



Buffalo Soldiers, Apaches, and Cultural Heritage Education

Eleanor M. King

To cite this article: Eleanor M. King (2008) Buffalo Soldiers, Apaches, and Cultural Heritage Education, *Heritage Management*, 1:2, 219-241, DOI: [10.1179/hma.2008.1.2.219](https://doi.org/10.1179/hma.2008.1.2.219)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1179/hma.2008.1.2.219>



Published online: 17 Jun 2014.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 270



View related articles [↗](#)

Buffalo Soldiers, Apaches, and Cultural Heritage Education

Eleanor M. King

Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Howard University, 2441 6th St., NW, Washington, DC 20059 (emking@howard.edu)

Abstract An important problem confronting cultural heritage management in the USA is the under-representation of groups historically defined as minorities. The roots of this absence are complex, but can be traced in part to deficiencies in cultural heritage education. An innovative archaeological project uniting descendants of opposing sides in the late 1800s Apache Wars serves to initiate a discussion of these issues. From 2004–2006 African American, Apache, and European American students and staff excavated a campsite in the Guadalupe Mountains of Texas used by Buffalo Soldiers and Apache alike. This project's successes underscore the need for cultural heritage education that reaches all sectors of society. They also serve to illuminate some of the obstacles students, particularly those from under-represented groups, face in pursuing careers in disciplines, like archaeology, related to cultural heritage. Analysis of professional trends in these fields confirms that lack of representation is endemic. It also suggests that there are strong currents in higher education impeding minority students from pursuing their cultural heritage interests. While there is no single way around this educational impasse, the lessons from the Guadalupes suggest certain key components to success: experiential learning, financial support, a mixture of ages, and relevant subject matter. They are presented here not as a blueprint for future programming but as an invitation for further discussion.

Resumen Un problema importante que afronta el manejo del patrimonio cultural en los Estados Unidos es la baja representación de grupos históricamente denominados como minorías. El origen de esta ausencia es complejo, pero puede remontarse a las deficiencias educativas en cuanto al tema del patrimonio cultural. Un proyecto arqueológico innovador que esta uniendo a los descendientes de los bandos opuestos de las Guerras Apaches del siglo XIX nos ayudará a iniciar una discusión acerca de estos problemas. Del 2004 al 2006 estudiantes y arqueólogos de descendencia afroamericana, apache y euroamericana excavaron un campamento en las Montañas Guadalupe en Texas, en un campamento que fue utilizado por Soldados Buffalo (de descendencia Africana) y Apaches. El éxito de este proyecto apunta a la necesidad de una mejor educación en el

manejo del patrimonio cultural y una educación que llegue a todos los sectores de la sociedad. El proyecto también ilustra algunos de los obstáculos que enfrentan los estudiantes, en especial aquéllos estudiantes provenientes de grupos minoritarios, en lograr una carrera exitosa en disciplinas cómo la arqueología que tocan al manejo del patrimonio cultural. Un análisis de los patrones vistos en esta profesión confirman que la falta de representación de grupos minoritarios es endémica. También sugieren que hay corrientes en el campo de la educación universitaria que impiden que estudiantes minoritarios exploren su interés por el patrimonio cultural. Aunque no hay una sola manera de solucionar este problema educativo, las lecciones del proyecto de Guadalupe sugiere que hay varios componentes que pueden asegurar el éxito de un estudiante: aprendizaje a través de experiencia directa, apoyo financiero, mezclar grupos de distintas edades y enseñar temas de relevancia. Esto presentamos en este artículo, no como un plan a seguir sino como una invitación a la discusión productiva.

A persistent challenge facing cultural heritage management in the United States is the balanced representation of the contributions made by diverse peoples to our history, particularly minorities. These groups, who by definition have not had secure access to wealth, power, prestige, and the other benefits conferred by the dominant society, are underrepresented in the historical record and undervalued in the public perception of our collective heritage. In the last 30 years there have been widespread efforts to remedy this situation by including a broader range of viewpoints in the interpretation of both public and private landmarks. Heritage tourism now targets specific ethnic groups, such as African Americans, and many cities have walking and/or bus tours that focus specifically on different ethnic legacies. Nonetheless, the actual numbers of minorities involved in heritage management remain low overall. National parks and monuments, museums, and other cultural heritage centers find themselves hard-pressed to hire and retain employees from underrepresented groups in interpretive and professional capacities. Well-qualified candidates of non-European ethnicity are simply not going into the heritage management field. This is a self-perpetuating problem, as the fewer who go into it, the fewer who are attracted to join them.

One source of the problem lies in the fields like history, anthropology, and archaeology that are conduits to heritage careers. In these tough economic times few students of any background are opting to pursue careers in such traditional liberal arts subjects. A related stumbling block is that, except for history, fields that emphasize cultural heritage are only taught at the college

level. By that time many students have already chosen their course of study; in fact, most colleges now require undergraduates to declare a major upon entry. An additional impediment to heritage careers is that no one quite knows what these careers look like in reality, as many are not exposed to them in everyday life. Indeed, the recent release of a new *Indiana Jones* movie reminds us that the usual public perception of archaeologists is of mature European-American men, distinguished in the Jones case more by physical prowess than by intellectual ability or ethics. Such role models are accurately recognized as the stuff of fantasy, not possibility. The disconnect is even greater for those who do not share in the same cultural background or social advantages as these icons.

A growing number of programs, mostly outside of academe, address this issue by offering alternative history lessons and after-school or summer activities aimed at engaging students in exploring their cultural heritage. The majority of them target one specific ethnic group—African Americans *or* members of specific American Indian nations *or* Hispanic Americans *or* Asian Americans of a particular background (e.g., Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese). They also tend to focus on one age group, usually precollegiate *or* college students, sometimes adults. Below, I present another model, a uniquely structured program that brings together students of various ages and diverse cultural backgrounds. I review the successes achieved by the program and use them to examine in more detail the obstacles generally facing the recruitment of minorities into cultural heritage management. Finally, I identify what I think are key components to the program's success, which derive from its very structure. My objective here is not to offer a perfect solution, but rather to open a broader discussion about what we want the heritage management field to look like in the future and how we want to get there.

