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ABSTRACT

While feature films such as the Indiana Jones and Lara Croft: Tomb Raider series have popularized the field of archaeology, they are hardly useful for providing an accurate and educational depiction of the practice of archaeology itself. Yet archaeological research provides an often underrated, outstanding way of deriving information about the past that may or may not be known otherwise. In light of “Hollywoodized” films, which largely present a romanticized, unrealistic view of the true practice of archaeology, one may wonder if more true-to-life visual depictions of archaeological research do exist. Accordingly, this manuscript seeks to analyze the availability of archaeology-related documentary films to the public, with a focus on audiences in the United States. How substantial is the availability of archaeology films to the general public? Or are such films restricted to academic institutions and scholars? What about age-range considerations? Are most films directed towards children, or a more adult audience? What type of language is used in presenting archaeology to the public through film? Are films geared – whether consciously or unconsciously – towards a well-educated audience that would properly understand complex terminology? Or do films incorporate “everyday language” to attract and inform a more educationally diverse population?

In considering documentaries produced by a number of different production companies, this thesis also aims to discuss social issues. For example, are societal differences and/or customs presented, or not presented, through the documentary medium?
In striving to answer the aforementioned questions, this thesis scrutinizes both archaeological research practices as well as filmmaking procedures. Ultimately, such evaluations conclude that archaeological research, excavation, and interpretation enables one to learn not only about the archaeological findings themselves, but often also leads towards the incorporation and presentation of other related facets. In a case study of the archaeological work performed at Robert H. Treman State Park, archaeological research, excavation, and interpretation has enabled scholars, park employees, visitors, and others to learn more about the history of the park itself – a history that may have been lost had archaeology not been a factor. Furthermore, such research initiatives have also made possible an installation of an outdoor walking exhibit of the multiple archaeological sites within the park and work performed thereon. Accordingly, the archaeology chapter of the accompanying DVD, entitled *Past, Present, Future: an Introduction to Robert H. Treman State Park*, serves as an example of an archaeology-based documentary film. The DVD as a whole further supports the notion that archaeological research often leads to the presentation of other related aspects.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

As a unique and rapidly growing component of anthropology, visual anthropology considers “how aspects of culture can be pictorially/visually interpreted and expressed,” by way of photography, film, and other camera and non-camera generated imagery, “and how images can be understood as artifacts of culture” (http://www.societyforvisualanthropology.org/svawelcome.html). In 2001, the Society for Visual Anthropology (SVA)¹ developed a resource known as the Guidelines for the Evaluation of Ethnographic Visual Media². The guidelines were created in hopes of educating others about the usefulness of visual anthropology and to aid in the critical evaluation of visual media as such media relates to the portrayal of anthropological information (http://etext.virginia.edu/VAR/guide.html). As one component of these Guidelines, the SVA noted that “visual representations offer viewers a means to experience and understand ethnographic complexity, richness and depth, which are the distinguishing features of anthropological knowledge. Visual media can convey forms of knowledge that writing cannot” (http://etext.virginia.edu/VAR/guide.html).

With regards to the Guidelines as stated above, it must similarly be argued that visual representations may also positively impact the way archaeological research and practices are presented to the public eye. Of course, this above quotation must not be taken out of context. While feature

¹ http://www.societyforvisualanthropology.org/svawelcome.html
² http://etext.virginia.edu/VAR/guide.html
films such as the *Indiana Jones* and *Lara Croft: Tomb Raider* series have popularized the field of archaeology, they are hardly useful for providing an accurate and educational depiction of the practice of archaeology itself. Yet archaeological research provides an often underrated, yet effectual, way of deriving information about past cultures and locales that may or may not be known otherwise. Accordingly, this thesis and accompanying DVD seek to shed light on the interdisciplinary field of visual anthropology, with a specific focus on the topic of presenting archaeology to the American public through film\(^3\). Importantly, this paper considers “archaeology-based documentary films” in determining how the general public receives and understands information about the study and practice of archaeology. Ultimately, one may find that archaeological research, excavation, and interpretation enables one to learn not only about the archaeological findings themselves, but often also leads towards the incorporation and presentation of other related facets, such as a newfound knowledge of the history of the study area itself, socioeconomic aspects, and so forth.

First and foremost, one must consider what archaeology means to Americans, and why it is important to present the information gleaned from archaeological processes to the general public. With reference to the *Guidelines for the Evaluation of Ethnographic Visual Media* – as quoted above – why is it important to convey anthropological knowledge to the public, and invite personal evaluations and criticisms? Within the field of historical archaeology in America, there is a burgeoning value placed on presenting archaeology to the public by way of educating and engaging local communities

---

\(^3\)“Film,” in the course of this thesis, refers to any type of visual moving picture – whether produced on actual film reels (e.g. 35mm) or digitally – that may be transferred onto a VHS, DVD, or other such device for mass-market distribution and either public (such as in museums) or personal home viewing.
throughout the archaeological process – via museum exhibits, lectures, volunteerism, and, in the case of this thesis, documentary film. New literature has brought perspective to this growing concern of public outreach. Most importantly, public education and outreach is necessary because archaeology is ultimately a destructive process. As Stephen Mrozowski, Grace Ziesing, and Mary Beaudry (Mrozowski et al. 1996:17) emphasize, “once a site is excavated, even when this has been done systematically and carefully, it can never be reassembled or reconstructed – except through the records kept by archaeologists”. Further, “investigation itself destroys the subtle relationships between items, and between items and their environment” (Dancey 1981:62). Thus, because archaeological sites can never be recreated following excavation, it is up to the archaeologists to convey the archaeological relationships and new insights gleaned to the general public.

In 1996, the Society for American Archaeology (SAA) approved an updated set of ethical principles regarding archaeological practice. As Mark Lynott and Alison Wylie note, the Principles of Archaeological Ethics “define goals for professional behavior rather than standards of minimally acceptable conduct” (Lynott & Wylie 2000:9). These principles “outlined archaeological responsibilities of stewardship . . . (and) drew out the implications of a commitment to stewardship in a number of specific areas,” including public education and outreach (8). The principles were created partially because of

---

4 Following the initial proposal of the Principles of Archaeological Ethics, a Register of Professional Archaeologists was established – and supported by the SAA, SHA, and AIA – which “maintain(s) a detailed code of conduct which specifies standards of research performance and sets out the responsibilities of professional archaeologists” (Lynott & Wylie 2000:9). Accordingly, the “SAA now supports both a general set of ethics principles and a professional code of conduct backed by enforcement mechanisms” (9).

5 The Principles of Archaeological Ethics defines stewardship in the following way: “Stewards are both caretakers of and advocates for the archaeological record for the benefit of all people” (SAA 2000:11).
the “concerns raised by the escalating destruction of the archaeological record and the increasingly complex ways in which archaeologists find their research implicated in the commercial exploitation of archaeological material” (8).

Further, Lynott and Wylie agree that “continued discussion about ethics, and a commitment to ongoing ethics education, is important because the circumstances which affect archaeologists and the archaeological record are constantly changing” (9). Looting and the increased role of technology in selling antiquities have exacerbated the unethical destruction of archaeological sites around the world. Accordingly, the role of presenting archaeology to the public in an informative and ethical manner becomes a necessary tool for ensuring “cooperation in efforts to protect archaeological sites from looting, vandalism, and economic development” (Herscher & McManamon 2000:49). Documentary films, as opposed to Hollywood feature films, help to portray archaeology in such educationally informative and ethical manners as described above.

As Ellen Herscher and Francis McManamon restate, the SAA principle regarding public education and outreach reads as follows:

“Archaeologists shall reach out to the public to: 1) enlist its support for the stewardship of the archaeological record, 2) explain and promote the use of methods and techniques of archaeology in understanding human behavior and culture, and 3) explain archaeological interpretations of the past . . . Archaeologists should participate in cooperative efforts with others interested in the archaeological record so that preservation, protection, and interpretation of the record may be improved” (Herscher & McManamon 2000:49).
Educating others about archaeological processes and interpretations provides the public with a unique way of connecting the present with the past. Importantly, it provides one with a sense of heritage and a personal connection to the history of the study area. As John Jameson, Jr. supports, "archaeologists are socially responsible not only for preserving the past but also for making that past accessible" (Jameson 1997:17). By providing opportunities for public involvement, archaeologists enable community members to become more engaged and excited about the past.

From a community standpoint, outreach, education, and developing partnerships between archaeologists and the local community are important for a number of reasons. Most importantly, they aid in building public support and provide opportunity for fresh insights and interpretations to such archaeological endeavors. As Maureen Malloy notes,

"Inviting community involvement in archaeological research early on, and keeping local communities involved throughout the process, not only builds public support for the stewardship of archaeological sites but also enriches the quality of the archaeological research. Descendant and nondescendant local communities bring their own unique perspectives and insights on the past that can inform and enrich our archaeological interpretations" (Malloy 2003:ix).

Linda Derry and Anne Pyburn also acknowledge the role of community involvement and provide laundry lists of notions to consider when partnering with community members (Derry 2003:185-188; Pyburn 2003:167-184). Oftentimes, communities may be interested in archaeological research, practice, and interpretation, but do not have a resounding voice in such
matters. Accordingly, collaboration between professional archaeologists and the local public may provide that needed voice.

In presenting archaeology to the public, documentary films offer viewers the opportunity to personally experience locales, processes, and ideas in a way that written literature may not. Yet, for the purposes of this thesis, what exactly is an “archaeology documentary film”? Does the genre include such popular Hollywood film series’ as *Indiana Jones, Lara Croft: Tomb Raider*, or even *Curious George*? Not hardly. Though the *Indiana Jones, Lara Croft*, and *Curious George* films popularized the field of archaeology – by forcing their main characters to dash off to remote locales in search of romanticized artifacts and treasures (i.e. magic keys, hidden rooms of gold, an ape idol) – such feature films have perhaps “Hollywoodized” the practice of archaeology in a not-so-positive way. For example, as reviewed in *Archaeology* magazine, the animated feature *Curious George* portrays the main character – the Man in the Yellow Hat – as an unethical looter of cultural artifacts from Africa (Author unknown 2006:14). In addition, largely overlooked in such films are the countless hours spent shoveling and sifting through earth before finding any tangible artifact, or the real-life importance placed upon such evidence as soil patterning, inter- and intra-site remnant placement, and the intrinsic value of objects (such as bottle glass and iron nails) that are far from being made of gold. Most importantly, such films are hardly based upon factual cases and sites. While such romanticism often helps practicing archaeologists get through long hours of shoveling and sifting, it is instead the real-life practices and factual locations that are central to documentary films.

Accordingly, the genre of documentary films focused upon here incorporates those works that, as documentarian Michael Rabinger best
defines, “explore actual people and actual situations” (Rabinger 1998:3). A documentary typically provides a serious, educational look at a factual study topic. My film on Robert H. Treman State Park (entitled Past, Present, Future: an Introduction to Robert H. Treman State Park⁶) serves as an example of the type of documentary reviewed in this thesis. The Treman film discusses the archaeological work performed throughout the state park during the past eight years, and distinguishes the role that archaeology has played in the rediscovery of the park’s history. In the context of Rabinger’s definition, the Treman documentary explores those real people – past and present – and true-to-life situations that have helped shape the park landscape over the years, and have helped to develop the park into what it is today. Accordingly, the documentary genre highlighted in this study is undoubtedly the most effective of all film mediums in realistically showcasing how archaeological study is both performed and applied.

In analyzing how scholars, filmmakers, and others use the documentary medium to present archaeology to the public, a variety of questions must be raised. Importantly, do archaeology-based documentary films come with certain presumptions? For example, do production companies such as National Geographic, PBS, and/or History Television Network Productions (commonly known as the History Channel) assume that their viewers fall within a general age range, or have prior knowledge of archaeology? Do most archaeology films actually instruct on proper research, excavation, and interpretation techniques, and thus fall under the category of a “how-to” film? Or are those films that highlight aspects of archaeological research, excavation, and interpretation more focused on presenting the anthropological

⁶ See back pocket for accompanying DVD.
or historical aspects of a society, rather than concentrating on the study of archaeology itself? This thesis seeks to address these questions through a detailed look into the availability of such archaeology-based films.

To begin answering these questions, Chapter Two discusses the availability of archaeology-related documentary films to the general public – specifically concentrating on audiences within the United States. Broadly speaking, how substantial is the availability of archaeology-based documentary films to the general American populace? Or are the majority of such films often limited to those scholars or persons affiliated with academic or other such institutions? With regards to the accessibility of films falling within certain target age-ranges, are most films geared towards children, or a more adult audience? In consideration of one’s previous, or lack of, exposure to the study of archaeology, what type of language is used in presenting archaeology to the public through film? Are films directed – whether consciously or unconsciously – towards an audience that is previously educated in the field of archaeology and that would be more likely to understand complex field-specific terminology? Or do films incorporate “everyday language” to attract and inform a younger and/or more educationally diverse population?

