues of Structure, Relevance, and Respect. *In* Native Americans and Archaeologists: Stepping Stones to Common Ground. N. Swidler, D. E. Dongoske, R. Anyon, and A. Downer, eds. Pp. 77-87. Walnut Creek: Altamira Press.
- Ayres, W. S. and R. Mauricio 1999. Definition, Ownership, and Conservation of Indigenous Landscapes at Salapwuk, Pohnpei, Micronesia. *In* The Archaeology and Anthropology of Landscape: Shaping Your Landscape. P. J. Ucko and R. Layton, eds. Pp. 298-321. London: Routledge.
- Barton, G. T. 1979. The Prehistory of Barbados. Reprinted. Originally published in the Advocate, 1953.
- Bean, R. N. 1971. The British Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade, 1650-1775. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Washington. Arno Press: New York.
- Belgrave, R. 1994. Black People and Museums: The Caribbean Heritage Project in Southampton. *In* The

Politics of the Past. P. Gathercole and D. Lowenthal, eds. Pp. 63-73. London: Routledge Press.

Beller, W., P. D'Ayla, and P. Helm (eds.). 1990. Sustainable Development and Environmental Management of Small Islands. MAB, Vol. 5. Davis: UNESCO/Parthenon.

Beckles, H. 1990. A History of Barbados: From Amerindian Settlement to Nation State. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Blundell, D. 1997. Archaeology, Cultural Resource Management, and the Pacific: A Look at the East Coast of Taiwan. *Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association Bulletin (Chiang-Mai Papers)* 16(3):233-241.

Boomert, A. 1983. Notes on Barbados Prehistory. *Journal of the Barbados Museum and Historical Society* 38:8-43.

Brink, J. 1989. Final report of the 1985 and 1986 field seasons at Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump, Alberta. Edmonton: Archaeological Survey of Alberta.

Cleere, H. 1989. Introduction: The Rationale of Archaeological Heritage Management. *In Archaeological Heritage Management in the Modern World*. H. F. Cleere, ed. Pp. 1-19. London: Unwin Hyman.

Corzo, M. A. and H. W. M. Hodges (eds). 1986. *In Situ Archaeological Conservation: Proceedings of the Mexico Conference*. Mexico: Instituto Nacional de Antropologia e Historia; Century City: J. Paul Getty Trust.

Britton, S. 1987. Tourism in Pacific Island States: Constraints and Opportunities. *In Ambiguous Alternatives: Tourism in Small Developing Countries*. S. Britton and W. C. Clarke, eds. Pp. 113-139. Suva: University of the South Pacific.

Bruseth, J. E., J. E. Corbin, C. E. Carter, and B. McKee 1994. Involving the Caddo Tribe During Archaeological Field Schools in Texas: A Cross-Cultural Sharing. *Society of American Archaeology Bulletin* 12(1):9-10.

Burley, D. 1993. Chiefly Perogatives Over Critical Resources: Archaeology, Oral Traditions, and

Symbolic Landscapes in the Ha'apai Islands, Kingdom of Tonga. *In* Culture and Environment: A Fragile Coexistence. R. Jamieson, S. Abonyi, and N. Mirau, eds. Pp. 437-443. Calgary: University of Calgary.

Charle, E. V. 1986. Foreign Trade Patterns and Economic Development in the South Pacific. *Journal of Pacific Studies* 12:1-32.

Colt, Sir H. Voyage of Sir Henry Colt Kt., to the Islands of the Antilles in the Ship called the 'Alexander', anno. 1631, *In* The Advocate. Barbados.

Connell, J. 1991. Island Microstates: The Mirage of Development. *The Contemporary Pacific* 3:251-287.

Cracknell, S. and M. Corbishley 1986. Presenting Archaeology to Young People. CBA Research Report No. 64. London: Council for British Archaeology.

Council of Europe 1988. A Future for Our Past. *In* Young People and Heritage 31:3-21.

Dolman, A. J. 1985. Paradise Lost? The Past Performance and Future Prospects of Small Island Developing Countries. *In* States, Microstates, and Islands. E. Dommen and P. Hein, eds. Pp. 40-69. London: Croom Helm.