The Mescalero-Buffalo Soldiers Archaeological Project

The story of this program actually begins in the late 1870s when the Apache Wars that dominated life in the southwestern U.S. for over 25 years entered their final phase. This prolonged conflict pitted various Apache nations resisting confinement on reservations against the settlers, miners, and others who encroached on their land and the U.S. government who backed the intruders. The final uprising, led by the noted Warm Springs chief Victorio, resulted

in a guerilla war that lasted well beyond his death in 1880, ending only with Geronimo's surrender six years later. At the height of the fighting virtually all the military units in western Texas, southern New Mexico, and southeastern Arizona were engaged. Prominent among these were the Buffalo Soldiers, the African American regular military regiments created after the Civil War. Two regiments in particular, the 9th and 10th Cavalry, participated in numerous skirmishes as they patrolled throughout the rugged southwestern mountains looking for Apache encampments and harrying Victorio and his followers (King and Haecker 2008; Leckie and Leckie 2003). The 24th and 25th Infantry, the two other Buffalo Soldier units, were also involved, as they often traveled with the cavalry and did the lion's share of road building in this region, strengthening communication routes between forts (King and Haecker 2008). One area regularly criss-crossed by the Apache and the Buffalo Soldiers alike were the Guadalupe Mountains straddling the Texas/New Mexico border. Home to abundant resources, including water, the most vital, as well as game and edible plants, the mountains served as a refuge and stronghold in earlier phases of the Apache Wars for the Mescalero and Lipan Apaches. During the Victorio uprising the mountains were again used by the Warm Springs bands, though less heavily. By then, the Army, under directives from Colonel Benjamin Grierson of the 10th Cavalry, had implemented a strategy of occupying all known water holes and springs in the mountains to prevent the Apache from re-supplying. While this effort was largely successful, it did not completely prevent them from using the Guadalupes, as troops rarely stayed in one place long. The territory they patrolled was immense and they had to keep on the move, remaining in one place for a couple of months at the most. This sporadic form of occupation allowed the Apache to visit the Guadalupe Mountains during the long stretches of time Army troops were absent and avail themselves of the local resources, as well as of the materials the soldiers left behind. Tin cans, cartridge cases, and bottles all provided raw materials for shaping into a variety of practical items and attracted the Apache to use the military camps (King 2006; King and Dunnavant 2008). As soon as patrols were sighted, the Apache would withdraw into the remote reaches of the mountains, and the pursuit and skirmishes would resume.

It is against this broad historical canvas that an innovative archaeological project took shape some 125 years later, uniting descendants of the antagonists in the conflict — Apache, African Americans, and European Americans — in a joint exploration of the past. The focus of the project was Pine

Springs Camp (41CU44), a known military campsite on the eastern slopes of the Guadalupe Mountains in Texas. It served as an officially designated Army sub-post during the Apache campaigns (Levy 1971:119) and had already been surveyed by the Texas Archaeological Society (TAS) in 1970 (Shafer 1970). Historical research by TAS member Anne Fox had suggested a strong Buffalo Soldier, especially 10th Cavalry, presence at the site. Subsequent reconnaissance by military archaeology expert Charles Haecker of the National Park Service (NPS) in the 1990s confirmed the military nature of the encampment and its probable use by Buffalo Soldiers, including elements of both the 9th and the 10th Cavalry. Haecker further identified the presence of Apache artifacts and structures in the same area. Accordingly, in 2004 a new archaeological project was initiated to examine the site in greater detail. This venture was itself part of the larger Warriors Project sponsored by the NPS. The aim of this ambitious program is to encourage African Americans and American Indians to discuss their frontier past. The Warriors Project started out as historical research carried out jointly by Haskell University, an American Indian institution in Kansas, and Howard University, a Historically Black College and University (HBCU) in Washington, DC.¹ Haskell created a bibliography of primary and secondary sources (Catron et al. 2003). Meanwhile, Howard worked on an inventory of related battlefields and sites (Anderson et al. 2003). By the end of 2003, with funding obtained through the Desert Southwest Cooperative Ecosystems Study Unit (DSCESU), these projects were largely completed (O'Brien 2004) and the Warriors Project turned to new ventures. Since 2004, in accordance with the main Project goal, Howard University has been partnering with the Mescalero Apache Tribe, with help from both the National Park Service and the Bureau of Land Management, to introduce students to archaeology. From 2004 to 2006 Charles Haecker (NPS) and I co-directed a field school at the Pine Springs Camp, the Mescalero-Buffalo Soldiers Archaeological Project (MBfSAP). Participants included Howard University undergraduates and graduates, Mescalero Apache and European American high school students, international visitors, and Guadalupe Mountains National Park staff and volunteers. Together, we looked at who had occupied the site, how the land was used, and what happened on this part of the frontier. We also discussed archaeology, cultural heritage, and the importance of preserving *all* of our pasts.

The archaeological discoveries at Pine Springs were unexpectedly rich. We uncovered a multi-component campsite that spread out over more than

60 acres and comprised a range of occupations. Most were from the late nineteenth century, though earlier and later components were present as well. We can identify three separate military uses of the campsite dating to the Apache Wars but know there were several more that left no trace, since, according to Army records, often the soldiers were only there for a few days. We can document five Apache and possibly pre-Apache occupations as well. On the military side, we discovered the remains of numerous campfires, tent pads, and activity areas, including one where a farrier shod horses. We also uncovered details of the everyday life of the soldiers, such as the fact that several of the tents were heated using underground channels, or hypocausts. These were connected to campfires outside the tent, which were also used for cooking. Such features would have been indispensable in helping troops weather the colder months, when temperatures drop to sub-zero degrees (King and Dunnivant 2008). On the Apache side, we found *wickiup* rings (the remains of the traditional Apache brush shelters), a succession of buried hearths, and artifacts made from discarded military materials. Among these were a glass scraper manufactured from the bottom of a beer bottle, a cartridge case modified to measure gunpowder, and several food can lids cut into pieces to make conical jingles for regalia. Significantly, Apache artifacts tended to concentrate in the vicinity of the military features, a distribution that supports the idea that they periodically “mined” the soldiers’ camp for useful materials. A small number of stone tools attest to prehistoric as well as historic use of this location (King 2006; King and Dunnivant 2008).

