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Summary

Within the field of heritage studies—that discipline which considers the past from the perspective of the present—the concept of the heritage site is a key component. Yet, to date, the heritage site as a cultural phenomenon remains under-explored and poorly understood.

Heritage sites form some of the essential building blocks of heritage and have an important and significant role in the development of individual and group identity and in the creation of a sense of the past. As physical places heritage sites—be they museums, ancient monuments or any other sort of place which has as a primary mandate the portrayal of "the past"—are relatively easy to recognise: as a cultural phenomenon they are much harder to grasp. In part, because these unique social spaces are so readily recognised, there has been a failure to develop a coherent and holistic methodology that may be used to assess the heritage site. Instead, many of our definitions of heritage (and its components) are based upon an innate understanding of the phenomenon of heritage. As such, we are left without an overarching characterisation of the heritage site.

Previously, researchers addressing this problem have relied upon a methodology based upon a rigidly defined set of criteria. However, the number of different types of place that tend to be categorised as a "heritage site" means that (a) sites often are evaluated by a rigidly defined set of criteria which has been developed for one site but which may not necessarily be applicable to another and (b) the list of places considered as heritage sites varies widely amongst researchers and heritage practitioners. In short, we lack a consistent and coherent means of characterising and discussing heritage sites. Further, not only does this approach obscure the individual "personality" of a site, more importantly, it makes it impossible to identify those underlying processes that accompany a heritage site.

This dissertation offers a new method of analysis: the *heritagescape*, which provides a coherent means by which sites may be evaluated. The heritagescape is predicated first on the understanding that all heritage sites are made up of a landscape and second, that there are universal processes which may be found at these sites. Critically, the heritagescape is made up of a set of "guiding principles" that allows features at an individual site to be assessed against a constant rather than against each other. Instead of imposing a set of criteria, the individual personality of a particular site begins to emerge and we are able to begin to discern those universal features that make heritage sites "work".
This concept of the heritagescape represents a significant advance in the way that heritage sites may be discussed and offers notable, long term potential towards a greater theoretical and practical understanding of how heritage sites operate and how they may change over time.

This dissertation is the result of my own work and includes nothing which is the outcome of work done in collaboration. This dissertation does not exceed the limit of 80,000 words as set by the Department of Archaeology, University of Cambridge.
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Landscapes of Heritage:  
Introducing the Concept of the Heritagescape

Landscape encompasses all the physical elements of the environment that surround us—the natural landform, water and natural vegetation and the cultural (the patterns of land use, buildings and other structures—old and new) but as well as the physical fabric, it is people’s experiences and perception of the land... that turns their surroundings into landscape. Landscape, therefore, is about the relationship between people and place  
Scottish Natural Heritage 2003

We experience and perceive the landscape predominantly through sight, but the totality draws upon all our senses, together with the feelings, memories and associations evoked by different places  
Scottish Natural Heritage 2003

Then, you step back in time though the portal of living history... The history depicted here is more than something you’ll just observe or hear. You’ll touch it. Smell it. Even try your hand at some of it... You may have a sense you were actually there.  
Jamestown-Yorktown Foundation April 2001

1.0 Introduction  
Most of us have in our mind a visit to a living history site or an open-air museum. In some cases this took place when we were children and the sight of old houses, towns or camps peopled with soldiers or other ancient folk remain vivid in our memory. Perhaps the visit took place as an adult and was simply a means to entertain a guest or to offer distraction to children already bored with half term. It may even have been a deliberate visit to “learn” something about the past. Whatever the reason, intentional or accidental, encounters with open-air museums rarely leave people untouched. There, the combination of an old/past landscape inhabited by people in strange dress and coupled with activities that create an
environment where one can hear, touch, smell and even participate in “the past” offers an experience of another time that is distinct, accessible and, often, friendly. And, while there is always a visitor who will not enjoy this sort of visit to the past, it is unlikely that he or she will forget the interactive and vivid experience that is offered by an open-air museum. Open-air museums have long been a part of the cultural scene. Found around the world, they portray a variety of pasts in any number of different places (Stone and Planal 1999:6; Zeuner 1999:85; Young and Riley 2002). Since 1891 when the Swedish museum, Skansen, opened its doors as the world’s first open-air museum, visitors have been drawn to these places. Their allure can be found in a variety of factors. Open-air museums often celebrate a past that ties in to a period of history that is familiar or meaningful to a significant number of the members of a society. A visit to such a place may offer an individual a closer relationship or greater familiarity with the group past: in this case visitors may be buying into a national heritage. Alternatively, the draw may lie in that, as a learning experience, this sort of interactive visit will be less tedious than that offered at “traditional” museums. In sharp contrast to “traditional” museums that display the past at a distance (and often in glass cases), open-air museums are almost entirely experiential places where the past not only appears close at hand but is also most often presented in a friendly and accessible style.