Dommen, E. and P. Hein. 1985. Foreign Trade in Goods and Services: The Dominant Activity of Small Island Economies. *In* State, Microstates, and Islands. E. Dommen and P. Hein, eds. Pp. 152-184. London: Croom Helm.

Downum, C. E. and L. J. Price. 1999. Applied Archaeology. *Human Organization* 58(3): 226-239.

Drewett, P. L. 1987. Archaeological Survey of Barbados. First interim report. *Journal of the Barbados Museum and Historical Society* 38:44-80.

----- . 1989. Early Ceramic Population Lifeways and Adaptive Strategies in Barbados. *In* Early Ceramic Population Lifeways and Adaptive Strategies in the Caribbean. P. E. Siegel, ed. Pp. 79-118. Oxford: British Archaeological Reports.

-----, 1991. Prehistoric Barbados. Denbigh: Archetype Publications Ltd.

-----, 1993. Excavations at Heywoods, Barbados, and the Economic Basis of the Suazoid Period in the Lesser Antilles. *Journal of the Barbados Museum and Historical Society* 38:113-137.

-----, In press (Ed.). Prehistoric Settlements in the Caribbean: Fieldwork in Barbados, Tortola, and the Cayman Islands. Wales: Archetype Press.

Elia, R. J. 1993. US Cultural Resource Management and the ICAHM Charter. *Antiquity* 67: 426-38.

Fairbairn, I. 1985. *Island Economies*. Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies.

-----, 1987. Pacific States and Development Options. *Islands Business*, April, 49-51.

Fitzpatrick, S. M. (n.d.) Human Remains Analysis from the Heywoods site. Report submitted to the Barbados Museum and Historical Society, Bridgetown.

Flood, J. 1989. 'Tread Softly for you Tread on my Bones': The Development of Cultural Resource Management in Australia. In H. F. Cleere, ed. Pp. 79-101. London: Unwin Hyman.

Foanota, L. 1994. Archaeology and Museum Work in the Solomon Islands. In *The Politics of the Past*. P. Gathercole and D. Lowenthal, eds. Pp. 224-232. London: Routledge Press.

Hackenberger, S. 1987. *Archaeological Investigations, Barbados, West Indies*. Typescript, Barbados Museum and Historical Society.

-----, 1988. An Abstract of Archaeological Investigations by the Barbados Museum, 1986. *Journal of the Barbados Museum and Historical Society* 38:155-62.

Hamilton, C. E. 1995. A Cautionary Perspective. In *Ethics in American Archaeology: Challenges for the 1990s*. M. Lynott and A. Wylie, eds. Pp. 57-63. Society for American Archaeology. Lawrence: Allen Press.

- Harlow, V. T. 1926. *A History of Barbados: 1625-1685*. New York: Negro Universities Press.
- Herrmann, J. 1989. World Archaeology – The World’s Cultural Heritage. *In Archaeological Heritage Management in the Modern World*. H. F. Cleere, ed. Pp. 30-37. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Herscher, E. and F. P. McManamon 1995. Public Education and Outreach: The Obligation to Educate. *In Ethics in American Archaeology: Challenges for the 1990s*. M. J. Lynott and A. Wylie, eds. Pp. 42-44. Washington D.C.: Society for American Archaeology Special Report.
- Hoffman, T. 1991. Stewards of the Past: Preserving Arizona’s Archaeological Resources through Positive Public Involvement. *In Protecting the Past*. G. S. Smith, J. E. Ehrenrud, eds. Pp. 253-259. Boca Raton: CRC.
- Howell, B. J. 1994. Weighing the Risks and Rewards of Involvement in Cultural Conservation and Heritage Tourism. *Human Organization* 53:150-159.
- Hoyos, F. A. 1978. *Barbados: A History from the Amerindians to Independence*. London: MacMillan Press.
- Jameson, J. H. Jr. 1994. Public Education: An Emerging Emphasis in the Practice of Archaeology. *Archaeology and Public Education* 4(4):1-11.
- King, T. F. 1987. Prehistory and Beyond: The Place of Archaeology. *In the American Mosaic: Preserving a Nation’s Heritage*. R. E. Stipe and A. S. Lee, eds. Pp. 236-265. Washington D.C.: US/ICOMOS.
- Klein, H. S. 1978. *The Middle Passage: Comparative Studies in the Atlantic Slave Trade*. Princeton University Press: Princeton.
- , 1986. *African Slavery in Latin America and the Caribbean*. Oxford University Press: New York.