As will be discussed further, the availability of archaeology films to the American public is largely dependent on how proactive one is in attempting to attain such media. While a majority of films are available and accessible to those with ties to academic institutions (especially universities), there is a wide range of archaeology-based documentaries that may also lie within public reach. Sadly, the access to such films is also often dependent on an individual’s financial means and desires – for example, the ability and desire to purchase more costly types of cable television and internet services, or to
purchase films for personal use. Though a majority of archaeological organizations individually emphasize continual involvement in public outreach and education – as stated within the internet sites of such organizations as the Society for American Archaeology (SAA), the American Anthropological Association (AAA), the Archaeological Institute of America (AIA), and the Biblical Archaeology Society (BAS) – most fail to adequately address the use of archaeology *documentaries* in contributing to such measures. Although *Archaeology* magazine (a publication of the AIA) has documentary film reviews in every issue, these reviews are not available on the AIA website. With regards to age-range considerations, the vast majority of films appear to target adult audiences. Though, in consideration of one’s level of prior education in the study of archaeology, many films employ the use of “everyday” language to appeal to a wider audience. This can have positive and negative ramifications. In using “everyday” language to explain procedures and concepts, both persons experienced in studying archaeology as well as persons without prior knowledge of the subject are likely to understand what is being talked about. However, by discussing procedures, scholarly interpretations, and so forth in “layman’s terms”, it is more likely that the message portrayed may not be as entirely accurate as if it were discussed using proper archaeological and scientific terminology. Ultimately, considering the time limitations of a film, the presentation of archaeology to the public becomes a balancing act between accurately presenting the research and relevant information, and appealing to the knowledge base of the general public. Ideally a film will spark a viewer’s interest in learning more about a particular topic. Archaeologists and students of archaeology that are seeking more scholarly information can turn to journal articles and books. Accordingly,
Chapter 2 also briefly considers the impact that film reviews may have on influencing one’s decision to view or purchase a particular archaeology documentary. While there are a variety of different types of reviews that one may consider — including scholarly reviews, advertising abstracts, and reviews by filmmakers — the scholarly reviews appear to be the most useful.

Chapter Three focuses on why archaeologists and film producers may or may not present information about a society or culture. Reflecting on the objectives/goals of the Society for Visual Anthropology, and the Society’s *Guidelines for the Evaluation of Ethnographic Visual Media*, this chapter considers why economic and/or social class differences of various societies, as determined by archaeological evidence, are presented, or not presented, through the documentary medium. The presentation of intersocietal/intercultural environmental differences will also be addressed in this chapter; namely, differences in public and private spaces, as well as urban and rural landscapes. The methodology for singling out socioeconomic and environmental issues for discussion stems from current trains of thought in anthropological study. For example, does the nature of archaeological research or the filmmaking process inhibit the discovery or dissemination of information regarding economic or social class differences, and/or customs, within a given society or cultural region? Do the documentaries show and discuss only public, or only private, spaces within a society or culture? Are the archaeologists and/or film producers focusing on urban spaces, to the exclusion of more rural locales?

---

7 As will be explained in greater detail in Chapter 3.
8 As will be explained in greater detail in Chapter 3.
9 As will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 3.
Specifically, this paper addresses documentaries produced by the following organizations: the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities (APVA), BBC TV/Films for the Humanities and Science, Bullfrog Films, the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, the Peabody Museum at Harvard University, Discovery Communications, Discovery Kids, Film Ideas, History Television Network Productions, Institute of Nautical Archaeology (INA) Films, National Geographic, and PBS. Notably, a variety of cultural traditions from around the world will be explored, including ancient Egypt, classical Greece and Turkey, the culture of Mediterranean mariners, Colonial Williamsburg and Jamestown, the Norse, the Anasazi, slavery in colonial North America, the Mayans, the Aztecs, and the Nuer.

Chapter Four reflects on my personal experiences in creating a documentary on Robert H. Treman State Park (entitled Past, Present, Future: an Introduction to Robert H. Treman State Park)\(^\text{10}\). Following the reviews of archaeology documentaries in Chapter 3, I then put my analyses into perspective by becoming the actual filmmaker and seeing how potential socioeconomic and landscape-related issues unfold over the course of the filmmaking process. Notably, the idea to create the documentary originally developed from the archaeological work undertaken at Robert H. Treman State Park. In the excavations by Cornell faculty and students, the archaeology has reconnected past with present in a unique and dramatic fashion, bringing together scholars, park employees, community members, and descendants of inhabitants of the once-thriving hamlet of Enfield Falls – the hamlet's remnants of which are buried within the park boundaries. Specifically, this work has enabled all those involved to learn not only about

\(^{10}\) As mentioned previously, a DVD copy is located in the back pocket of this thesis.
the archaeological research, excavation, and interpretation entailed; but has also prompted a rediscovery of the history of the park itself. Such research initiatives have also made possible the creation of an outdoor interpretive walking exhibit connecting the multitude of archaeological sites within the park. The film as a whole further supports the notion that archaeological research, excavation, and interpretation enables one to learn not only about archaeological findings themselves, but often also leads towards the incorporation and presentation of other related fields and facets of information – such as the history of the study area. Furthermore, archaeology documentaries such as this one often serve as appropriate and effectual media for educating others about anthropological information and interpretations, as gleaned from archaeological processes. Lastly, creating an archaeology documentary may be one unique and effective way of bringing together archaeologists, filmmakers, and community members in a cooperative partnership.

Finally, Chapter Five coalesces the variety of issues raised during the course of this thesis. Additionally, and in light of my own experiences while creating a documentary about the archaeology in Robert H. Treman State Park, I will share considerations for future endeavors. In sum, the goal of this paper is to introduce the inherently interdisciplinary field of visual anthropology, and to demonstrate how the visual medium of documentary film may provide a unique way of educating others about the study and practice of archaeology. This thesis takes a critical look at how archaeology is presented through film.

CHAPTER 2
AVAILABILITY OF ARCHAEOLOGY DOCUMENTARIES

Assessing the availability of archaeology-based documentaries to the general public is not as simple as walking into a local video store and browsing the shelves. However, depending on the area in which one lives, obtaining access to such films may be easier than one initially assumes. Throughout this chapter, availability of archaeology films will be broken down into three main categories: 1) the availability of films through various sources; 2) the availability of films falling within general age ranges or educational levels; and 3) the availability of specific categories of archaeological films, namely films that are more anthropologically or historically-based, as well as technique-based, or “how-to,” films. In addition, this chapter will also consider the impact of film reviews on influencing one’s decision to view or purchase a particular archaeology documentary. As will be discussed further, those persons with the greatest potential for accessing the widest range of archaeology films are also those who hold greater financial revenues, as well as those who have access to local university libraries or relatively large public library systems. Clearly, this places a greater burden on those who wish to obtain such visual media but do not have the financial, academic, or community resources that make accessibility less of a strain. Ultimately, accessibility is directly related to the amount of effort exerted, as well as the importance and/or desire one maintains with regards to learning about archaeology.
Availability of Films through Various Sources

If one is desirous of learning about the study and/or practice of archaeology via film, there are a variety of resources that may be considered. Venues that are most likely to offer access to archaeology documentaries for public use include: academic institutions (primarily universities, though also including individual elementary, middle, and high school collections), public libraries, relevant museums and historic/cultural sites (both indoor and outdoor), television networks, and the Internet. However, the ability to access such resources may vary between persons, based on an individual's academic, community, and financial wherewithal.

One of the best resources to consider with regards to archaeology documentaries is that of individual academic institutions. However, access to films within the library collection of a university (or any other academic establishment) is often limited to students, faculty, and staff of the particular school in question. Depending on the school, local community members may also be allowed to borrow materials; though such access may be limited and not include visual media. If one is able to obtain access, university collections often have documentaries on a variety of archaeological sites and topics.

Another resource to consider is that of one's local public library. Naturally, availability of archaeology documentaries within a public library system often directly correlates with the size of the local library network. Available titles are likely to be fewer in number and breadth compared to the collections of universities, or compared to what may be accessed via television or the Internet. However, one positive aspect of considering local libraries is that access to any films within such collections are free and open to anyone who may be interested.
Both indoor and outdoor public museums and historic/cultural sites may also enable one to learn about archaeology through film. However, access to such media is surprisingly very limited. For example, the Smithsonian Institution, based in Washington, D.C., has an extensive public museum system as well as individual anthropological, archaeological, and film collections. However, short films shown within various museums operated by the Smithsonian (such as the National Museum of Natural History, National Museum of the American Indian, and so forth) concentrate on displaying cultural and historical facets of the particular societies and topics – there is a noticeable lack of archaeology related documentaries. Under the guidance of the National Museum of Natural History, the Smithsonian Department of Anthropology offers educational resources for teaching others (both children and adults alike) about anthropology and archaeology. However, of all the resources available, none are films (http://www.nmnh.si.edu/anthro/outreach/outrch1.html). Further, access to related archaeology resources and documentary films is extremely limited. To access the Smithsonian's National Anthropological Archives and/or Human Studies Film Archives, one must request an appointment in advance, and may only visit during weekday business hours (http://www.nmnh.si.edu/naa/about.htm). In order to request an appointment, one must designate why – specifically, for what project – they wish to browse items within the collection, and must also list the particular items or collections they wish to view (http://voom.si.edu/anthro/archives_request.htm). A number of collections are further restricted – one must speak directly with a staff member before viewing them. Accordingly, all of the materials available for perusal within the archives are restricted for use inside the building, and none
are available to borrow (http://www.nmnh.si.edu/naa/about.htm). Of course, such restrictions drastically hamper one’s ability to browse the Smithsonian’s otherwise vast collection of archaeology documentaries; and all but exclude access by those members of the public who only have a general interest in archaeology.

Other historic and cultural sites may provide additional means of presenting archaeology to the public through film. The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation and Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities (APVA), for example, have produced a number of documentaries regarding archaeological excavations throughout colonial Williamsburg, Jamestown, and the surrounding Virginia landscape. Ultimately, the availability of archaeology documentaries through museums and/or historic and cultural sites varies tremendously; yet, depending on the specific museum or site in question, may provide a wealth of opportunity for enrichment.

Oftentimes, the television and Internet are useful means for accessing archaeology films. However, access to relevant television channels or the Internet requires appropriate financial expenditures. With regards to television, only one station – the Public Broadcasting Service (PBS) – provides free (non-cable) regular programming regarding archaeological research, excavation, and interpretation. Cable stations such as the History Channel, Discovery Channel, National Geographic Channel, and Discovery Kids all offer frequent archaeology programs at a price. Additionally, these stations are not available through all cable packages; availability varies by zip code and between local cable suppliers.

The Internet may also provide one with access to vendors that sell archaeology documentaries. Of course, this assumes one has the financial
means to obtain Internet access, as well as purchase the films. In the course of my research, only one site, the Archaeology Channel, enabled users to download and watch short films (usually 2-15 minutes each) directly through the Internet. Though in order to utilize this service, one must have a minimum connection speed of 56 kbps, as well as have downloaded the appropriate software for viewing. All other sites were used as modes through which one may purchase personal copies of said documentaries. Typically, an individual archaeology documentary is available to purchase directly from the Internet site of the particular production company that made it — such as National Geographic, the History Channel, Discovery Communications, the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, PBS, and so forth. Though with the constant and rapid increase in development and utilization of electronic technology, one must recognize the increasing role of the Internet in providing greater accessibility of archaeology films. Such development may pave the way for future live-feed streaming of archaeological excavations, or other advanced modes for presenting archaeology to the public. While accessibility via the Internet is presently somewhat limited, such availability is rapidly changing for the better.

Notably, the Internet sites of most archaeology organizations either only briefly mentioned (but did not directly provide access to) related documentaries, or omitted any such discussion at all. For example, the sites for the Society for American Archaeology (SAA) and the American Anthropological Association (AAA) failed to adequately address the topic of archaeology films. Though the Archaeological Institute of America (AIA) does mention such a topic, and provides a running list of potentially related films, all of the films on the list are popular Hollywood productions (such as the Indiana
Jones series), not documentaries in the truest sense (http://www.archaeological.org/webinfo.php?page=10278). Interestingly, the AIA specifically states that “the mission of the Education Division of the AIA is to serve as a resource for responsible and accurate information about archaeology and to encourage the appreciation of archaeological methods and ethical approaches” (http://www.archaeological.org/webinfo.php?page=10260). Yet the AIA’s list of films fails to meet the standards set by the organization’s mission. In contrast, the Biblical Archaeology Society (BAS) offers a number of archaeology documentaries for purchase. Overall, it appears that the majority of archaeological organizations individually emphasize continual involvement in public outreach and education, yet fail to adequately address the use of archaeology documentaries in contributing to such measures.

Ultimately, the accessibility of archaeology films to the general public varies greatly based on one’s academic, community, and financial resources. Further, such availability depends on how desirous and proactive one is in attempting to obtain such media. Those persons with the greatest opportunity to access archaeology documentaries are those who have ties to academic institutions, live in a community with a substantial public library system, are near relevant indoor or outdoor museums, or are willing and able to pay the cost for internet access, appropriate cable television programming, and/or the costs for personal copies of the films themselves.

**Availability of Films Based on Age Range or Educational Level**

Regarding the broad topic of archaeology documentaries, another aspect to consider is the availability of films that are geared for persons falling
within general age ranges or educational levels. Initially, one may ask: are archaeology-based documentary films created based on such aforementioned presumptions? Are the films ever targeted for a particular audience? For example, do production companies such as National Geographic, PBS, and/or the History Channel assume that their viewers are within a general age range, or fall within a general level of education? In one word: absolutely\textsuperscript{12}.