The real discoveries of these three field seasons, however, lay in the whole experience of working together. The field school was hugely successful. Over the course of the project, a total of 15 Howard undergraduates and recent graduates participated, two of them returning for a second season each. Overall, six Mescalero students joined in, two of them also for two seasons apiece. In addition, every year we had two other high school students join us, including one Latina American, two European Americans (one of whom, my daughter, was there each year), and two French girls. Other participants included archaeologists from the Mescalero Apache Tribe, who were sent by the Tribe to join us for several days of excavation and survey in 2005 and 2006. Also present all three years were volunteers and staff members from the Park, who came when they were able to. Some were as young as eight, others in their 70s. Most were American, but we had some international visitors as well. The result was a lively and changing mix of people who discussed the project

finds and project process. A particularly important component of the field school was the visit each year by a group from the Mescalero Apache Reservation. The first year a group of elders came out to the site and shared their knowledge of local resources with us. The second year we met Elbys Hugar, Cochise's great-granddaughter, whose own granddaughter was on the project. She told the students about her early life on the Mescalero Reservation and her work as a linguist recording the Chiracahua language. The final year we were visited by a summer youth group and their teachers. That year, we returned the visits, traveling to the Mescalero Reservation at the end of the field season to participate in the annual 4th of July Feast, where several Apache girls traditionally celebrate their coming of age ceremony. There, we helped two of the sponsoring families with food preparations. Witnessing the rituals and dances and participating in the various activities with Apache friends was an experience none of us will forget. We were not surprised at the closeness experienced, however. By then, as several students put it in their assessments, we had become family.

The success of the field school can be measured not just in interpersonal dynamics, however. It has yielded solid academic achievements in terms of classes, presentations, and student careers. Students in various archaeology courses at Howard University, including independent studies, have conducted original research on Pine Springs and its military users in the National Archives in Washington, DC. They have also co-authored publications, papers, and posters on the project results. To date, the research has produced two published articles on the site, one of them co-authored with a Howard undergraduate (King 2006; King and Dunnavant 2008). Seven papers presented the results of different seasons to both regional conferences (Texas Archaeological Society) and national ones (George Wright Society, Society for Historical Archaeology). Four of these had Howard students as co-authors (King, Haecker et al. 2004, King, Richbow et al. 2004, 2006; King and Dunnavant 2007). In addition, students have presented four posters on the project at national conferences (Society for American Archaeology, American Anthropological Association; Baker et al. 2007; Chatman et al. 2005; Richbow et al. 2005; Members of the MBfSAP 2007). While these were all collaborative and spearheaded by the undergraduates, the last one was truly a project-wide venture, with high school students, undergraduates, and staff all contributing reflections on their experience and effectively co-authoring the poster. Additional presentations have included more informal ones by Howard students to local groups, including an

archaeology class at another Washington, DC, university. Finally, a short film made during the first field season by Eric Berry, an undergraduate communications major, explored the past and present relationship among the Apache, the Buffalo Soldiers, and European Americans (Berry 2005). It garnered two coveted Paul Robeson Awards (producer and sound) from Howard University's John H. Johnson School of Communications in 2005 and is currently shown at the Guadalupe Mountains National Park Visitors Center.

More subtle effects of the three-year project can be seen in career statistics on the students who participated. Of the 15 from Howard, two went on to do archaeological internships, one in a laboratory setting, the other with the Society for American Archaeology. At present, one of the 15 has just completed a master's in forensic archaeology and is getting practical experience before going on for her PhD. Three are currently in graduate school in anthropology (including the former laboratory intern). One is doing public anthropology, one biological anthropology, and one historical archaeology, with plans to continue working on the interaction of Buffalo Soldiers and American Indians. Finally, among the Apache, one student was working until recently as an archaeologist for the Tribe. That makes a total of 28.6 percent of the African American and Apache students who participated in the project presently engaged in either anthropology or archaeology as a career. This percentage is not insignificant, especially considering that each field season was only two weeks long. It could be argued that the number is skewed, as only those interested in archaeology and anthropology would participate to begin with. However, that would be only partially correct. In talking to the students it seems that most of them joined because they thought it might be an interesting and fun summer adventure. While many were anthropology majors or minors at Howard, they were not particularly drawn to archaeology. Indeed, a common thread throughout the reflections we solicited for our most recent poster was the idea that many students equated the discipline with "old, white men" in khakis digging in exotic places. As one Howard student put it, "archaeology did not seem like a discipline I would enjoy or relate to." However, as another said, "I soon learned that true archaeology combines science, art, mathematics, geography, geology, and a lot of educated imagination to explain our human past." Added the first student: "I did not know how much archaeologists contribute to history and our assessment of the culture." By the end of the project, they had gained not only an appreciation of the archaeological process but also of the historical substance. Several remarked on

the powerful impact the project had had. Said one, “working on the ... project placed me face to face with the realities of my history.” Another commented, “this experience overall connected me with the people of the past. Learning about the day-to-day activities and how the sacrifice on both sides played out in a very real manner is more than can ever be learned from a history book alone.” Finally, the first student, the one who did not think much of archaeology to begin with, wrote that participation in the project:

... was a reaffirmation of the struggle, cruelty, accomplishment, resilience, and fortitude of American people. This experience made me reconsider the complex relationship between those who created the foundation of the United States of America: native, black, and white Americans. Learning of the hardship and faith of my ancestors required I reflect on the roles and responsibilities of the descendants.

