Four Books by Thomas F. King: A Joint Review

Introduced by Lawrence F. Van Horn

In this, the Fall 2004 issue, the High Plains Applied Anthropologist carries on the multi-review format begun with the Fall 2003 issue and continued in the Spring 2004 issue. This time, instead of one book reviewed by three reviewers followed by the author’s commentary, each of four reviewers reviews one of the same author’s books. Cultural Resource Laws and Practice: An Introductory Guide, Federal Planning and Historic Places: The Section 106 Process, Thinking About Cultural Resource Management: Essays from the Edge, and Places That Count: Traditional Cultural Properties in Cultural Resource Management are reviewed respectively by Eric Petersen, Darby Stapp, Fred York, and Jacilee Wray. Including me as the introducer, we are all federal employees or federal contractors involved in land management. That is entirely appropriate for at least three reasons. First, cultural resource management and historic preservation are the common themes of the four books. Second, the federal government, through various laws and policies, has been a pioneer in the preservation of cultural resources. Third, Tom King, the author (although no longer with the federal government but now in independent consulting and teaching practice), has been and remains an outstanding pioneer in philosophizing about cultural resources and their management for protection and preservation.

To his credit, King defines “cultural resources” and “cultural resource management” broadly:

A cultural resource . . . is any resource (i.e., thing that is useful for something) that is of a cultural character. Examples are social institutions, historic places, artifacts, and documents. Others define the term much more narrowly, often to mean only archeological sites or historic properties (p. 361, Cultural Resource Laws and Practice, Second Edition).

Cultural resource management (CRM): The management both of cultural resources and of effects on them that may result from land use and other activities of the contemporary world (p. 362, Cultural Resource Laws and Practice, Second Edition).

Nevertheless, King criticizes the National Park Service (U.S. Department of the Interior), an agency generally known for its broad, comprehensive CRM approach. The criticism is for what I understand King to mean as misapplied nomenclature in categorizing types of cultural resources. At issue, for example, is the NPS use of the term “ethnographic,” as in the special issue of Cultural Resource Management, edited by Muriel “Miki” Crespi (2001), our late chief ethnographer, entitled People and Places: The Ethnographic Connection. “Ethnography, like archeology, is a tool,” says King (p. 17, Thinking About Cultural Resource Management: Essays from the Edge) and should not, for many reasons, end as a type of cultural resource when it is only a means to identifying that end.

The National Park Service (NPS) defines “ethnographic resource” as follows:

Ethnographic resources – objects and places, including sites, structures, landscapes, and natural resources, with traditional cultural meaning and value to associated peoples. Research and consultation with associated people identifies and explains the places and things they find culturally meaningful. Ethnographic resources eligible for [listing or listed in] the National Register of Historic Places are called traditional cultural properties (National Park Service 2001:129).

King argues for “a cultural resources management that reflects and respects the cultural values of living people” (p. 17, Thinking About Cultural Resource Management: Essays from the Edge). Would not the NPS definition of “ethnographic resource” meet his broad CRM goal? The NPS recognizes five types of cultural resources for the description and analysis of possible impacts from proposed federal actions – archaeological resources, cultural landscapes, ethnographic resources, historic structures, and museum collections and archives. King’s definition of cultural resource coverage is broad and certainly goes beyond the narrow thinking of some who would limit the term to “archeological sites or historic properties.”

The misapplied-nomenclature problem involves not only the term “ethnographic resource” but also that of “archeological resource.” To paraphrase King, would not a traditionally associated people, tribe, group, community, or family prefer the term “ancestral village site” rather than “archeological site” (p. 17, Thinking About Cultural Resource Management: Essays from the Edge)? Similarly, would not a
traditionally associated people, tribe, group, community, or family like the term “traditional place” better than “ethnographic resource?”

Perhaps King is right. It might be clearer to employ three instead of five types of cultural resources: 1) traditional places and landscapes; 2) historic structures and landscapes; and 3) museum collections and archives. Archaeology and ethnography would then contribute to the identification of “traditional places and landscapes” without lending their respective names as disciplines to two cultural-resource categories, as is the case now. As disciplines, history, historical architecture, and landscape architecture with special emphasis in cultural-landscape analysis would contribute to “historic structures and landscapes.” Museology would contribute to “museum collections and archives.” Correcting purported misapplied nomenclature is something to think about in order to achieve greater cultural sensitivity to the groups involved, not to mention greater eloquence and clarity of expression. To do so would be in the creative-thinking tradition of Tom King. Please read on in that vein and enjoy the four reviews followed by the author’s commentary.

Notes

1. Lawrence F. Van Horn is the book review editor of the High Plains Applied Anthropologist. He received his Ph.D. from the City University of New York in 1977 in anthropology. He serves as a cultural resource specialist in the Planning Division, Denver Service Center, National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, 12795 West Alameda Parkway, Denver, CO, 80225-0287. He can also be contacted at larry_van_horn@nps.gov, or at 303-969-2255. Please note that he offers ideas only for himself, not officially on behalf of the National Park Service.


4. Walnut Creek, California: Alta Mira Press, A Division of Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2002. Fifth in the Heritage Resources Management Series, sponsored by the University of Nevada at Reno. Series edited by Don Fowler. 216 pages, acknowledgments, foreword by Don Fowler, introduction, four parts, twenty chapters, illustrations, glossary, bibliography, index. Cloth, $70.00 U.S. Paperback, $22.95 U.S.

5. Walnut Creek, California: Alta Mira Press, A Division of Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2003 Sixth in the Heritage Resources Management Series, sponsored by the University of Nevada at Reno. Series edited by Don Fowler. 349 pages, foreword by Don Fowler, acknowledgments, thirteen chapters, illustrations, bibliography, index. Cloth, $69.00 U.S. Paperback, $24.95 U.S.

6. Thomas F. King received his Ph.D. in anthropology in 1976 from the University of California at Riverside. His past experience as a federal employee in cultural resource management now serves him in his private practice as a consultant, teacher, and writer. He may be contacted at tfking106@aol.com, at 301-588-8012, and at 410 Windsor Street, Silver Spring MD 20910-4242.
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