However, those presumptions and subsequent target audiences are based on very broad parameters. For the purposes of this thesis, “general age ranges” and “educational levels” may each be divided into two very basic groups. The age ranges considered here reflect films that may be targeted for either younger audiences, up to the high school level (0-15 years), or more mature audiences (15+ years). With regards to level of education, archaeology documentaries most often are geared towards those audiences who either know little to nothing about the practice of archaeology itself, or have prior knowledge of the field and thus have a greater understanding of appropriate terminology and procedures.

In light of the general availability of archaeology documentaries, a small minority are geared towards younger audiences. Of the various resources considered, only two feature programs geared for children. One is National Geographic, which markets age-appropriate films for use either in the home or classroom. While such visual programming is not commonly aired on television, various films are available for purchase directly through National Geographic, including films on ancient Egypt, Stonehenge, and the Pazyryk nomads of Siberia. The other resource is the Discovery Kids television

\textsuperscript{12} For example, National Geographic provides recommended target grade levels for each of their films (http://www.ngschoolpub.org/c/@jO4JZstPgVbM/Pages/index.web).
network. While the station does not solely feature archaeology programming, it routinely airs related shows and series regarding archaeology. Examples include the *Tutenstein* series on ancient Egyptian history and archaeology, and the *Mystery Hunters* series featuring archaeological explorations from around the world. Both the *National Geographic* and *Discovery Kids* shows present archaeology in an exciting, exploratory way using basic language and animation that appeals to younger children.

While two resources market archaeology films to a younger audience, each comes with its own share of financial constraints. For example, many of the films produced by *National Geographic* are pricey – especially if purchased for individual viewing rather than for use in a classroom. Most are between twenty and sixty minutes long, and range from $20 to $70 (http://www.ngschoolpub.org/c/@vAXvuSVDDm2og/Pages/list.web?nocache @24+curList@O+frompage@search). Similarly, the *Discovery Kids* network is a cable television channel that may only be accessed through particular cable suppliers and packages. In other words, the channel is not generically available through all cable suppliers. To find out which, if any, local cable television suppliers provide access to the *Discovery Kids* channel, one may type in their zip code on the channel's website (http://kids.discovery.com/utilities/getchannel/getchannel.html?clik=kids_leftnav/). Of course, having access to the channel would make it easier for younger audiences to learn about and enjoy the study and practice of archaeology, as it would provide greater opportunities to watch or record such programs for use in the home, school, or other appropriate venue. Unfortunately, none of the archaeology-related programming shown through the channel is available for purchase online. While the *Discovery Kids* parent company, *Discovery*
Channel, operates an online store, there are no films available to purchase that are both archaeology-related and geared for younger audiences. Accordingly, availability of child-appropriate archaeology programming is restricted to those with the financial and community resources necessary for either purchasing National Geographic videos or subscribing to the Discovery Kids channel.

In contrast, the majority of archaeology documentaries available to the public are geared toward a more mature, adult audience. Resources such as National Geographic, PBS/Odyssey, the History Channel, and other production companies discussed in detail throughout this thesis focus on targeting a relatively more mature age group. With that in mind, however, one must ask further: what type of language is used in presenting archaeology to the public through film? Are films directed – whether consciously or unconsciously – towards a well-educated audience that would be more likely to understand complex terminology? Or do films incorporate “everyday” language to attract and inform a broader age-range and/or more educationally diverse population? Though there are documentaries that most accurately describe and portray archaeology for knowledgeable audiences – such as “how-to” films, which are discussed further in the following subsection – the later practice is more prominent.

With regards to educational level, the majority of archaeology documentaries currently in circulation have been produced in such a way as to attract and appeal to the widest possible audience. In hopes of accommodating various age ranges and educational levels, production companies most often incorporate “everyday” language to explain archaeological procedures and concepts. In doing so, persons with, as well as
those without, a prior knowledge of archaeology are likely to understand the
topics and concepts presented throughout a particular film. This production
method may have negative ramifications, however. In discussing archaeology
concepts using more general language, it is quite likely that the processes and
notions may not be explained as accurately as possible. Accordingly,
presenting archaeology to the public becomes a balancing act. On the one
hand, archaeological research, practice, and interpretation must be presented
as accurately as possible. Yet, if one hopes to attract and educate a greater
audience, the information being presented must also appeal to the knowledge
base – in other words, the level of education – of the general public. Such
films are the most widely available, and may be found throughout any of the
venues discussed in the previous subsection.

Availability of Films Falling Within Certain Categories

In discussing the availability of archaeology documentaries, one topic
that must not be overlooked is the accessibility of particular types of such
films. In general, the majority of archaeology films fall into two categories. A
number of films focus on displaying and discussing the correct procedures and
techniques used during the research, excavation, and interpretation stages of
archaeological practice. Those works may also be referred to as “how-to”
films. However, such documentaries are few and far between. In contrast,
most of the documentaries available to the general public merely highlight
aspects of archaeological study, and are more focused on presenting the
anthropological or historical facets of a society, rather than concentrating on
the study of archaeology itself.
Overall, “how-to” films are harder to find than documentaries that more generally highlight archaeological study and practice. This is partially because “how-to” films most often employ appropriate archaeological and scientific terminology, and also detail archaeological procedures – aspects that typically appeal to a smaller audience. “How-to” documentaries are most often found via the collections of academic institutions or specific archaeological organizations. For example, the Institute for Nautical Archaeology (INA) has published a number of films that document various nautical excavations. While it is not yet possible to purchase films produced by INA online, one can ask questions and place an order by telephone. There are also a plethora of documentaries available for purchase online through the Archaeology Channel (http://www.archaeologychannel.org)\textsuperscript{13}. However, access to such films may be restricted to those who do not mind paying a substantial amount. Most of the documentaries listed through the Archaeology Channel’s “Video Shop” are between five and twenty-five minutes long, and range between $15 and $50 (http://www.archaeologychannel.org/content/VideoList.asp). Interestingly, a number of major archaeological organizations do not provide information of any kind regarding archaeological films. Neither the Society for American Archaeology nor the Society for Historical Archaeology provides any leads or suggestions. Further, as mentioned previously, the AIA provides only a list of preferred popular Hollywood films (such as the Indiana Jones series), and omits discussion of appropriate archaeology documentaries (http://www.archaeological.org/webinfo.php?page=10278). Ultimately, the availability of “how-to” films is determinate upon one’s effort in obtaining such

\textsuperscript{13} Do not let the name fool you – the Archaeology Channel is not a television channel, nor affiliated with a specific television channel, but is rather an organization dedicated to promoting archaeology.
media, the ability to access collections of a university (or other such academic institution), and/or one’s financial means.

In contrast to the procedural and technical “how-to” films, the majority of documentaries currently in circulation are more ethnographically-based, archaeology-related films. Such films are more focused on presenting the anthropological or historical facets of a society, and merely highlight aspects of archaeological research, excavation, and/or interpretation. Instead of detailing appropriate procedures, techniques, and analytic processes, the ethnographic archaeology documentaries are more general in scope. That is, they are not archaeology-based, but rather discuss aspects of archaeological study and practice throughout the course of the film. Commonly, such documentaries will touch on aspects of archaeology by filming within a particular archaeological site, displaying relevant artifacts on-camera, discussing how archaeological research aided in the discovery or rediscovery of a particular culture or locale, and so on. Accordingly, those persons interested in learning about archaeology in general may narrow down the choices by choosing films based on specific cultures or sites that are of particular interest. As archaeology-related documentaries are most prevalent, they may be found in any of the venues discussed previously.

With the variety of archaeology documentaries in existence, how does one know what is, or is not, a good film to view and/or purchase? If one wishes to invest time in research, film reviews may offer unique insight. Notably, there are many different types of reviews. Perhaps the most scholarly of reviews can be found via academic journals, such as the Visual Anthropology Review and Archaeology magazine (a publication of the AIA).
Of course, not every film, nor every high-quality film, has been academically reviewed. On the other hand, one may find a short advertising abstract for just about every documentary. Such abstracts are essentially overviews of the film that appear on the back of DVD/VHS boxcovers – they do not provide an opinion as to the quality or validity of the information contained within the documentary, but do mention the film’s general content. Reviews may also be obtained from such places as archaeological organizations (the Biblical Archaeology Society, for example); academic institutions; the Internet Movie Database (http://www.imdb.com); the internet sites of individual film production companies, distributors, and television channels (such as the History Channel and Discovery Kids); and so forth. When considering film reviews, one must take note of who is performing the review. Such reviews may be conducted by filmmakers (who consider the cinematic aspects of creating the film more so than the archaeological information being presented), scholars (who, conversely, consider the archaeological/anthropological information more so than the cinematography)\textsuperscript{14}, or random viewers who have no previous background in either field\textsuperscript{15}. Accordingly, reviews may or may not be accurate or biased. For example, the individual sites of production companies or other distributors – such as the History Channel, and the Biblical Archaeology Society (BAS) – who sell archaeology documentaries may write engaging overviews in hopes of enticing customers to buy their product\textsuperscript{16}.

\textsuperscript{14} Such as each review in Archaeology magazine, and at http://www.anth.ucsb.edu/videos.
\textsuperscript{15} See user comments on IMDB.com (for example, the Digging for the Truth comments at http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0446618/usercomments), and at such sites as Amazon.com.
In analyzing various reviews written about certain films critiqued in the ensuing Chapter 3, it appears that, of the limited reviews found, academic reviews were the most useful. This is because the academic reviews were the most comprehensive – they touched on the important themes of each film more so than popular reviews, advertising abstracts, reviews by the production companies, and so forth. For the purposes of such study, I concentrated on two particular films – *The Ancient Mariners* and *The Chaco Legacy* (both produced by PBS). The advertising abstracts listed by PBS provide only a brief two- or three-sentence synopsis of each film (http://shop.wgbh.org/webapp/wcs/stores/servlet/ProductDisplay?productId=13978&storeId=11051&catalogId=10051&langId=-1, http://www.shoppbs.org/sm-pbs-odyssey-the-chaco-legacy-vhs--pi-1405654.html). I did not uncover any discussion by the filmmakers as to their specific goals for creating and presenting each film, though that may be because both of the films are older (both were produced in the early 1980’s). Though the corresponding academic reviews listed on the University of California-Santa Barbara (UCSB) film review site provide more of an overview of the films’ contents, rather than a discussion of the quality/validity of the information presented, they do give candid explanations as to what to expect upon viewing each film (http://www.anth.ucsb.edu/videos/mariners.html, http://www.anth.ucsb.edu/videos/chaco.html). Notably, I found the reviews on the *Documentary Educational Resources* website to be most compelling. They provide candid explanations as to each film’s content as well as specifically address the archaeological insights and interpretations discussed within the film. Further, depending upon the specific documentary, each review lists awards that the film received (if any), and provides downloadable

In sum, the availability of archaeology films to the general public is largely dependent on how proactive one is in attempting to attain such media. While a greater majority of films are available and accessible to those with ties to academic institutions (especially universities), there are a wide range of archaeology-based documentaries that may also lie within public reach – via public libraries, cable television, the Internet, and public museums. With regards to age-range considerations, the vast majority of films appear to target adult audiences. Also, most archaeology documentaries incorporate “everyday” language to appeal to persons both with and without a prior knowledge of archaeology. Finally, the availability of those archaeology documentaries that are more anthropologically or historically based far outweighs the availability of more technique-driven, “how-to” films. Those persons with a more general interest in archaeology are likely to find a number of documentaries in any of the venues discussed above, and have a greater opportunity to choose films based on specific cultures or sites that are of particular interest. Those who wish to obtain information about the actual skills and techniques used in practicing archaeology do not have as many options, and often must look for such films within the collections of academic institutions or through archaeological organizations – such as the Institute for Nautical Archaeology or Archaeology Channel – via the internet. Although some organizations, such as the SAA, AAA, and SHA, claim to support the public education and outreach of archaeology, most fail to adequately address or promote the use of archaeology documentaries in contributing to such measures. For those who wish to pursue background research, film reviews
may aid in influencing one’s decision to view or purchase a particular archaeology documentary.
CHAPTER 3
PRESENTING ARCHAEOLOGY THROUGH FILM

While the previous chapter outlined the general availability of archaeology films to the public, this chapter considers how archaeology is presented through the available films. Once someone sits down to watch such a film, are they really gaining an understanding of archaeology as practiced or applied? Or are they learning about the results of archaeology rather than the practice? In other words, are they learning what archaeology has revealed about the past? What information is really being portrayed through the so-called “archaeology documentary”? For the purposes of this chapter, I selected a number of films to watch and critique, in hopes of shedding light on this important series of questions. Ultimately, I consider how archaeologists and film producers/production companies present information about the topic society or culture in question.