These comments suggest that a major impact of the project for the students lay in discovering a cultural heritage that they only distantly knew. Their connection to this past is what transformed the initially foreign discipline of archaeology into an engaging and relevant experience. Their ability to hold it in their hands is what drove that lesson home.

Obstacles to Recruitment and Retention in Cultural Heritage Careers

The students' initial hesitation to engage in archaeology points up a more widespread problem that affects not only this discipline but anthropology as well. Despite active recruiting of candidates from groups historically considered minorities, the actual number of minority professionals in these fields remains disproportionately low. The American Anthropological Association (AAA), for instance, the main professional organization for cultural, biological, archaeological, and linguistic anthropologists, has around 11,000 members. They can choose to affiliate with a number of sections within the organization, depending on their interests. Only 329 of them belong to the Association of Black Anthropologists (ABA), or just shy of 3 percent of total membership, a small number indeed. While it might be argued that not all African American anthropologists necessarily belong to the ABA, conversely, not all those on the list are African American. Indeed, it has been estimated that as many as half are European American or of another background. Similarly,

the Association for Africanist Anthropology, another section that captures a slightly different demographic, focusing on people with research interests in Africa, has only 323 members. Again, many of these are neither African nor African American. Comparable numbers can be cited for other sections representing minority interests. The Society for East Asian Archaeology is larger, with 445 members, or 4 percent of the total membership, but, again, a majority of those who belong do not come from that area. The Association of Latino and Latina Anthropologists has 185 members, or 1.7 percent of the AAA membership. Even the Society for Latin American and Caribbean Anthropology, which casts a broader net, has only 792 members, or 7.2 percent of the total. As for the newly established Association of Indigenous Anthropologists, so far it boasts only one, lone member. In archaeology, the situation is similar across the board. Among the main professional organizations, the Society for American Archaeology has only recently begun keeping statistics on the ethnicity of its members and the Society for Historical Archaeology does not ask for this information, so no numbers are available for either organization. Nonetheless, it is safe to say that they both have consistently few minority members, judging by the attendance at yearly meetings. Indeed, the total number of practicing African American archaeologists in the U.S., for example, is still reported to be somewhere under 10, though a small group of current graduate students promises to increase the ranks.

The lack of minority participation in these careers in part reflects a lack of interest in role models and subject matter that may seem foreign to students contemplating their future (e.g., old white men in khakis). Mostly, though, it reflects a lack of knowledge and opportunity; students simply do not know about these subjects or the career possibilities they offer. The real problem seems to lie in our educational system, where students of all backgrounds come by information about anthropology, archaeology, and other careers related to culture and cultural heritage way too late. In high school students are generally not exposed to these subjects. True, they are well drilled in history, but students typically do not see it as a possible career choice. For many who go on to college, the objective of their B.A. is a J-O-B, spelled out in just those capital letters. This goal is particularly compelling for those who are first-generation-in-college and expected to make good on the money their families struggle to expend for their education. Compounding the problem is the fact that there are often few role models of anthropologists, archaeologists, and others in our communities or on television for students to emulate.

Doctors, shopkeepers, teachers, lawyers, nurses, office workers, businessmen, musicians, and policemen abound, but other careers are conspicuously absent. The result is that, regardless of background, most students in college, unless urged to experiment, flock to what they already know. If they branch out, they will look into subjects they have at least heard of, such as psychology and sociology. The importance of familiarity cannot be overstated. A pertinent example can be found in the sudden surge of interest in forensic science on many campuses, because of several popular television series. Unless confronted like that with new possibilities, however, most students remain unaware of them throughout their undergraduate careers.

This predicament is exemplified at Howard University by the unequal numbers of students engaged in different types of studies. Howard has around 10,500 students total, of which 6,900 are undergraduates. The latter are distributed in six schools (liberal arts, engineering, business, health sciences, communications, and education) representing 62 different majors. More than half of these majors (34) are in the College of Arts and Sciences (COAS), the traditional liberal arts section of the university, and about 2,975 undergraduates are currently enrolled there. This is a telling number in and of itself (about 43 percent of the undergraduate total), if one looks at the proportion of students in relation to numbers of majors. Clearly, more students are enrolling in the targeted pre-professional programs than in liberal arts. Even more striking is their distribution within the COAS. Between 800-850 undergraduates are biology majors, or about 30-32 percent of COAS undergraduates and 11-12 percent of all undergraduates. In fact, almost half of the students in each entering freshman class at Howard declare biology as their major. The reason for such high percentages lies in the fact that most of them are preparing to go on to medical school, the known route towards a respected and high-paying profession. Their numbers are augmented by other undergraduates who choose chemistry as their preferred path to a future medical career. Indeed, the health professions are overwhelmingly represented in the undergraduate population at Howard, if one adds in those registered in the School of Pharmacy, Nursing, and Allied Health Sciences. In contrast, the Anthropology Program currently has around 20 students majoring in the discipline and the highest it has reached in recent years is the low 40s.

Typically, two factors impede recruitment into Howard's Anthropology Program. First, as noted, students do not hear of the subject until they are in college and frequently they are not exposed to anthropology courses until

forced to take them as requirements. Both Introduction to Cultural Anthropology and Introduction to Biological Anthropology fulfill general, divisional distribution requirements. In addition, Introduction to Cultural Anthropology is a specific requirement for the School of Business's International Business program, for Nursing, and for selected majors within the COAS. Sometimes, students taking the class discover that what they were really looking for in International Business or another course of study was anthropology, and they switch over to our program. Our most frequent anthropology "converts," however, come from Biology. Students sign up for Introduction to Biological Anthropology as the Division of Social Sciences class most appropriate for their specialization. They discover, to their surprise, that anthropology's focus on people dovetails more with their ultimate interests and decide they want to pursue the discipline further. Often, they will choose to double major, keeping the option of medical school open. The result for the Anthropology Program at Howard is that many of our majors declare late in their college careers—frequently as juniors or even first-semester seniors. That means that our retention rates are very good, as by that time students really have to commit to a course of study to graduate within a reasonable time. However, it also means that our numbers overall remain low, despite efforts to recruit at earlier stages.