- Krause, E. L. 1992. The Looking Glass of Historic Preservation in Micronesia: A Reflection of Modernization and Changing Values. *Human Organization* 51:197-201.
- Kristiansen, K. 1989. Perspectives on the Archaeological Heritage: History and Future. *In* *Archaeological Heritage Management in the Modern World*. H. F. Cleere, ed. Pp. 23-29. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Layng, A. 1983. *The Carib Reserve: Identity and Security in the West Indies*. Washington D.C.: University Press of America.
- Lea, D. 1980. Tourism in Papua New Guinea: The Last Resort. *In* *Of Time and Place* . J. N. Jennings and G. J. R. Linge, eds. Pp. 211-231. Canberra: Australia National University Press.
- Levy, C. 1980. *Emancipation, Sugar, and Federalism: Barbados and the West Indies, 1833-1876*. Gainesville: University of Florida Press.
- Lewis, J. 1994. Designing a Cultural Policy. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society* 24:41-56.
- Ligon, R. 1657. *A True and Exact History of the Island of Barbados*. Reprinted by Frank Cass and Co. Ltd.: London, 1970.
- Lorenzo, J. L. 1984. Mexico. *In* *Approaches to the Archaeological Heritage*. H. F. Cleere, ed. Pp. 89-100. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lowenthal, D. 1957. The Population of Barbados. *Social and Economic Studies* 6:451.
- Lynott, M. J. and A. Wylie 1995. *Ethics in American Archaeology: Challenges for the 1990s*. Washington D.C.: Society for American Archaeology.
- McDonald, I. 1989. The Destiny of a Small Nation. *Caribbean Affairs* 2:173-179.

- McManamon, F. P. 1995. Hidden Data: Learning About Ecosystems from Archaeological Sites: *Federal Archaeology* 8(1):2.
- Momsen, J. 1986. Linkages between Tourism and Agriculture: Problems for the Smaller Caribbean Economies. Department of Geography Seminar Paper 45, University of Newcastle.
- Monroe, J. W. 1995. Angkor Wat: A Case Study in the Legal Problems of International Cultural Resource Management. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society* 24:277-286.
- Mturi, A. A. 1995. Whose Cultural Heritage?: Conflicts and Contradictions in the Conservation of Historic Structures, Towns, and Rock Art in Tanzania. *In Plundering Africa's Past*. P. R. Schmidt and R. J. McIntosh, eds. Pp.170-190. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Nason, J. D. 1984. Tourism, Handicrafts, and Ethnic Identity in Micronesia. *Annals of Tourism Research* 421-450.
- National Park Service. n.d. Micronesian Resources Study: Protecting Historical Properties and Cultural Traditions in the Freely Associated States of Micronesia. Washington: U.S. National Park Service, Interagency Resources Division (Draft Report 1992).
- Nzewunwa, N. 1994. Cultural Education in West Africa: Archaeological Perspectives. *In The Politics of the Past*. P. Gathercole and D. Lowenthal, eds. 189-202. London: Routledge Press.
- PACT 1985. Acts of the First Meeting on 'Making Children Aware of the Existence, Study, and Conservation of the Archaeological Cultural Heritage', Ravello, June 11-13, 1985. *PACT News* 15:23-100; 16:14-82.
- Pariser, H. S. 1990. *The Adventure Guide to Barbados*. Edison: Hunter Publishing Inc.
- Paynter, R. 1994. Afro-Americans in the Massachusetts Historical Landscape. *In The Politics of the Past*. P Gathercole and D. Lowenthal, eds. Pp. 49-62. London: Routledge.
- Petersen, J. B. 1998. Long, Rich Cultural Heritage in Anguilla. *Anthropology Newsletter*, Feb.:10-11.

Price, N. P. S. 1994. Conservation and Information in the Display of Prehistoric Sites. *In* *The Politics of the Past*. P Gathercole and D. Lowenthal, eds. Pp. 284-290. London: Routledge.