Established in 1984, the Society for Visual Anthropology (SVA) is a subset of the American Anthropological Association dedicated to promoting “the study of visual representation and media” and “the use of images for the description, analysis, communication and interpretation of human (and sometimes nonhuman) behavior” (http://www.societyforvisualanthropology.org/svawelcome.html). As part of this mission, the Society created a set of guidelines to aid in determining whether specific visual mediums are scholarly enough to meet the Society’s objectives. The recommendations are as follows: 1) to evaluate visual works as “appropriate media for the production and dissemination of anthropological knowledge,” and to consider whether such works incorporate “theoretical
analysis, interpretation, and understanding; 2) to evaluate the "technical and scholarly work entailed in producing ethnographic media," including the extensive amount of time and labor involved; 3) to rate the scholarly significance and appropriateness of each visual work as falling under one of six categories\(^{17}\); and 4) to consider opinions from filmmakers and other media specialists that work outside the field of anthropology (http://etext.virginia.edu/VAR/guide.html).

Accordingly, with regards to the SVA's *Guidelines for the Evaluation of Ethnographic Visual Media*, I evaluated whether each film\(^{18}\) adequately serves as "appropriate media for the production and dissemination of anthropological knowledge," providing a unique visual reference for understanding and/or interpreting intersocietal/intercultural relationships (http://etext.virginia.edu/VAR/guide.html). In order to do so, I looked for the presence/absence of several important issues that are consistently raised by scholars within the field of anthropological archaeology – namely, issues of social and economic class/status, differences between urban and rural environments, and distinctions between public and private spaces\(^{19}\).

Specifically, are such topics as economic or social class\(^{20}\) differences presented during the course of the film? Or are they purposely or arbitrarily

---

\(^{17}\) The six categories are as follows: “1) research footage and documentation that adds to the historical and/or ethnographic record, or is used for the further analysis (such as linguistics, dance, and art); 2) ethnographic media that contributes to theoretical debate and development; 3) innovations in new media forms; 4) media designed to enhance teaching; 5) media produced for television broadcast and other forms of mass communication; 6) applied media made with and/or for the benefit of a particular community, government, or business” (http://etext.virginia.edu/VAR/guide.html).

\(^{18}\) All of the films viewed for this thesis fall under Category #5: media produced for television broadcast and other forms of mass communication.

\(^{19}\) Scholarly evidence supporting the importance of each of these topics within the field of anthropological archaeology will be discussed in detail later in this chapter.

\(^{20}\) The term "social class," for the purposes of this thesis, refers to one definition of "class" cited in *Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition*: "the division of society into ranks or castes," specifically "a group of people considered as a unit according to . . . social status; especially a social rank or caste" (Neufeldt 1994:258).
omitted? Why might such differences be presented, or left out? Does the nature of archaeological research or the filmmaking process inhibit the discovery or dissemination of such information? Furthermore, do any of the films discuss public versus private spaces\(^{21}\) – as understood through archaeological research and practice – within a given society or culture? What about urban versus rural environs? The answers to these questions are mixed. As will be discussed, the most effective films were those that distinguished between the different social, economic, and/or environmental issues (thus discussing a greater number of the topics) within a given society/culture. This is because such discussion enables one to gain a greater understanding of how the social, economic, and/or environmental relationships and complexities shaped – or continue to shape – a particular society/cultural group. In addition, I found that even though presentation styles may differ between films, such variation does not necessarily take away from the educational value of each film. The documentaries studied may nevertheless meet SVA standards by serving as “appropriate media,” as referenced above.

In determining what documentaries to view for this particular study, I incorporated the information gathered and discussed throughout Chapter Two. Conclusions made regarding availability through particular sources, for general age-ranges or educational levels, and of categorical types (anthropology or history-based; and “how-to” films) served as the basic criteria. In the end, I decided to view twenty-four different films, all produced for primary distribution

\(^{21}\) For the purposes of this thesis, public spaces are those which, by individual common societal/cultural standards, are open for use by the general community (such as public parks, entertainment areas, community workspaces), while private spaces are restricted for use by a specific person or group (such as one family living together in a private household). In some societies/cultures, these definitions may become blurred – such as when areas within family households are open for communal use. Accordingly, it must be emphasized that these definitions are relative to the standards implicitly followed within each given society or culture.
in North America. This total number of films to be watched and critiqued was picked rather arbitrarily. Since many individual archaeology documentaries are one in a series produced by the same company (i.e. the Discovery Kids series' Mystery Hunters, and Timeblazers; the Film Ideas series Secrets of Archaeology; the History Channel series Digging for the Truth; and the PBS Odyssey series), I limited myself to a maximum of four films by the same production company. However, I set a requirement that no two films produced by the same company could focus on the same locale. Accordingly, Table 1 below lists each of the films used in this study, the production company involved, and the source used to obtain access to each film.

Table 1 – Films, Production Companies, and Sources Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FILM</th>
<th>PRODUCTION COMPANY</th>
<th>SOURCE USED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jamestown Rediscovery</td>
<td>Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities (APVA)</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digging for Slaves</td>
<td>BBC TV; Films for the Humanities and Science</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norse America</td>
<td>Bullfrog Films</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doorway to the Past</td>
<td>Colonial Williamsburg Foundation (CWF)</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Nuer</td>
<td>Peabody Museum, Harvard University</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women Pharaohs</td>
<td>Discovery Communications</td>
<td>Public Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mystery Hunters – Desert</td>
<td>Discovery Kids</td>
<td>Television</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mummies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mystery Hunters – Dragons</td>
<td>Discovery Kids</td>
<td>Television</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM</td>
<td>PRODUCTION COMPANY</td>
<td>SOURCE USED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeblazers – Can You Dig It?</td>
<td>Discovery Kids</td>
<td>Television</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeblazers – Who Discovered North America?</td>
<td>Discovery Kids</td>
<td>Television</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secrets of Archaeology - The Pyramids of the Sun</td>
<td>Film Ideas</td>
<td>Public Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secrets of Archaeology – The Forgotten Civilizations of Anatolia</td>
<td>Film Ideas</td>
<td>Public Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secrets of Archaeology – Pompeii: A City Rediscovered</td>
<td>Film Ideas</td>
<td>Public Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secrets of Archaeology – The Roads to El Dorado</td>
<td>Film Ideas</td>
<td>Public Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digging for the Truth – Cleopatra: The Last Pharaoh</td>
<td>History Television Network Productions</td>
<td>Television</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digging for the Truth – The Real Temple of Doom</td>
<td>History Television Network Productions</td>
<td>Television</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digging for the Truth – Troy: Of Gods and Warriors</td>
<td>History Television Network Productions</td>
<td>Television</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digging for the Truth – The Vikings: Voyage to America</td>
<td>History Television Network Productions</td>
<td>Television</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voyage from Antiquity</td>
<td>Institute of Nautical Archaeology (INA) Films</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Into the Great Pyramid</td>
<td>National Geographic</td>
<td>Public Library</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FILM</th>
<th>PRODUCTION COMPANY</th>
<th>SOURCE USED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Odyssey – The Ancient Mariners</td>
<td>PBS</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secrets of the Dead – Cannibalism in the Canyon</td>
<td>PBS</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odyssey – The Chaco Legacy</td>
<td>PBS</td>
<td>Academic/Television</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odyssey – Maya Lords of the Jungle</td>
<td>PBS</td>
<td>Academic/Television</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As discussed in the previous chapter, there are a variety of sources that may offer access to archaeology films, including academic institutions, public libraries, television networks, the Internet, and relevant museums and historic/cultural sites. In obtaining films to view and critique for this paper, I focused mainly on the first three sources. Due to cost issues, I did not consider films that may be purchased over the Internet. In addition, as explained in detail in Chapter Two, I did not consider films from museums and historic/cultural sites because access to appropriate archaeology films by way of such sites is surprisingly limited. Thus, I obtained each of the films either from an academic institution (the film collection at the University of Virginia, to which I was able to obtain personal access), a local public library (the Fairfax County Public Libraries system located throughout Fairfax County, Virginia), or from local or paid cable television stations. Of course, and as also noted in Chapter Two, one’s own access to films may differ from the sources cited above. In compiling the final list of films to be viewed, I wanted to equally
utilize the three available sources. As shown below in Figure 1, ten of the twenty-four films (41.67%) were obtained from the academic collection, six films (25%) were obtained from the public library, and eight films (33.33%) were viewed on television. Notably, two of the films borrowed from the academic source were also shown on television during the course of this study (*The Chaco Legacy* and *Maya Lords of the Jungle*; both shown on, and produced by, PBS).

![Pie chart showing sources of films](image)

**Figure 1 – Sources Used to Obtain Films**

Other criteria used to select the final list of films were those of target age-ranges and levels of education. With regards to target age groups, I wanted to analyze both films that were geared towards younger as well as mature audiences (as identified and explained in Chapter Two). Since only a small minority of documentaries are geared towards younger audiences, I
allocated an appropriately proportional percentage to such films. Overall, only four of the twenty-four films (16.67%) viewed were specifically geared towards younger audiences (see Figure 2). Incidentally, all four of these programs were shown via the *Discovery Kids* television network. Likewise, regarding educational levels, the majority of archaeology documentaries publicly available are geared towards viewers who have little to no previous knowledge of archaeology. Accordingly, I focused primarily on those types of documentaries. Only one film (4.17%) viewed was geared towards an audience with previous knowledge of archaeology (see Figure 3). As summarized in Table 2, Figure 2, and Figure 3 below, the ratios of films meeting the age-range and educational-level criteria considered directly corresponds with the overall availability of films falling within the specified categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FILM</th>
<th>PRODUCTION COMPANY</th>
<th>TARGET AGE</th>
<th>ASSUMES PRIOR KNOWLEDGE?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jamestown Rediscovery</td>
<td>Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities (APVA)</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digging for Slaves</td>
<td>BBC TV; Films for the Humanities and Science</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norse America</td>
<td>Bullfrog Films</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doorway to the Past</td>
<td>Colonial Williamsburg Foundation (CWF)</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 – Assumed Age-Range and Educational Level of Viewers
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FILM</th>
<th>PRODUCTION COMPANY</th>
<th>TARGET AGE</th>
<th>ASSUMES PRIOR KNOWLEDGE?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Nuer</td>
<td>Peabody Museum, Harvard University</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women Pharaohs</td>
<td>Discovery Communications</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mystery Hunters – Desert Mummies</td>
<td>Discovery Kids</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mystery Hunters – Dragons</td>
<td>Discovery Kids</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeblazers – Can You Dig It?</td>
<td>Discovery Kids</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeblazers – Who Discovered North America?</td>
<td>Discovery Kids</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secrets of Archaeology - The Pyramids of the Sun</td>
<td>Film Ideas</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secrets of Archaeology – The Forgotten Civilizations of Anatolia</td>
<td>Film Ideas</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secrets of Archaeology – Pompeii: A City Rediscovered</td>
<td>Film Ideas</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secrets of Archaeology – The Roads to El Dorado</td>
<td>Film Ideas</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digging for the Truth – Cleopatra: The Last Pharaoh</td>
<td>History Television Network Productions</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM</td>
<td>PRODUCTION COMPANY</td>
<td>TARGET AGE</td>
<td>ASSUMES PRIOR KNOWLEDGE?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digging for the Truth – The Real Temple of Doom</td>
<td>History Television Network Productions</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digging for the Truth – Troy: Of Gods and Warriors</td>
<td>History Television Network Productions</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digging for the Truth – The Vikings: Voyage to America</td>
<td>History Television Network Productions</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voyage from Antiquity</td>
<td>Institute of Nautical Archaeology (INA) Films</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Into the Great Pyramid</td>
<td>National Geographic</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odyssey – The Ancient Mariners</td>
<td>PBS</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secrets of the Dead – Cannibalism in the Canyon</td>
<td>PBS</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odyssey – The Chaco Legacy</td>
<td>PBS</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odyssey – Maya Lords of the Jungle</td>
<td>PBS</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2 – Targeted Age-Range of Viewers

Figure 3 – Targeted Level of Education of Viewers
The final criterion considered in determining the list of documentaries used for this study was that of films falling within certain categories – specifically, "how-to" films versus archaeology-related documentaries (as discussed in greater detail in Chapter Two). Due to the nature of "how-to" films, such documentaries are primarily geared towards those audiences with a prior knowledge of archaeology. Accordingly, the statistics regarding both films geared towards audiences with prior knowledge and "how-to" films are virtually identical. As shown in Table 3 below (and as supported by Table 2 and Figure 3 above), only one (or 4.17%) of the documentaries viewed in this study falls under the "how-to" category. Since "how-to" documentaries are much harder to find, and fewer in number, than so-called archaeology-related films, I felt that such a percentage appropriately represented the overall study group. Of course, the rest of the films critiqued are considered to be archaeology-related documentaries. In other words, the focus of such documentaries tend to center on the anthropological or historical facets of the culture or society in question, while only briefly discussing archaeological impacts.