A second factor impeding program growth is what could be called the "parental problem." Enthusiastic students, who have just discovered the possibilities of anthropology, are often met with a cold dose of reality when they go home for a weekend or a break. Frequently, they report having "the" conversation in which concerned parents seriously question the possibilities and future of study in anthropology. Sometimes, these parents will come into the Department while visiting campus, to hear reassurances directly from the faculty. Perhaps the most dramatic illustration of this problem came during a presentation I made with four undergraduates from Howard on the MBfSAP. We gave a talk to a local chapter of the 9th and 10th (Horse) Cavalry Buffalo Soldiers' Association, a group one would expect to be unabashedly enthusiastic about what we were doing. I thought they might be even more excited as their membership is aging and they are anxious to pass on their passionate interest in the Buffalo Soldiers to a younger generation. I began the presentation and each of the students got up in turn, ably discussing with ample PowerPoint illustrations what we had found out in the course of our first season. We ended with Eric Berry's (2005) film on the interaction between Buffalo

Soldiers and Apaches. I got up to take questions, basking in the applause and fully expecting unreserved endorsement. The very first one was posed by an older woman, who said, "All this experience is just great and very enriching for the students, I'm sure, but where's the j-o-b?" I would like to say my response was decisive ("you can't get a job with a B.S. in biology, either; you need a master's for most professions," my now-standard reply), but I fumbled and simply assured her of the possibilities.

The bottom line is that anthropology and archaeology are still considered to be esoteric subjects by many students and much of the general public, and the only outcome of study is thought to be a professorship (again, think Indiana Jones). While such a profession might be desirable, it is well known that it takes additional time and, especially, money to achieve. It is also no secret that academic slots are hard to obtain. Thus, while such a narrow career path might appeal to someone with the means and leisure to pursue it, it is not going to attract those who are called on to account for what they do and to pay their own way as soon as they leave college. As for the many careers available in cultural heritage management with a master's (or less), those remain largely unexplored. Even when students get exposed to a small fraction of them through museum internships or similar programs, the low salaries generally paid by non-profits drive them away. Repaying student debt is too much a burden to countenance years of such labor, especially when other, more lucrative and seemingly secure careers are at hand. Better-paid federal and other jobs in places like national parks are usually not even on the radar screen. This is especially true in the eastern states where federally owned lands are less prominent.

Academic efforts to remedy the lack of minority participation in anthropology, archaeology, and other fields where they are underrepresented have not been entirely successful. The National Science Foundation (NSF) and other agencies, such as the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations, have set aside specific grants to encourage minority participation in higher education. Most of these initiatives, however, are aimed at funding students going into or already in graduate school. By then it is too late. The series of decisions that determine the career an undergraduate will pursue have already been set in motion since high school and even before. Facilitating their entry into the sciences or other areas at the point of college graduation will only help those few who have already decided to give graduate school a chance. It cannot serve to attract a new and expanded population. Other initiatives designed to give

undergraduates a taste of research and a set of skills for graduate school are similarly problematic as far as minority recruitment is concerned. NSF, for instance, has Research Experiences for Undergraduates (REUs), well-crafted programs that are designed to take undergraduates from being dependent to independent scientific researchers, typically through a 10-week summer season in the field and/or laboratory, followed by a presentation at a professional meeting (National Science Foundation 2007). These programs have the additional advantage of paying students a good wage so they need not give up precious summer work time to participate. REUs, by definition, are open to the most deserving students nationwide and recruit through a web-based application to ensure broad accessibility. The New Philadelphia Archaeology Project, for example, which focuses on an early multi-racial township in the Midwest, has attracted considerable attention and consistent African-American participation (Center for Heritage Resource Studies 2006). Unfortunately, however, many minority students are not even at the stage where they are interested enough in the careers represented by the REUs to participate in such projects, because of their lack of exposure to certain fields. Most of the Howard students who worked on the MBfSAP would never have contemplated a longer and more rigorous training program in archaeology, a subject they were not engaged by. It would have represented too large a commitment of time and energy, which they could better spend pursuing other options. Thus, while REU programs in the natural sciences might attract underrepresented students as an additional item to put on their résumés for medical school, archaeology and similar fields hold little appeal. Once again, students simply do not see where such experiences might lead them, because they have no practical understanding of what such careers look like. In sum, while academic programs currently reach a certain number of minority students, they do not by all means reach as many as they potentially could and should.

Non-academic and extra-curricular programs face similar difficulties. Two of the more robust programs are the paid internships offered by the federal government: the Student Temporary Employment Program (STEP) and the Student Career Experience Program (SCEP). The STEP is more flexible, as it allows students to intern in federal positions not necessarily in their career field (U.S. Office of Personnel Management 2008). The SCEP program, on the other hand, provides students with work experience directly related to their chosen career. It can also provide tuition and travel benefits to participants (Bureau of Land Management 2007; U.S. Office of Personnel Management

2008). Both internships require enrollment in an accredited educational program, ranging from vocational to graduate school. While they are available to all federal agencies (U.S. Office of Personnel Management 2008), in the field of cultural heritage management they are most prominently associated with the Bureau of Land Management. Interns with the BLM experience working on federal lands in a wide variety of jobs, including archaeology and cultural resource management. Like the REUs, however, these programs are limited in their ability to recruit and retain underrepresented students by lack of awareness and reluctance to participate. Most of the BLM lands, for example, are in the western states, so students from the ethnically diverse East and South remain largely unaware of these employment possibilities. Even in the West, those who do know what the BLM is may be hesitant to sign up for a whole summer of unknown work in a “foreign” environment.