Pyburn, K. A. and R. R. Wilk 1995. Responsible Archaeology is Applied Anthropology. *In* *Ethics in American Archaeology: Challenges for the 1990s*. M. Lynott and A. Wylie, eds. Pp. 71-76. Society for American Archaeology. Lawrence: Allen Press.

Renker, A. M. and A. Greig 1988. Exploring the Role of Education in Cultural Resource Management: The Makah Cultural and Research Center Example. *Human Organization* 47:302-307.

Richard Gill Associates Ltd. 1995. Executive Summary of Impact Assessments - Port St. Charles Waterfront Development, Heywoods, St. Peter, Barbados. Report submitted by Guy M. Griffith Engineers, Associated Consulting Engineers, Inc., and Richard Gill Associates Ltd.

Rouse, I. 1986. *Migrations in Prehistory: Inferring Population Movements from Cultural Remains*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Ruppe, R. J. 1980. Sea-Level Rise and Caribbean Prehistory. *In* *The Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress for the Study of Pre-Columbian Peoples of the Lesser Antilles*. S. M. Lowenstein, ed. Pp. 331-337. Arizona State University Anthropological Research Papers, 22, Arizona State University.

Sanoja, M. 1965. Venezuelan Archaeology Looking Toward the West Indies. *American Antiquity* 31: 232-236.

Schmidt, P. R. 1995. The Human Right to a Cultural Heritage. *In* *Plundering Africa's Past*. P. R. Schmidt and R. J. McIntosh, eds. Pp. 18-28. Indiana University Press: Bloomington.

Schmidt, P. R., and R. J. McIntosh (eds.) 1996. *Plundering Africa's Past*. Indiana University Press, Bloomington.

Schomburgk, R. H. 1998. *The History of Barbados (1848)*. London: Frank Cass.

- Siegel, P. E. 1991. Migration Research in Saladoid Archaeology: A Review. *Florida Anthropologist* 44(1):79-91.
- Simmons, R. T. and W. C. Mitchell. 1984. Politics and the New Resource Economics. *Contemporary Policy Issues* 5: 1-13.
- Solow, B. L. 1985. Caribbean Slavery and British Growth: The Eric Williams Hypothesis. *Journal of Development Economics* 27: 99-115.
- . 1987. Capitalism and Slavery in the Exceedingly Long Run. *In British Capitalism and Caribbean Slavery: The Legacy of Eric Williams*. B. L. Solow and S. L. Engerman, eds. Pp. 51-78.
- Tanaka, M. 1984. Japan. *In Approaches to the Archaeological Heritage*. H. F. Cleere, ed. Pp. 82-88. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Trotzig, G. 1989. The 'Cultural Dimension of Development' – An Archaeological Approach. *In Archaeological Heritage Management in the Modern World*. H. F. Cleere, ed. Pp. 59-63. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Watkins, J., L. Goldstein, K. Vitelli, and L. Jenkins. 1995. Accountability: Responsibilities of Archaeologists to Other Interest Groups. *In Ethics in American Archaeology: Challenges for the 1990s*. M. Lynott and A. Wylie, eds. Pp. 33-37. Society for American Archaeology. Lawrence: Allen Press.
- Wilson, S. M. 1997. Introduction to the Study of Indigenous Peoples in the Caribbean. *In The Indigenous Peoples of the Caribbean*. S. M. Wilson, ed. Pp. 1-8. Gainesville: The University Press of Florida.
- . 1997. The Legacy of the Indigenous Peoples of the Caribbean. *In The Indigenous Peoples of the Caribbean*. S. M. Wilson, ed. Pp. 206-213. Gainesville: The University Press of Florida.
- World Monuments Fund. 1998. Criteria, Results, and Indicators for Success: Case Studies from the 1996-97 List of 100 Most Endangered Sites. New York: World Monuments Fund.

Zimmerman, L. J. 1997. Remythologizing the Relationship Between Indians and Archaeologists. *In* Native Americans and Archaeologists: Stepping Stones to Common Ground. N. Swidler, D. E. Dongoske, R. Anyon, and A. Downer, eds. Pp. 44-56. Walnut Creek: Altamira Press.