Table 3 – Archaeology Film Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FILM</th>
<th>PRODUCTION COMPANY</th>
<th>HOW-TO?</th>
<th>ARCHAEOLOGY-RELATED?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jamestown Rediscovery</td>
<td>Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities (APVA)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 3 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FILM</th>
<th>PRODUCTION COMPANY</th>
<th>HOW-TO?</th>
<th>ARCHAEOLOGY-RELATED?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Digging for Slaves</td>
<td>BBC TV; Films for the Humanities and Science</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norse America</td>
<td>Bullfrog Films</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doorway to the Past</td>
<td>Colonial Williamsburg Foundation (CWF)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Nuer</td>
<td>Peabody Museum, Harvard University</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women Pharaohs</td>
<td>Discovery Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mystery Hunters – Desert Mummies</td>
<td>Discovery Kids</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mystery Hunters – Dragons</td>
<td>Discovery Kids</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeblazers – Can You Dig It?</td>
<td>Discovery Kids</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeblazers – Who Discovered North America?</td>
<td>Discovery Kids</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secrets of Archaeology - The Pyramids of the Sun</td>
<td>Film Ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secrets of Archaeology – The Forgotten Civilizations of Anatolia</td>
<td>Film Ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FILM</th>
<th>PRODUCTION COMPANY</th>
<th>HOW-TO?</th>
<th>ARCHAEOLOGY-RELATED?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secrets of Archaeology – Pompeii: A City Rediscovered</td>
<td>Film Ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secrets of Archaeology – The Roads to El Dorado</td>
<td>Film Ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digging for the Truth – Cleopatra: The Last Pharaoh</td>
<td>History Television Network Productions</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digging for the Truth – The Real Temple of Doom</td>
<td>History Television Network Productions</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digging for the Truth – Troy: Of Gods and Warriors</td>
<td>History Television Network Productions</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digging for the Truth – The Vikings: Voyage to America</td>
<td>History Television Network Productions</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voyage from Antiquity</td>
<td>Institute of Nautical Archaeology (INA) Films</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Into the Great Pyramid</td>
<td>National Geographic</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odyssey – The Ancient Mariners</td>
<td>PBS</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secrets of the Dead – Cannibalism in the Canyon</td>
<td>PBS</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FILM</th>
<th>PRODUCTION COMPANY</th>
<th>HOW-TO?</th>
<th>ARCHAEOLOGY-RELATED?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Odyssey – The Chaco Legacy</td>
<td>PBS</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odyssey – Maya Lords of the Jungle</td>
<td>PBS</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within this final list of films, I sought to answer a number of questions. First, how is archaeology being presented, or not presented, through the documentary medium? Are the modes of presentation variant among the different production companies, or are the presentation styles similar? Or do such modes vary based on the particular culture/society being studied? Archaeological research, excavation, and interpretation often provide insight into intersocietal or intercultural differences that may have existed during the time of occupation – such as economic or social class differences. Are such findings presented during the course of the documentaries? May the presentation (or lack thereof) of such information be attributable to the archaeological and other information available, or may it be the result of cinematic objectives?

I chose to concentrate on distinctions of social and economic class, public and private spaces, and urban and rural environments because all of these are important anthropological issues that have consistently been explored by prominent scholars. With regards to the first topic, many anthropologists and/or archaeologists have considered underlying issues of class/status as linked with ethnicity. For example, in his work *In Small Things*
Forgotten, James Deetz explores social and economic differences of colonial households as shown through foodways and the types of ceramic wares used. “The place of a household in the social scale had an important effect on the kinds of ceramics to be found in it. We know that the foodways of differing social classes differed significantly” (Deetz 1996:75). Deetz also considers the social and economic similarities and differences between white and black cultures in colonial America in terms of architectural forms of houses, settlement patterns, ceramics used, grave goods, ways in which the dead were buried, and so forth (Deetz 1996:187-252). Vernon Baker has also recorded similar findings in his article “Archaeological Visibility of Afro-American Culture: An Example from Black Lucy’s Garden, Andover, Massachusetts” (Baker 1980). As discussed in Jamestown Rediscovery III (Kelso 1997a), and Discoveries in Martin’s Hundred (Noel Hume 1983), social and economic class differences within and throughout colonial sites may also be distinguished from types of artifacts found (such as helmets); how elaborate those remains were; or the presence/absence of gold, silver, or other such status symbol as embedded into such artifacts. Class issues have also been explored in the context of the Boott cotton mills boardinghouses in Lowell, Massachusetts (Mrozowski et al. 1996); through archaeological research and the uncovering of an African burial ground in New York City (Cantwell and Wall 2001); and throughout historic sites in New Jersey (Veit 2002).

Relationships between public and private spaces have also consistently been explored by scholars. Notably, excavations and historical studies along Mulberry Row at Thomas Jefferson’s Monticello have elicited new insight as to the nature of private slave quarters as contrasted with the relatively more
public main house and adjacent surrounding gardens of the plantation (Kelso 1997b). In the context of classical Roman architecture, public and private spaces are both distinct, yet intertwined, settings. For example, in discussing the private villa at Oplontis, Bettina Bergmann notes that “architectural forms that invoke public spaces are explicitly recommended as the proper décor for elite Roman houses by Vitruvius” (Bergmann 2003:107). Distinctions between public and private environments have also been a main focus during the excavation and study of the Boot Mill boardinghouses in Massachusetts (Mrozowski et al. 1996), and with regards to Spanish missions throughout the American Southwest and Mayan Mesoamerica (Graham 1998).

Finally, distinctions between urban and rural spaces are also commonly explored through anthropological and archaeological study. With the rise of cultural resource management (CRM), the trend in North American archaeological practice, research, and scholarship within the twenty-first century is to consider the relevance of distinctions between urban and rural landscapes. For example, in Unearthing Gotham: The Archaeology of New York City, Anne-Marie Cantwell and Diana Wall discuss the transformation and development of New York City from its rural beginnings into the urban center that it is today (Cantwell and Wall 2001). In this way, the city’s rural past is contrasted against its modern urban landscape. In his book, Digging New Jersey’s Past: Historical Archaeology in the Garden State, Richard Veit analyzes a variety of urban and rural sites throughout New Jersey, and considers such topics as the differences between urban and rural taverns, as well as architectural and environmental contrasts between urban and rural houses (Veit 2002). Further, Robert Schuyler discusses the relationship between black oystermen living in Sandy Ground – a rural village on Staten
Island – and those residents living within the urban core of New York City (Schuyler 1980). As Schuyler notes, “during the 19th century Blacks not only lived within the urban core of cities like New York but also in satellite communities that were economically dependent on the city” (Schuyler 1980:48). Urban/rural landscape issues have also been discussed with regards to a Hohokam village near Phoenix, Arizona (Bartlett et al. 1986), and settlement patterns in ancient Mesopotamia (Matthews 2003, Pollock 1999).

Considering that social and economic class differences are issues consistently approached by archaeologists and anthropologists during the course of their research, I sought to analyze whether archaeology documentaries also touch upon these two important topics. While quantifiable results may be obtained with regards to the twenty-four films viewed for this study, such results are not resolute – that is, the data obtained does not necessarily reflect how other archaeology films may or may not present such intersocietal/intercultural differences. Below, Table 4 notes the general presence or lack of such information within each film.

Table 4 – Intercultural Differences Discussed Within Films

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FILM</th>
<th>PRODUCTION COMPANY</th>
<th>DISCUSSES ECONOMIC CLASS DIFFERENCES</th>
<th>DISCUSSES SOCIAL CLASS DIFFERENCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jamestown Rediscovery</td>
<td>Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities (APVA)</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM</td>
<td>PRODUCTION COMPANY</td>
<td>DISCUSSES ECONOMIC CLASS DIFFERENCES</td>
<td>DISCUSSES SOCIAL CLASS DIFFERENCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digging for Slaves</td>
<td>BBC TV; Films for the Humanities and Science</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norse America</td>
<td>Bullfrog Films</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doorway to the Past</td>
<td>Colonial Williamsburg Foundation (CWF)</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Nuer</td>
<td>Peabody Museum, Harvard University</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women Pharaohs</td>
<td>Discovery Communications</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mystery Hunters – Desert Mummies</td>
<td>Discovery Kids</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mystery Hunters – Dragons</td>
<td>Discovery Kids</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeblazers – Can You Dig It?</td>
<td>Discovery Kids</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeblazers – Who Discovered North America?</td>
<td>Discovery Kids</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secrets of Archaeology - The Pyramids of the Sun</td>
<td>Film Ideas</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secrets of Archaeology – The Forgotten Civilizations of Anatolia</td>
<td>Film Ideas</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM</td>
<td>PRODUCTION COMPANY</td>
<td>DISCUSSES ECONOMIC CLASS DIFFERENCES</td>
<td>DISCUSSES SOCIAL CLASS DIFFERENCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secrets of Archaeology – Pompeii: A City</td>
<td>Film Ideas</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rediscovered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secrets of Archaeology – The Roads to El</td>
<td>Film Ideas</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digging for the Truth – Cleopatra:</td>
<td>History Television Network</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Last Pharaoh</td>
<td>Productions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digging for the Truth – The Real Temple</td>
<td>History Television Network</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Doom</td>
<td>Productions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digging for the Truth – Troy: Of Gods</td>
<td>History Television Network</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Warriors</td>
<td>Productions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digging for the Truth – The Vikings:</td>
<td>History Television Network</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voyage to America</td>
<td>Productions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voyage from Antiquity</td>
<td>Institute of Nautical Archaeology</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(INA) Films</td>
<td>Films</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Into the Great Pyramid</td>
<td>National Geographic</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odyssey – The Ancient Mariners</td>
<td>PBS</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secrets of the Dead – Cannibalism in the</td>
<td>PBS</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM</td>
<td>PRODUCTION COMPANY</td>
<td>DISCUSSES ECONOMIC CLASS DIFFERENCES</td>
<td>DISCUSSES SOCIAL CLASS DIFFERENCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odyssey – The Chaco Legacy</td>
<td>PBS</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odyssey – Maya Lords of the Jungle</td>
<td>PBS</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interestingly, of the films viewed for this thesis, most either discussed both social and economic class differences, or discussed neither. As Table 4 shows, seven of the twenty-four films (29.17%) discussed economic class differences, and nine of the films (37.5%) touched upon social class differences. Seven of the twenty-four films (29.17%) discussed both economic and social class differences, while fifteen of the films (62.5%) discussed neither economic nor social differences. Notably, all of the films that considered economic differences also touched upon social class differences. To reiterate, the results shown below must not be construed as reflective of the entirety of archaeology documentaries available. Each film must be considered on an individual basis.

As one may discern from the Table above, the discussion (or lack thereof) of intersocietal/intercultural economic or social class differences is not necessarily dependent on which particular film production company was involved. In other words, not all documentaries produced by Film Ideas, History Television Network Productions, or PBS are consistent in the presentation or exclusion of such information. Ultimately, the presentation of
various types of class differences often depends on the particular motives and objectives of the production companies, when producing each unique film. Oftentimes, the presentation or exclusion of information is directly related to the focus/central topic of the documentary, not to the specific culture/society being studied. Accordingly, presentation styles vary widely between production companies.

A prime example of how the presentation or exclusion of economic or social class differences directly relate to the focus/central topic of each documentary may be demonstrated through the PBS film *Secrets of the Dead – Cannibalism in the Canyon*. The overarching theme of this film was to present research (including archaeological research and findings) that may support the notion that Anasazi members were involved in cannibalistic practices (i.e., eating their dead). As Table 4 shows above, this film lacked discussion of both economic and social class differences. However, this is not necessarily because such differences were not present amongst the Anasazi. Rather, the main purpose of this archaeology-related documentary was to specifically discuss the potential practice of cannibalism in Anasazi society. Accordingly, notions of economic or social class differences were not relevant with regards to this central topic, and therefore were not discussed. If archaeological evidence suggested that economic or social class differences were directly related to the cannibalistic practices (for example, if those of a lower economic or social class were relegated to eat the remains of persons of a higher economic or social class, or vice versa), then such differences likely would have been discussed. However, no evidence suggests that the two facets are directly related to each other. As such, it comes as no surprise that this film fails to touch upon such class differences.
This above notion – that the failure to present a society’s or culture’s economic or social class differences within a documentary is largely due to each film’s unique overarching theme – accounts for the vast majority of results obtained. In the lone “how-to” film viewed – *Voyage from Antiquity* – (which tracked the underwater archaeological excavation of a Bronze-Age ship that had sunk of the coast of Turkey) the notion of differences amongst Bronze-Age Mediterranean seafarers was markedly absent. As is the nature of “how-to” films, the documentary focused more on the archaeological procedures necessary to conduct a successful underwater excavation. More attention was given to displaying proper excavation practices and techniques, rather than in discussion of the shipping culture being studied. Similarly, the main focus of the APVA film, *Jamestown Rediscovery*, was to display and discuss the archaeological research performed at Jamestown that led to the uncovering of one of the New World’s earliest colonial establishments (the triangular Jamestown fort). Due to the nature and topic of the film itself, discussion of economic and/or social differences was not relevant.

On the other hand, oftentimes the nature and direction of a particular documentary is such that necessitates the discussion of economic and/or social class differences. For example, the BBC TV film, *Digging for Slaves*, focuses on colonial slave life at various locations throughout South Carolina and Virginia. Since the documentary focuses on the lives of colonial slaves – at such locations as Somerset Place Plantation and Middleburg Plantation in South Carolina; and Monticello, Williamsburg, and Carter’s Grove in Virginia – discussion of economic and social class differences between the slaves and those whom they labored for is inescapable. Also, in *Odyssey – Maya Lords of the Jungle* (produced by PBS), both economic and social class differences
are used to juxtapose the relationships between the wealthy elite and the lower classes. Within Mayan society, a social hierarchy exists because such a distinguishing of the differences in class status is needed to operate an extensive agriculture system, labor force (to build the massive Mayan structures), and system of trade. As economic and social class differences dominate Mayan society, such discussion is imperative if one wishes to understand the culture and its history.