Other non-academic and extra-curricular programs exist, many aimed at younger students. They, too, have their drawbacks, however, in terms of recruiting underrepresented students into cultural heritage careers. While there are afterschool programs nationwide that explore African-American cultural heritage, for example, they reach only those who are interested enough — or whose parents are interested enough — to join to begin with. The whole point is that they are not regularly interwoven into an academic program that would give students some idea of what a focus on cultural heritage and a career in it would look like. They are viewed more as activities for personal enrichment than for serious pursuit, like art and music in the U.S. (except for those forms glorified by the entertainment industry). Among American Indian nations the focus is slightly different, as many have been striving for a long time to develop culturally appropriate pre-collegiate curricula in the face of cultural loss. An initial impetus towards language and cultural conservation by people such as Tehanetorens of the Seneca Nation, who published folktales and other material under the name of Aren Akweks in the 1940s and founded a museum with his family in 1954 (New York State Library 2007; Purcell 2004), led to active language instruction in reservation schools and to the development of other kinds of cultural programming. Today on the Mescalero Apache Reservation, for instance, Head Start students are taught to speak Apache and there are regularly scheduled cultural events woven into the pre-collegiate curriculum (Holly Houghten, personal communication, 2008). Other nations engage their youngsters in cultural learning through community museums and cultural centers (e.g., Fiske 2008). Some projects, such as the innovative

Hopi Footprints program, focus specifically on teacher training to build and implement a community-based culture curriculum (Partnership for Public Archaeology 2001). While these and other programs show great promise for the future, their potential is still hampered by the college bottleneck. Young students who are interested in cultural heritage may still find it difficult to pursue at a collegiate level for reasons discussed above (e.g., finances). They may also have trouble imagining what such a career would look like outside of the often limited possibilities offered by their home communities. This comment applies more broadly to all programs that focus on the cultural heritage of one specific group. There are just not that many culturally specialized jobs available. Finally, again, these programs only reach a small percentage of those we are seeking to find nationwide.

It is clear that we are still a long way from solving problems of minority recruitment and retention in heritage management careers. On the one hand, both academic and non-academic programs are not always structured in ways that will attract a large number of students or allow them to participate. On the other, the programs that do succeed in generating an interest do not necessarily have clear outlets. Career possibilities may still seem murky and the path towards them uncertain.

Lessons from the Field

While there is no one solution to this educational dilemma, the experience we had on the MBfSAP suggests certain components that might be important to an effective approach. Some of these are shared with other programs. However, it is the unique structure of the project, with its mix of ages and backgrounds, as well as the particular combination of components that seem to have been key to its success.

First, short-term, hands-on experience works well for students, as it exposes them to new domains and new ways of thinking by doing, but does not demand excessive engagement. Working their brains differently than they do during the school year seems to help them relax about the learning that takes place while allowing them to exercise different mental circuits. This kind of “informal learning” (Bonvillain 2007:111) happens in all cultures and has been well-documented by anthropologists across the globe. It is usually most prominent in our early formative years, only gradually giving way in importance to formal learning in classrooms and other settings. It is therefore

something that students are naturally adept at. The short time commitment plays into this, as it is easy to engage in an educational experience that seems different when the end is clearly in sight. Any potential discomfort over the close living conditions, the physical nature of the work, cultural differences, and other issues is mitigated by that factor. The short time involved was especially critical for the high school students, who being younger, were perhaps less interested in archaeology and less committed to the process of learning to begin with. They were also not with teachers or others they felt they needed to impress, unlike the Howard undergraduates who were working with me as their professor. For all the students, the short time period had the additional advantage of letting them sample archaeology without sacrificing a large portion of their summer and their employment possibilities to it.

Second, for all three seasons, we were able to cover student expenses completely. This factor added to the attractiveness of a program that otherwise disrupted summer work (we ran the field school in July). Students found they could arrange for the time off and still make the money they needed to cope with the coming school year. The importance of combining experiential learning with financial incentives is supported by other successful programs. As noted, REUs, which give a hands-on introduction to research, pay students for their work, as do the federal STEP and SCEP that allow students to explore real-life jobs. The MBFSAP, however, was pitched at a more basic, introductory level, which did not require any prior knowledge of archaeology or engagement with it. In that, it resembles the STEP rather than the SCEP and REU approaches. That made it more accessible to a broader range of students. Its shortness compared to the STEP may have furthered that advantage.

Third, and perhaps most importantly, the combination of students of different ages in our project had a significant impact. In addition to high school and college students, we had staff members who were in graduate school or had completed master's degrees. The project thus ran the educational gamut from pre-high school diploma to PhD. Seeing an educational and training trajectory thus materialized was important in illuminating career possibilities for students who did not know they existed or were hesitant to try them. Several students commented on the benefits of listening to the graduate students and professors swap stories about life in the field. While these stories were mostly told as humorous anecdotes, they also served as informal career discussions, giving students a better sense of what such a choice would entail. Like the learning by doing of archaeological work, this kind of informal learning perpetuates ways of

absorbing knowledge that we master early on in life. Of course, such exchanges are nothing new on archaeological projects. Graduate students routinely comprise the staff on field schools, frequently working with undergraduates on their own dissertation research. The difference here, I surmise, lay in the inclusion of the high school students, who turned to the undergraduates as role models, just as the latter looked to the graduate students. Being put in that kind of position and remembering their own high school days seems to have helped the undergraduates focus on their own place in the continuum. Having taken the step from high school to college, they were able to envision more concretely the possibility of going from college to graduate school. Many had thought about doing so already; their experience on the project just made it seem that much more doable. As for the high school students, living and working with college-age students who were not initially family or friends introduced them to a wider world. They discovered they had personal skills equivalent to or better than those of the college students and could cope with difficult situations. For some, this experience made college seem less of an alien place, one they might picture themselves in. For others, it revealed career possibilities they had not thought of to explore, whether inside or outside of a college setting. The small size of the field school (11 students at its largest) and the high ratio of supervisors to students (up to eight supervisors when the Mescalero Tribal archaeologists were present) no doubt contributed to these discoveries. The intimate, “family” feel of the project made it safe for self-exploration.