In addition to considering the inclusion or exclusion of economic and/or social class differences throughout the various documentaries studied, the concept of spatial landscapes within each particular society/culture was also analyzed. Specifically, the following two questions were asked: 1) did any of the documentaries discuss differences in public and private spaces within a given society or culture? Also, what about comparisons/contrasts between urban and rural environments? As Table 5 shows below, about half of the films discussed both types of environments, whereas the other half considered only public spaces. Further, the results regarding urban and rural landscapes were mixed. About one-third of the films considered both urban and rural spaces, one-third discussed only urban environments, and the final third either discussed only rural landscapes, or neither type. These statistical conclusions are partially due to the fact that, as was the case with presenting economic and social class differences, the discussion (or lack thereof) of public and private spaces, or urban and rural environs, is directly related to the cinematic objectives of the individual film production companies involved.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FILM</th>
<th>PRODUCTION COMPANY</th>
<th>DISCUSSES PUBLIC / PRIVATE SPACES</th>
<th>DISCUSSES URBAN / RURAL SPACES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jamestown Rediscovery</td>
<td>Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities (APVA)</td>
<td>Pub</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digging for Slaves</td>
<td>BBC TV; Films for the Humanities and Science</td>
<td>Pub, Priv</td>
<td>U, R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norse America</td>
<td>Bullfrog Films</td>
<td>Pub, Priv</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doorway to the Past</td>
<td>Colonial Williamsburg Foundation (CWF)</td>
<td>Pub, Priv</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Nuer</td>
<td>Peabody Museum, Harvard University</td>
<td>Pub</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women Pharaohs</td>
<td>Discovery Communications</td>
<td>Pub, Priv</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mystery Hunters – Desert Mummies</td>
<td>Discovery Kids</td>
<td>Pub</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mystery Hunters – Dragons</td>
<td>Discovery Kids</td>
<td>Pub</td>
<td>Neither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeblazers – Can You Dig It?</td>
<td>Discovery Kids</td>
<td>Pub</td>
<td>U, R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secrets of Archaeology - The Pyramids of the Sun</td>
<td>Film Ideas</td>
<td>Pub</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FILM</th>
<th>PRODUCTION COMPANY</th>
<th>DISCUSSES PUBLIC V. PRIVATE SPACES</th>
<th>DISCUSSES URBAN V. RURAL SPACES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secrets of Archaeology – The Forgotten Civilizations of Anatolia</td>
<td>Film Ideas</td>
<td>Pub</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secrets of Archaeology – Pompeii: A City Rediscovered</td>
<td>Film Ideas</td>
<td>Pub, Priv</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secrets of Archaeology – The Roads to El Dorado</td>
<td>Film Ideas</td>
<td>Pub, Priv</td>
<td>U, R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digging for the Truth – Cleopatra: The Last Pharaoh</td>
<td>History Television Network</td>
<td>Pub, Priv</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digging for the Truth – The Real Temple of Doom</td>
<td>Network Productions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digging for the Truth – Troy: Of Gods and Warriors</td>
<td>History Television Network</td>
<td>Pub</td>
<td>U, R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digging for the Truth – The Vikings: Voyage to America</td>
<td>Network Productions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voyage from Antiquity</td>
<td>Institute of Nautical</td>
<td>Pub</td>
<td>Neither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archaeology (INA) Films</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Into the Great Pyramid</td>
<td>National Geographic</td>
<td>Pub, Priv</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odyssey – The Ancient Mariners</td>
<td>PBS</td>
<td>Pub</td>
<td>Neither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM</td>
<td>PRODUCTION COMPANY</td>
<td>DISCUSSES PUBLIC V. PRIVATE SPACES</td>
<td>DISCUSSES URBAN V. RURAL SPACES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secrets of the Dead – Cannibalism in the Canyon</td>
<td>PBS</td>
<td>Pub</td>
<td>Neither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odyssey – The Chaco Legacy</td>
<td>PBS</td>
<td>Pub, Priv</td>
<td>U, R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odyssey – Maya Lords of the Jungle</td>
<td>PBS</td>
<td>Pub, Priv</td>
<td>U, R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown above in Table 5, twelve of the twenty-four films (50%) discussed differences between public and private spaces, while the other twelve films (50%) discussed only public environments. With regards to urban and rural landscapes, seven of the twenty-four films (29.17%) discussed both urban and rural spaces, nine films (37.5%) considered only urban environments, and the remaining eight films (33.33%) discussed either rural spaces alone, or neither type of environment. Again, like the data observed from Table 4, such results must not be considered representative of all archaeology documentaries currently in circulation. There is no general assumption or conclusion that may be drawn for why public and private, or urban and rural, environments may or may not be incorporated into particular films. Instead, each film must be considered independently, as the presentation (or lack thereof) of such information is often merely due to the objectives of the production company at the time each unique documentary is produced.
In some instances, lack of discussion regarding public and private, or urban and rural, landscapes may merely be due to the fact that such differences were not present in a particular society (or) during a given time period. For example, it is impossible to distinguish between urban and rural environments in the case of the Norse Vikings because, as the Norse discovered and explored lands in the New World, all of their colonies were rural. During initial explorations and periods of brief settlement, not enough time elapsed to establish urban areas. It must come as no surprise, then, that the films *Norse America* and *Digging for the Truth – The Vikings: Voyage to America* fail to discuss both urban and rural spaces. Similarly, the Nuer culture subsisted (and continues to subsist) within a very rural African environment. As documented in *The Nuer*, said culture inhabits a pastoral landscape; *literally* feeding off of the land and nearby river. Even the concept of an urban environment would seem bizarre and out-of-place.

Finally, those documentaries that are geared towards younger audiences – such as the programs produced by Discovery Kids – typically do not touch upon differences regarding public and private, and urban and rural, landscapes. No doubt, this is due to the age-range and corresponding level of understanding of child-age persons. Those programs geared towards children typically provide more of a general introduction and overview to the topic of archaeology and to a particular culture/society itself, rather than focusing on specific intercultural/intersocietal differences. As such programs are designed to appeal to young audiences, and attract interest in learning more about archaeology and unique ways of life, it is likely that discussing details about varying environments within a particular society/culture would create confusion and/or disinterest. In this case, the absence of any discussion regarding
differences in varying landscapes must be attributable to the unique objectives of those films that are geared towards younger audiences.

In sum, this chapter has shed light on the broad topic of how archaeology is presented to the public through relevant documentary films. In determining what documentaries to use for this study, the information regarding availability of films was incorporated. Such information aided in gathering films that proportionally represented the various available sources, the types of audiences for which archaeology documentaries may be geared towards, and the two distinct archaeology film categories. After narrowing the list down to twenty-four films, each film was reviewed with the following considerations in mind: 1) whether the film presented, or failed to discuss, economic and/or social class differences, and 2) whether the film considered similarities and/or differences in public and private spaces, and urban and rural landscapes. Ultimately, the discussion of such information is largely dependent on the central topic of the specific film in question, as well as the cinematic objectives of the particular production company involved. Even though presentation styles may differ between films, such variation does not necessarily diminish the educational value of any particular documentary. With regards to the Society for Visual Anthropology’s Guidelines for the Evaluation of Ethnographic Visual Media, each of the twenty four films viewed for this thesis adequately serves as “appropriate media for the production and dissemination of anthropological knowledge,” (http://etext.virginia.edu/VAR/guide.html). Nonetheless, some of the most effective films were those that distinguished between the different social, economic, and environmental issues (thus touching upon a greater number of the topics) within a given society/culture. This is because such discussion
enables one to better understand how intersocietal/intercultural relationships and complexities have shaped – or continue to shape – a particular society/culture.
CHAPTER 4
INTERDISCIPLINARY FACETS OF PRESENTING ARCHAEOLOGY: CREATING A DOCUMENTARY FOR ROBERT H. TREMAN STATE PARK

Within the field of historical archaeology, scholars have developed an increased recognition and placed value on engaging and partnering with local communities throughout the archaeological process. As John Jameson, Jr. argues, archaeologists, interpreters, and other specialists, “are challenged to make archaeologically generated insights more accessible to the public. They do this by empowering members of the public to participate in the critical evaluations of historical and archaeological interpretations that are presented to them and helping them to understand how and why the past is relevant to the present (Jameson 1997:12-13).

Additionally, as asserted in the previous chapter, archaeology documentaries often serve as appropriate and effectual media for educating others about anthropological information and interpretations, as gleaned from archaeological processes. Accordingly, creating an archaeology documentary may be one unique and effective way of bringing together archaeologists, filmmakers, and community members in a cooperative partnership.

In this chapter, I seek to further support the above arguments by detailing my own experiences in producing an archaeology documentary similar to those films reviewed in the last chapter. The film itself – entitled Past, Present, Future: an Introduction to Robert H. Treman State Park – is attached and comprises the second part of this thesis. This documentary serves as both an example of the type of “archaeology documentary”
discussed throughout this paper, as well as one of a number of enterprising activities that have developed out of the archaeological research performed within Treman State Park. In fact, as the film shows, much of what we know about the history and development of Robert H. Treman State Park over time has been rediscovered as a result of archaeological exploration throughout the park. The documentary also illustrates the compelling character of Treman State Park – why this particular landscape has attracted people for hundreds of years, and why it has “been set aside for past, present, and future generations” (Beck and Cable 1998:49). As will be further exemplified throughout this chapter, archaeological research enables scholars, volunteers, and other members of the general public to understand not only how archaeology itself is practiced, but also helps one develop a clearer understanding of the history of the study area (as found via archaeology). Archaeological research also paves the way for the creation of future exhibits and other educational opportunities. Importantly, both the archaeological and filmmaking processes conducted throughout Treman have served as catalysts for engaging the local community.

**Background on Robert H. Treman State Park**

Robert H. Treman State Park encompasses over one thousand acres of land, nestled in the southwestern portion of Tompkins County, New York (NYS Parks, n.d.). The public park originated in 1920, when Robert Treman and his wife Laura donated the land to the State of New York. Though only a few buildings are scattered throughout the park grounds today, such has not always been the case. During the nineteenth century, a portion of the park actually served as the site of a small hamlet known as Enfield Falls. In the
years since the hamlet’s decline, all of the buildings have been destroyed, save two – a restored grist mill and the miller’s house (Poppensiek 1990:1-2). Both are New York State landmarks and are listed on the National Register of Historic Places. In 1998, at the encouragement of park staff, Cornell researchers became involved in historical and archaeological research on the land once known as Enfield Falls, which now comprises most of the “Upper Park”. Since the first field season back in 1998, the archaeological work undertaken throughout the park has propelled a rediscovery of the park’s rich history, and has ignited both a desire and need to educate visitors about the geological, historical, and cultural landscapes of the park.

Original Goals

When I set out initially to create a documentary on the archaeology work undertaken in Robert H. Treman State Park, my focus was strictly limited to the presentation of archaeological excavation and laboratory processes as well as the interpretation of artifact discoveries. To put it simply, my initial objective was to create a “how-to” film. The original idea to create this documentary was spurred by an interest in educating others about archaeology. Initially, there was no intent to present geological, historical, or cultural facets of the park’s storied background. However, once the park staff heard of the project, they immediately saw potential in creating not only a film about the archaeology in the park, but also a film representing and highlighting all of the varied features and opportunities that this park has offered to generations of people. This idea makes the most sense because in interpreting the finds of archaeological investigation we saw how much of the park’s geology, history, and archaeology are interconnected. For generations,
people have been attracted to this area because of the geological attributes – especially access to water and water power. Those who settled down in this area did so partially because they admired the beauty of, and saw opportunity for growth from, the features of this landscape. In turn, much of what we know about the cultural history of Treman State Park was actually rediscovered as a result of archaeological excavation and interpretation\textsuperscript{22}.

\section*{Revised Goals}

With the encouragement and involvement of the Finger Lakes regional park office, I sat down with parks staff to establish their goals as well as determine what information they desired to present to park visitors through the documentary. Using some of the criteria set out in Chapter 2 and Chapter 3 of this thesis, we assumed that the average visitor perusing the video would be of mature adult age and have no prior knowledge of the park’s geological, cultural, or archaeological histories. Though the New York State Parks Finger Lakes Regional office offers a wealth of outdoor educational and interpretive programs, lectures, visitor center exhibits, and brochures for patrons throughout the year, the documentary medium had never before been employed. Further research indicated that such a mode of outreach would certainly capture the interest and attention of park visitors, as well as promote and advance long-standing goals of the regional park office.

One of the main goals of the Finger Lakes Regional office continues to involve public outreach and education, largely via the interpretation and

\textsuperscript{22} For more information regarding the geology, history, and archaeology of Robert H. Treman State Park, please see Appendix A. Please also see Costura, Daniel. \textit{An Interpretive Design for the Archaeological Excavation of Enfield Falls at Treman State Park}. Cornell University, M.L.A. Thesis, 2002.
promotion of the geological, historical, cultural, and other natures of the various parks throughout the region. Importantly, one must realize that "interpretation is not a thing, but rather a very specific type of communication process" (Veverka 1998:19). Specifically, one may consider a definition of "interpretation" developed by Interpretation Canada in 1976, and restated by John Veverka (1998:19): "Interpretation is a communication process designed to reveal meanings and relationships of our cultural and natural heritage to the public (visitors) through first-hand experiences with objects, artifacts, landscapes, or sites" (emphasis added). In this light, it seems that the documentary medium is one of the more underutilized, yet effective, ways of supplementing the interpretation process while simultaneously communicating information to the public.

Another objective for creating the film was to provide a mode of learning by which park visitors may not only listen to and discover the park's varied history, landscape, and other offerings, but, most importantly, remember the messages being conveyed well after leaving the park boundaries. As museum interpreter John Veverka (1998:2) states, "we must . . . grab the visitors' attention and feed their desire to remember the interpretive message, to carry it home with them. If we fail, the visitor may choose to not participate, or may quickly forget all that was 'learned'." It was then concluded that use of a touch-screen would enable patrons to decide for themselves which park topics they would like to learn more about. By focusing only on topics of interest – as opposed to sitting through a longer comprehensive video segment – viewers are more likely to stay and watch film chapters in their entirety and remember the messages being conveyed. "Visitors remember about: 10% of what they hear; 30% of what they read; 50% of what they see; 90% of what they do"
(Veverka 1998:10). Furthermore, “visitors generally are not interested in reading – they’d rather look at artifacts or push some buttons” (Veverka 1998:133). By emphasizing individual choice and participation through use of a touch-screen video player and topic-driven chapter segmentation, the odds of one enjoying their park experience and remembering the messages conveyed increase dramatically.

Another, more long-term, objective of the park office is to develop an inter-regional association between the individual Finger Lakes parks. As Veverka (1998:87) has realistically assessed:

“While interpretive master planning is generally regarded as essential to the success of any interpretive site or facility, the majority of such plans are site, facility, or park specific, with little attention to a regional context and integration with interpretation at other nearby sites or facilities . . . A large percentage of interpretive efforts tend to be rather narrow in their potential to market regional stories and interpretive opportunities.”

Ultimately, Finger Lakes park authorities hope not to follow such a trend; and instead desire to capitalize on the added opportunities for outreach. It is anticipated that a documentary on Robert H. Treman State Park will become the first in a series of park videos highlighting the unique features of each of the Finger Lakes regional parks. Developing such a regional scope creates unity as well as integration of interpretive efforts amongst and between the individual parks. In addition, the regional context provides greater opportunity for increased patronage and enhanced marketability of the parks.

In addition to the above objectives of the Finger Lakes park staff, another aspect of the educational video to consider is that of length, with
regards to the attention span of museum/park visitors. Previous research and
documentation has shown that, for films displayed in museums, parks, or other
educational exhibit settings, the average length of time that viewers will stay
and watch is rather short. As Veverka (1998:133-134) argues,

“The average viewing time for a video or slide program
that is part of an exhibit is about three minutes. If you have a
program longer than that, the visitors will probably not stand
through the whole thing . . . The average maximum time that
visitors are willing to sit through a theater program in a visitor
center or museum is about seven minutes. After that, attention
and interest drop dramatically.”

This observation is not unusual. Nature and culture interpreters Larry Beck
and Ted Cable further support the above argument. “Most people will watch a
video exhibit for three minutes or less” (Beck and Cable 1998:104).

Length of the standard visitor/interpretive center film sequence has also
been the focus of a national Forest Service survey. According to Veverka,

“A 1989 publication by Region 8 of the USDA Forest
Service entitled ‘Being Up Front and Out Front . . .
Communicating through Interpretation’ contains some ‘exhibit
survey results’ from the fall of 1987. The statistics were from
two years of studies done by the USDA Design Division at nine
different locations including the Adirondack New York Museum;
the Smithsonian Air and Space Museum; the Begich-Boggs
Visitor Center in Alaska; the Keowee-Toxaway Energy Complex
Visitor Center in South Carolina; and the Williamsburg Visitor
Center in Virginia” (Veverka 1998:135).
The most important results of Veverka’s study are the following:

1) “37% listened to tape messages. Length of time was approximately four minutes. Messages nearly ten minutes long were listened to by only 5% of the visitors. Almost 95% of the listeners waited for the entire message if it was less than three minutes long”;

2) “slide shows, videos, or movies were viewed by 55% of the visitors. Length again was a factor for viewing, as only 8% watched programs over six minutes long” (Veverka 1998:135).

In consideration of this survey and other relevant opinions of those working in the field of museum/visitor center interpretation, all of the chapters in the Treman documentary have been edited down to fall between three and seven minutes in length.

**Organization of the Film**

In determining what information to present to the public through the documentary, there was one question that overwhelmingly dominated discussion. The prevailing question has also been eloquently summarized by Larry Beck and Ted Cable. “Why has this place been set aside for past, present, and future generations? What is the *genius loci*: the unique and representative values, the distinctive atmosphere, the pervading character of the place? What should everyone *know* about this remarkable setting?” (Beck and Cable 1998:49). Ultimately, for the purposes of this documentary, the parties involved decided on the following chapters: 1) a general introduction to the park; 2) an overview of the park’s geology; 3) a discussion on the ‘early
history' of the park, up to the donation of the park land by Robert and Laura Treman to the state of New York (up to 1920); 4) a section on the 'later history' of the park, from the time of its acquirement by the state up through the present day (1920-Present); 5) a chapter regarding the archaeological research, excavation, and interpretation performed throughout the park; and 6) a conclusion discussing various opportunities for exploring and learning more about Robert H. Treman State Park.

With variation and creativity in mind, we decided to employ a narrator to discuss – both on-camera and through voice-overs – most of the information regarding the park. Ultimately, it was hoped that the narrator would provide a sense of continuity throughout the different chapters of the film. The narrator (Sarah Fiorello) is both a member of the parks staff and Chief of Interpretation, and thus has first-hand knowledge of the relevant material.

Interspersed through the history and archaeology chapters are interviews with two scholars who have direct experience with the topics at hand. Dan Costura and Dr. Sherene Baugher are primary resources for the chapters because both are co-directors of the archaeological excavations at Treman State Park. Consequently, both have presented a number of scholarly papers regarding the historical background of, and archaeological discoveries made within, the park. Since each chapter is short in duration, it was agreed that only two persons other than the narrator would appear as special-topic authorities within the documentary. Otherwise, the film would appear too choppy and overloaded.
Factors in the Production of the Film

During the creation of this film, a number of factors and concerns evolved that must be shared. Some of the issues are common to the field of documentary filmmaking, and others were specific to this particular project. Among such important general factors to consider are the time and dedication needed to pursue a professional-grade product. As recognized by the Society for Visual Anthropology in their *Guidelines for the Evaluation of Ethnographic Visual Media*, “far more footage is shot than is used and that all footage – used and unused – must laboriously be interpreted and evaluated. Even short visual works represent an enormous amount of labor. For example, independent of preparatory fieldwork, the creation of a film easily consumes forty hours for every minute of final screen time” (http://etext.virginia.edu/VAR/guide.html). In the case of the Treman documentary, I compiled approximately five to six hours of filming on tape. In other words, only five to six hours of filming were recorded on the mini-DV tapes – the actual overall time spent on filming was well above that. Various portions of filming were completed on different days – I would estimate that a combined total of approximately ten full days were spent solely on the filming process. The filming stage consisted of interviews; narration; filming of general scenery; and recording of the archaeological excavations, laboratory procedures, and installation of one of the outdoor archaeology exhibits. In addition, I compiled hundreds of still photographs and area maps. The final product is a little over twenty minutes long. What many may fail to realize is that such discrepancies in time are necessary. For example, it is virtually impossible to film a perfect two-minute narration sequence in the first two minutes. It is rare for one to overestimate the time that may be needed to
complete filming, as the filming process often well exceeds the amount of time originally budgeted.

Community Involvement

Today within the field of historical archaeology, there is a value placed not only on community outreach work, but also work that engages the community. Some archaeologists are striving to work with the public, and not just for the public. As Maureen Malloy asserts, “partnership with the public must go beyond participation by the public in archaeology. Partnership, or collaboration, suggests that the ‘goals and objectives of a project are developed jointly’ by the archaeologist and members of the local community” (Malloy 2003:ix). Additionally, Robert Kelly argues for “the use of the past as a way to empower a local community or communities. This is done primarily by using the archaeological venture as a focal point for a continuing conversation between the various stakeholders and the material archaeological record” (Kelly 2003:vii).

Both the archaeological work performed throughout Treman and the Treman documentary have succeeded in engaging the community and have helped build partnerships between community members and professional archaeologists.

This particular film is not intended to be a professional-grade film; nor will it serve as the final product. However, the film has served as a catalyst for engaging the public. This film is a polished student film and was viewed by community members and park staff. Draft reviews by the parks staff have led to further discussion, questioning, and a revamping of the film’s methodologies
and goals. Though intentions have changed, this documentary has served as a focal point for initiating and stimulating community discussion. Such discussion has prompted all parties involved to think about what they want to incorporate into the park’s final documentary film – specifically, what aspects of the park’s historical, cultural, and environmental landscapes they consider to be important and necessary to educate park visitors about. After viewing this documentary, park staff, community members, and members of the Friends of Robert H. Treman State Park acknowledged the need to incorporate additional sections, and shorten some of the original chapters. Among those add-ons include: a park safety component; a “naturalist” section discussing the park’s ecology, tree and plant life, animals, and bird species often found within the park; and a section about the park’s various trails. This film on Treman State Park has succeeded in engaging the public and has encouraged a dialogue on what diverse “stakeholders” needed.

Technical Issues

To go from the initial documentary to a finished product marketable to the public, there are a number of other considerations to keep in mind and steps to take. Financially, my documentary was created on an extremely limited budget. I borrowed a professional-level mini-digital video (mini-DV) camera from the Cornell library system, and spent a limited amount on mini-DV tapes. I used the in-camera microphone to record all of the audio. Notably, to create professional-level audio, separate sound equipment is needed. Further, if incorporating narration, sound-rooms are desirable. Additionally, I used my personal computer and digital editing software. As I was a student, and because the documentary was also to be incorporated into
this thesis, I was unable to accept any financial benefits or pay for services rendered. Inevitably, to create a higher-end product, one would likely have to pay a professional for any and all services, which often include time spent on the project, wear and tear on equipment, travel, use of editing hardware and software, a “salary” of sorts, and so forth. As such, the cost differentials are substantial. In their book *Interpretation of Cultural and Natural Resources*, Douglas Knudson, Ted Cable, and Larry Beck provide an extensive list of additional factors and costs to consider in developing a commercial film – including: access to locations for filming, number of film copies produced, number of crew members involved, type of equipment used, on-camera talent, insurance, props, additional costs for creation of special effects and animated graphics, and so on (Knudson et al. 1995:203).

**Copyright and Legal Issues**

Most importantly, one must also consider the legal (and, consequentially, financial) issues at stake when attempting to create a film for public use and for purposes other than the purely self-educational. Any and all visual media – such as photographs, maps, filming of persons – as well as any and all audio recordings may not be used or reproduced without express written documentation of consent by the original person involved or user who owns the copyright. Otherwise, the filmmaker is in direct violation of copyright law and may face substantial fines or other legal consequences. A complete explanation of United States copyright law may be found under Title 17 of the United States Code. Copyright restrictions are normally considered with regards to three major categories: rights over photographs, music, or persons shown on-camera.
When using photographs as part of a film, each photograph’s copyright is owned by the original photographer. Even if the original photo is physically transferred to another individual or organization, the copyright belonging to that photo does not automatically transfer. In other words, physical ownership of a photograph does not necessarily constitute ownership of the copyright. Only if the original photographer provides written consent of the transfer of copyright ownership does such title change hands. Another aspect to keep in mind is that copyrights expire after a designated period of time. Depending on the year in which the photograph was taken, the original copyright expires after a pre-set time limit. Such time limits are designated by sequential United States Copyright Acts (i.e. the U.S. Copyright Act of 1909; the U.S. Copyright Act of 1976). The time limit for each photograph is determined by the most current Copyright Act in existence at the time the photo was taken. Accordingly, the copyright time limit for a photo is not altered based on the passage of subsequent Acts. A final consideration to keep in mind is that copyrights may be renewed, upon request (Philip Porter, Esquire, Personal Communication, 2006).