In a similar vein, the mixture of ethnic and social backgrounds made the students more aware of the variety of people inhabiting the U.S. and the world. This internet generation has already been exposed in varying degrees to cultures and customs from all parts of the globe. “Diversity” is a catchword they live by. Nonetheless, there is a difference between seeing and understanding. Rubbing shoulders on a daily basis with people they might otherwise have encountered only in books or on a screen helped them realize more concretely both the similarities and differences between us. It also brought home the idea of cultural heritage as the legacy not of one particular culture, but of many different cultures, each one with its own emphasis and viewpoint. This basic anthropological lesson in cultural relativity is critical for those who want to go into the heritage management field. It is also not one easily offered by other archaeological programs, many of which tend to recruit more from one ethnicity than others. Usually European Americans are dominant, despite efforts to the contrary, because of the reasons outlined above.

A final ingredient of the field school's success lay in its subject matter. Learning about their own cultural heritage, within the broader context of the American West and other cultures, made a powerful impact on students. The adults who visited from the Mescalero Tribe repeatedly told us that they were glad the high school students were getting to know a part of their ancestral homeland so different from the Mescalero Reservation. The Howard students were fascinated to discover the minutiae of the Buffalo Soldiers' lives. They were also interested in confronting the history of African Americans and American Indians in the West. As one undergraduate put it:

Reading about the Buffalo Soldiers while simultaneously excavating their remains allowed me to engulf the realities of American history through all of my senses. Looking beyond the glamorized image of great American fighters and seeing the true lifestyle of men commissioned to kill was an important part of my adult internalization of the role African Americans had in this area of US history.

Giving students a window on their own heritage makes an otherwise arcane subject like archaeology seem much more vivid and tangible. It is also an indispensable part of the growth of the discipline. While I hope to live long enough to see African American Sumerologists or Apache Mayanists, that is not likely to happen while so many important stories remain to be told in the U.S. We need to hear the different voices of all those who lived them, if we are ever truly going to understand our past, and we can best do so by engaging their descendants directly and jointly in their recovery.

Conclusion

If we are ever to change the lack of diversity among those involved in cultural heritage management, we need to make a concerted effort to address the lack of minorities in fields that are conduits to heritage careers, such as anthropology and archaeology. I have outlined some of the obstacles to recruiting students in these areas. Obviously, a major positive step would be to have students exposed to different fields far earlier in their academic careers. Some of the most promising programs currently in existence are those being sponsored by several American Indian nations, which are developing culturally appropriate pre-collegiate curricula that reinforce the importance of cultural heritage. More of these types of programs need to be initiated for different

ethnic legacies in mainstream schools off the reservations. In the climate of No Child Left Behind and teaching to mandatory tests, however, it is unlikely that we will see new subject matter easily introduced. We need, therefore, to develop additional strategies that will reach students once they are in college and persuade them to look at least at some alternatives. I have recounted the success of one small, unique program that aims to do just that and have suggested some of the reasons behind it. It is time for us to engage in a much broader discussion, though, of how to diversify cultural heritage management and bring it into the twenty-first century.

Acknowledgments

The National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, Howard University, the Mescalero Apache Tribe, and Guadalupe Mountains National Park (GMNP) all provided financial and/or material support to the Mescalero-Buffalo Soldiers Project. John Lujan, Fred Armstrong, Gordon Bell, and Jan Wobbenhorst of the GMNP were especially helpful throughout all three field seasons, as was Holly Houghten of the Mescalero Apache Tribe. Pat O'Brien of the Desert Southwest Cooperative Ecosystems Study Unit facilitated much of the original funding and has continued to support the project. While the numbers of staff, crew, and volunteers preclude mentioning everyone here, I would like to thank them all for one of the liveliest experiences of my career. I especially thank my co-director, Charles Haecker of the National Park Service's Heritage Partnerships Program, for introducing me to Apache and military archaeology and to the beauties of the site. I am also grateful to Cody Bill Browning, Mescalero Tribal Archaeologist, who went out of his way to provide assistance whenever he could. Kristin Baker, Chandra Harris, Chinyere Knight, and Maraina Montgomery provided key commentary that helped stimulate my thoughts. To all the staff and the students go the lion's share of the credit for what the project has accomplished, both academically and interpersonally. Back in academia, Rani Alexander, Richard Thomas, Linda Jones, George Middendorf, and Chester King all provided key information and/or discussions on this topic. I am grateful for their thoughts and insights, which I have no doubt cheerfully pilfered. I alone, however, am responsible for any misrepresentations, misconstructions, or sheer stupidities contained herein.

Note

1. The Warriors Project is now co-directed by Dr. Maceo C. Dailey, Director of the African-American Studies at the University of Texas at El Paso, and by Dr. James Riding In, Associate Professor of American Indian Studies at Arizona State University.