United States copyright law also governs the use of copyrighted audio recordings. Audio tracks that are not copyrighted are listed in the “public domain,” and are free for public use. Yet, determining what is or is not in the public domain can become blurry. For example, original scores by Mozart are listed in the public domain. However, a Mozart score that is played by the Boston Pops, or other professional orchestra, is not within the public domain. To determine if a particular piece is listed in the public domain, one may consider sources such as http://www.pdinfo.com, the Public Domain Chart published by Cornell University, or any other comparable resource. If one
wishes to obtain rights to use a copyrighted audio track, there are a number of options available. The most common form of obtaining rights is by purchasing the general right to a particular song or other audio recording. However, one also has the option of purchasing singular rights to only the lyrics, or notes, or arrangement of the audio track. In addition, one must also obtain multiple rights if one wishes to use an audio recording that was previously copyrighted, yet performed by a different artist (i.e. not the original performer). For example, if “Artist X” obtained rights to perform a song originally copyrighted by “Artist Y”, and if the filmmaker wanted to use the recording done by “Artist X”, they would have to obtain permission from both “Artist X” as well as the rights to the “Artist Y” song. Finally, one does not necessarily have to buy rights for an entire audio track, but also often has the opportunity to purchase rights for portions of songs. Such rights are termed “synchronization” or “synch” rights, and are often less expensive than the rights for an entire audio piece (Philip Porter, Esquire, Personal Communication, 2006).

Finally, in creating a professional film for public use, one must consider the lawful ability to use on-camera personalities. With regards to filmmaking, personalities include any actors, narrators, persons who are interviewed on-camera, as well as any and all persons indirectly shown via photographs, during the filming process, and so forth. If a person is displayed on camera by way of a photograph, the copyright must be obtained for both usage of the photo as well as the person(s) shown within the picture. (Accordingly, if the copyright is obtained only for use of the photo, the heads of the person(s) from whom permission was not obtained must be blurred out.) Under laws of privacy and publicity, one may not use a person’s name, picture, or personal characteristics within a film without written permission from the particular
individual. Unlike copyright laws over photographs and music, laws of privacy and publicity regarding people may continue even after a person's death. In such instances, written permission must be obtained from the estate of the deceased individual (Philip Porter, Esquire, Personal Communication, 2006). Usually, all that is necessary is a signed standard consent form from each person (or surviving estate of the person) that is willing to appear on camera. Of course, troubles may arise if one does not know the name or contact information of those who appear in desired photographs.

Of course, obtaining permission for the use of such copyrighted material is not without cost. Depending on the type of material for which permission is requested, such consent may cost up to hundreds of dollars – for just one photo, one audio track, and so on. Notably, once permission has been obtained, such consent is only granted for use in the particular project for which the copyrighted material has been requested. In other words: if a filmmaker wishes to obtain the right to incorporate a still image, audio track, or personality in a particular film, such a right is non-transferable to additional projects that the same filmmaker may produce. Accordingly, once the final project has been completed, the filmmaker then owns the overall copyright to his/her work. Of course, one may transfer ownership of the new copyrighted film by signing a waiver – which would then transfer title of the work to the organization or individual to whom the film is given (Philip Porter, Esquire, Personal Communication, 2006).

Evaluation of the Treman Documentary

Using the guidelines set forth in the previous chapter of this thesis, a critical evaluation of my film has yielded unique insight as to the film's
educational content. While the film does not touch upon social or economic class differences of the people who have inhabited the landscape over the years, it does consider distinctions between public and private environs, as well as between urban and rural landscapes. That does not mean that such social and economic class distinctions did not exist, but rather that such potential differences were not relevant to the overall mission and focus of this documentary. On a positive note, the film illustrates nicely how the private sphere of the past has played out in what is the public sphere today. Though the gristmill is one of the two original buildings left standing, Treman State Park is not just about the mill; rather, it is about a social and cultural history, and the development of a public space that is both vibrant and rich with such social and cultural history. As shown in the last scene of the archaeology chapter, the installation of the outdoor exhibits/archaeology walking trail is a visual reminder of how the private sphere of the past (i.e. individual households) reads through into today's public sphere – such households existed on what is now a public picnic area and additional communal park space. The film further depicts the contrasts between urban and rural spaces within the park's boundaries. The restored Mill and the blueprint-like archaeology outdoor exhibits juxtapose the once-urban landscape against the rural environmental surroundings of the gorges, walking trails, and so forth. Similar to the public/private relationship, both the Mill and the installation of the outdoor exhibits serve as visual reminders of how the urban sphere of the past reads through into the rural landscape. In discussing such social and environmental relationships, the Treman documentary serves as an effective tool for educating the public about the unique features and history of the State Park. Ultimately, an evaluation of my film further supports the conclusion
made in Chapter 3 – that although most archaeology documentaries lack a “how-to” component, they may nevertheless serve as appropriate media for educating others about archaeology as well as the anthropological evaluations and interpretations gleaned from those archaeological processes.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the idea for creating the Robert H. Treman State Park documentary originated from the archaeological work performed within the park itself. While the original objective was to create a “how-to” visual aid for the practice of archaeology, the role archaeology has played within the park boundaries – aiding in the rediscovery and interpretation of the geological, historical, and cultural facets of Treman State Park – led instead to the creation of an archaeology-related documentary. This documentary was also created as a mode of community outreach – a way to educate and involve the community and other visitors in the goings-on at Treman State Park. The park staff’s array of methodologies and goals also shaped the content of this work. Though the film is not intended to be the final product displayed within the restored Mill/museum, it has served to initiate community discussion and involvement. Importantly, when producing the final professional film for public display and perusal, there are a number of financial and legal aspects one must consider. Ultimately, the production of the original documentary itself is but one example of how archaeological research, excavation, and interpretation may aid in developing and influencing greater public awareness and endeavors. Additionally, the Treman documentary exemplifies the assertion that, though most archaeology documentaries lack a “how-to” component, and fail to instruct audiences about proper archaeological
excavation and laboratory techniques, such films nevertheless often serve as appropriate media for educating others about anthropological information and interpretations that are gleaned from archaeological processes.
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSION

This thesis has sought to introduce the interdisciplinary field of visual anthropology by exploring how, and why, archaeology is presented to the public through documentary film. As discussed in Chapter 1, within the field of historical archaeology – as practiced in North America – there is a burgeoning emphasis placed on public outreach and education, as well as engaging with local communities throughout the archaeological process. Documentary films offer a unique way of presenting archaeology to the public. As supported by the Society for Visual Anthropology (SVA), and their *Guidelines for the Evaluation of Ethnographic Visual Media*, “visual representations offer viewers a means to experience and understand ethnographic complexity, richness and depth, which are the distinguishing features of anthropological knowledge. Visual media can convey forms of knowledge that writing cannot” (http://etext.virginia.edu/VAR/guide.html). Notably, in contrast to more popular “Hollywood” feature films, documentaries provide viewers with true-to-life locations and situations. With specific regards to the topic of this thesis, the documentaries reviewed all consider real archaeological sites, practices, and interpretations. Accordingly, this manuscript has sought to uncover the ways in which archaeological research, excavation, and interpretation may be portrayed to the general public.

Initially, this paper considered the availability of archaeology documentary films to the public. Availability was first assessed according to type of resource – such as through academic institutions, public libraries, relevant indoor or outdoor museums and historic/cultural sites, television
networks, and the Internet. In short, the ability to access archaeology documentaries varies based on one's academic, community, and financial wherewithal, as well as how desirous and proactive one is in attempting to attain such films. Those with the greatest accessibility often have ties to academic institutions, live in a community with a substantial public library system, are near relevant museums, have sufficient television and Internet access, and/or have the private funds to purchase such films. The availability of films falling within general age ranges or educational levels was then scrutinized. Notably, most documentaries are targeted for more adult audiences, even though they are also geared towards those who have no previous knowledge of archaeology. Most of the films currently in circulation throughout North America incorporate simplistic “everyday” language so as to appeal to the greatest number of people – persons of wide-ranging ages and educational levels. The last type of availability discussed was the accessibility of two broad categories of archaeology films – specifically, technique-driven “how-to” films, as well as films that are more anthropologically or historically-based. Generally, the archaeology-related documentaries are more prevalent than procedural films. Those wishing to learn about archaeology in a general sense may have a greater variety of films to choose from, whereas those looking for a procedural “how-to” documentary will have to search harder and will not have as broad a selection. Though some archaeological organizations claim to support public outreach and educational agendas (the SAA, AAA, and SHA, for example), most fail to adequately address or promote the use of archaeology documentaries in contributing to such measures. Finally, for those who wish to research particular films before viewing or purchasing them,
film reviews may aid in influencing one's decision. Of the many different types of reviews available, it appears that scholarly reviews are the most useful.

The above-mentioned categories of availability then provided the basis for the general criteria used in determining what types of films to view and scrutinize. Films chosen for review were selected from the collections of a local university (the University of Virginia – to which I was able to obtain insider access), a local public library system (the Fairfax County Public Libraries), and television stations (the History Channel, Discovery Kids, and PBS). I watched films designed for both children and adults; as well as films targeted to those with and without prior knowledge of archaeology. The vast majority of films reviewed (all but one) fell under the category of the anthropologically or historically-based, archaeology-related documentary. Those films reviewed discussed various archaeological sites and cultural groups – from the ancient Egyptians to the Mayans and Aztecs to the lives of colonial slaves.

Within each documentary, I looked at whether certain anthropologically relevant issues were discussed, such as social and economic class differences, distinctions between public and private spaces, and urban and rural environments. I chose to consider these particular issues because each of them are important anthropological questions and have continually been explored by prominent scholars in the field. Of the films viewed for this thesis, most either discussed both social and economic class differences, or discussed neither. With regards to public and private spaces, about half of the films viewed touched upon both environments, whereas the other half considered only public spaces. In reference to urban and rural landscapes, the results were mixed. About one-third of the films considered both urban
and rural spaces, one-third discussed only urban environments, and the final third either discussed only rural landscapes, or neither type. Overall, the most effective films were those that distinguished between the different social, economic, and environmental issues (and thus touched upon a greater number of the topics) within a given society/culture. Such discussion enables one to better understand how intersocietal/intercultural relationships and complexities shaped – or continue to shape – a given society/culture. Additionally, after viewing the core list of documentaries, I found that even though presentation styles (including the socioeconomic or environmental issues discussed or omitted) may differ from film to film, such variation does not necessarily diminish the educational value of any particular documentary. For example, though most archaeology documentaries lack a “how-to” component (and thus fail to educate viewers on proper excavation and laboratory procedures), the films may nevertheless serve as appropriate media for educating others about anthropological information and interpretations as gleaned from archaeological processes - pursuant to the Society for Visual Anthropology guidelines. Further, it must be concluded that archaeological research, excavation, and interpretation enables one to learn not only about archaeological findings themselves, but often also leads towards the incorporation and presentation of other related fields and facets of information.

The argument above is further supported by both the archaeological work performed at Robert H. Treman State Park, and the subsequent documentary produced as part of this thesis. As mentioned previously, the archaeological work performed throughout the park has brought together scholars, community members, park employees, and descendants of those
who lived on the properties involved. Not only has the archaeology work enabled all those involved to learn about archaeological processes, data, and interpretation, but it has also provoked a rediscovery of the park's history. Research initiatives have paved the way for the creation of an outdoor interpretive walking trail connecting the various archaeology sites throughout the park. In addition, such work has also provided a foundation for the creation of a documentary on Robert H. Treman State Park, of which the archaeological process is one component. Though this particular film (that serves as the second part of this thesis) is not intended to be the final product, it has succeeding in engaging the local community by serving as a focal point for initiating and stimulating community discussion. Such discussion has prompted all parties involved to think about what they want to incorporate into the park's final documentary film – specifically, what aspects of the park's historical, cultural, and environmental landscapes they consider to be important and necessary to educate park visitors about. In consideration of the points used to evaluate archaeology documentaries in Chapter 3, my film succeeded in touching upon two of the three topics. Specifically, the Treman film shows how the private sphere of the past hamlet plays out into the public sphere of the state park today. Similarly, the documentary also juxtaposes past urban spaces with the modern rural environment.

Having created the Robert H. Treman State Park documentary as an example of the type of film discussed throughout this paper, I experienced firsthand a variety of technical and legal filmmaking issues that were raised and commented on. Among such important factors to consider are the time and dedication needed to pursue a professional-grade product. For example, in the case of my own documentary, approximately five to six hours of filming
were completed, including interviews; narration; filming of general scenery; and recording of the archaeological excavations, laboratory procedures, and installation of one of the outdoor exhibits. In addition, I compiled hundreds of still photographs and area maps. The final product is a little over twenty minutes long. Also, use of professional-level video and audio equipment, when available, significantly enhances the overall quality of the final product. Finally, one must also consider the legal (and, consequentially, financial) copyright issues at stake when attempting to create a film for public use and for purposes other than the purely self-educational.

Ultimately, this thesis has served as an introduction to the unique and interdisciplinary field of visual anthropology, with particular emphasis on documentary film. Depending on the nature and depth of individual films, the documentary medium may provide a unique way of educating others about archaeology. Furthermore, the research, excavation, and interpretation stages of archaeological study enable persons to learn not only about the importance of archaeological findings, but may often also lead towards the incorporation and presentation of other related fields and facets, such as the history of the study area, socioeconomic issues, and cultural landscapes. Those who have little to no previous knowledge of filmmaking itself may be surprised to learn about the considerations and intricacies involved in producing a documentary film. Despite the demanding and time-consuming nature of filmmaking, the documentary approach provides a great way to educate others about the study and practice of archaeology in ways that other visual and educational mediums may not.
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