References Cited

- Anderson, Donovan, Jessica Franklin, LaShawn Harris, Sharita Jacobs, Norma Lee, Noelle Trent, and Donald Roe
- 2003 GPS Inventory of Buffalo Soldiers Sites in the American West. Electronic manuscript on file, Department of History, Howard University, Washington, DC.
- Baker, Kristin, Chinyere Knight, Darcie Flanigan, Linsey Richbow, and Christine Taylor
- 2007 Camping Out: Apache and Buffalo Soldier Occupations of Pine Springs. Poster presented at the 72nd Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology, Austin, Texas.
- Berry, Eric
- 2005 Untold Stories. E. King, Executive Producer. Howard University, Washington, DC.
- Bonvillain, Nancy
- 2007 *Cultural Anthropology*. Pearson/Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey.
- Bureau of Land Management
- 2007 What Are the Benefits? Electronic document, http://www.blm.gov/wo/st/en/res/blm_jobs/national_recruitment1/internship_opportunities1.html, accessed July 8, 2008.
- Catron, Melissa, Joseph Gray, Galen Springer, and Michael D. Tosee
- 2003 Warrior Tradition: Buffalo Soldiers and American Indians — Final Report, Dec. 16. Manuscript on file with Haskell All Nations Indian University, Lawrence, Kansas.
- Chatman, Kelley, Linsey Richbow, Sharonda Oglesby, Steven Williams, and Eleanor King
- 2005 The Warriors Project: Rediscovering Buffalo Soldiers on the Western Frontier. Presented at the 70th Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology, Salt Lake City, Utah.
- Center for Heritage Resource Studies
- 2006 New Philadelphia. Electronic document, <http://www.heritage.umd.edu/CHRSWeb/New%20Philadelphia/NewPhiladelphia.htm>, accessed July 7, 2008.

Fiske, Shirley

- 2008 Community Engagement and Cultural Heritage in Fort Apache. *Anthropology News* 49(5):41.

King, Eleanor M.

- 2006 Archaeology and the Warriors Project: Exploring a Buffalo Soldier Campsite in the Guadalupe Mountains of Texas. In *Peoples, Places, and Parks. Proceedings of the 2005 George Wright Society Conference on Parks, Protected Areas, and Cultural Sites*, edited by D. Harmon. The George Wright Society, Hancock, Michigan.

King, Eleanor, and Justin Dunnivant

- 2007 Buffalo Soldiers in the Guadalupe Mountains: a Review of Research at Pine Springs Camp. To be presented at the symposium "Assessing African American Archeology in Texas: Current Theories, Methods, and Practices," organized by Rachel Feit for the 78th Annual Meeting of the Texas Archaeological Society, San Antonio, Texas.
- 2008 Buffalo Soldiers and Apaches in the Guadalupe Mountains: a Review of Research at Pine Springs Camp. *Bulletin of the Texas Archaeological Society*, 79:87-94.

King, Eleanor, and Charles Haecker

- 2008 Emancipation on the Frontier: Buffalo Soldiers, Apaches, and the Battle Over Land in the Southwest. Paper presented at the symposium "Post-Emancipation Transitions in the African Diaspora," organized by F. Bugarin and T. Weik for the Meeting of the Society for Historical Archaeology, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

King, Eleanor, Charles Haecker, Bruce Moses, Darcie Flanigan, Kelley Chatman, Damian Kibby, Kito Nzingha, and Linsey Richbow

- 2004 Revisiting Buffalo Soldiers in the Guadalupe Mountains of Texas. Paper presented at the 75th Annual Meeting of the Texas Archaeological Society, College Station, Texas.

King, Eleanor, Linsey Richbow, Kelley Chatman, Bruce Moses, and Darcie Flanigan

- 2004 Exploring Camp Life among the Buffalo Soldiers: What Can Archaeology Tell Us? Paper presented at the Second Fort Craig Conference, Socorro, New Mexico.

King, Eleanor, Chinyere Knight, and Kristin Baker

- 2006 Finding Captain Lebo: New Information on Buffalo Soldier and Apache Occupations at Pine Springs Camp. Paper presented at the 77th Annual Meeting of the Texas Archaeological Society in San Angelo, Texas.

Leckie, William H., and Shirley A. Leckie

- 2003 *The Buffalo Soldiers*. University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma.

Levy, Benjamin

- 1971 Guadalupe Mountains National Park. Historic Resource Study. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Division of History, Washington, DC.

Members of the Mescalero-Buffalo Soldiers Archaeological Project

- 2007 Polyperspective: Stories of High School— College Interaction on the Former Frontier. Poster presented in the poster session “Anthropology Goes to High School,” organized by B. Chiarulli for 106th Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Washington, DC .

National Science Foundation

- 2007 Research Experiences for Undergraduates (REU). Electronic document, http://www.nsf.gov/funding/pgm_summ.jsp?pims_id=5517&from=fund, accessed July 8, 2008.

New York State Library

- 2007 Native American Language and Culture Preservation Project. Reel Contents Guide. Electronic Document, <http://www.nysl.nysed.gov/mssc/nalc.htm>, accessed July 10, 2008.

O'Brien, Patrick

- 2004 The Warriors' Project: Two-Year Review. Manuscript on file with, National Park Service, Desert Southwest Cooperative Ecosystems Study Unit, Tucson, Arizona.

Partnership for Public Archaeology

- 2001 Hopi Footprints: Building Better Teachers with a Community-Based Culture Curriculum. Electronic document, http://www4.nau.edu/idig/htm_orig/projects/hopifoot/footdes.htm, accessed July 7, 2008.

Purcell, Shawn

- 2004 Ephemeral Assays— Fire Keepers. Ioba Standard. Electronic document, http://www.ioba.org/newsletter/archive/v14/purcell_11-04_d.php, accessed July 10, 2008.

Richbow, Linsey, Justin Dunnivant, Kahlil Carter, Kito Nzingha, and Eleanor King

- 2005 Conflict on the Frontier: Buffalo Soldier and Mescalero Apache Perspectives at the Pine Springs Camp. Presented at the 104th Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Washington, DC.

Shafer, Harry J.

- 1970 A Preliminary Report of An Archaeological Survey in the Guadalupe Mountain National Park by the Texas Archaeological Society. *Texas Archaeology* 14(3):10–17.

U.S. Office of Personnel Management

- 2008 Student Educational Employment Program. Introduction & Background. Electronic document, <http://opm.gov/employ/students/intro.asp>, accessed July 8, 2008.