There are many things known about open-air museums and they have been long the object of considerable research and analysis; however, in many ways these places are still unfamiliar entities. We do know (e.g. Corbin 2002: passim; Stone and Planal 1999:6) that there is an innate appeal to these places and that even if the past that is being marked out is unfamiliar, visitors nonetheless appear to be able to engage—physically and emotionally—with the site. Yet, what the quality (or qualities) is that creates this recognisable space is still not fully understood. In part, this is a problem that arises out of the nature of these places as particular experiential and social spaces.
The very characteristics that make these places engaging and distinct also mean that few open-air museums appear to be or are similar; they do all, of course, have a primary mandate of portraying a past but there the similarities tend to stop. No one open-air museum portrays all of the past and most tend to centre upon a relatively short period of time. Be it decades or centuries open-air museums offer only a glimpse into the past. Even sites that portray a past that spans many centuries offer an experience that is still only a fraction of the sum total of history. Not surprisingly, open-air museums will more often than not differ chronologically, thematically and culturally. In fact, the variety of extant open-air museums means that experiences of the past on offer is almost beyond measure. From an analytical point of view this diversity has meant that the task of trying to develop a standardised means of discussing and investigating these places in a way that is coherent, replicable and flexible has been, at best, difficult. In turn, this has resulted in the current ad hoc approaches of analysis. This is not to say that research in this area has not been thoughtful. However, because there is no standard method of analysis and because, at present, there is not an agreed set of terms or understandings, two things tend to happen. In the first instance, the research on sites tends to focus on a very small number of sites that appear to be similar. At this level the criteria used to evaluate such places are usually quite specific and have often arisen out of a set of like features found at a particular group of sites. Thus, as the scope of an investigation is widened to include other (apparently) similar places; i.e., other open-air museums, researchers may find that the original criteria don't "fit" and are no longer entirely appropriate. The outcome is that the methods and language used to investigate and describe them change. Instead of an overarching methodology we are left with a multitude of separate studies none easily compared to each other. This is best reflected in the definitions that various authors have offered in an attempt to characterise open-air museums and other heritage sites (e.g., Chappell 2002; Harwood 2002; Leask and Yeoman 1999, Trinder 1988, Stone and Planel 1999). We will
return to this point in Chapter 2 when we look at open-air museums as particular social spaces. The second consequence of the methods that have been undertaken to date is that it is very rare that a site is discussed both as an individual, particular place and also in the context of the range of other sorts of sites that portray the past. In part this is fall out from the first problem. Therefore, not only do we not know how these places operate relative to each other (and thus what may distinguish one type of place from another) but this approach also prevents the individual “personalities” of a particular site from emerging. Both of these trends mean that, as yet, while we can recognise these places, our understanding of how they “work” —particularly over the long term—is incomplete.

This trend is obviously important to our understanding of open-air museums as a particular type of place. It is, however, also critical at a larger level. This is where we arrive at the heart of the problem.

Open-air museums, like many of the other kinds of place that portray the past, fall into the category of “heritage site”. Here we have another problem: like open-air museums, heritage sites tend to be easily (indeed innately) recognised but poorly comprehended. For many of the same reasons that affect open-air museums, the analysis of heritage sites as a group and as a cultural phenomenon lacks a coherent and transparent means of analysis. Thus, while we will be looking primarily at a method of analysing and comprehending open-air museums, they will be used chiefly as an exemplar of heritage sites. Open-air museums, for many of the reasons discussed above and others which will be discussed in Chapter 3, have qualities which make them ideal candidates to explore this question of “what is a heritage site” It is this essential question that is central to this analysis and which forms the basis of the issues that will be addressed in the course of this dissertation.

1.1 Open-air Museums as Heritage Sites

To engage in any sort of dialogue on the subject of heritage, almost inevitably, will be daunting. Narrowing this down to a discussion of the
phenomenon of the heritage site offers little assistance; both these topics are large, varied and, as yet, not fully understood. Of course these challenges are not unique to heritage studies; what is unusual and, to some extent, what defines heritage is the personal involvement and individual stakes that are inherent in any consideration of this subject. These qualities coupled with a rapid development of heritage studies as a discipline have resulted in a situation where more often than not our definitions of heritage and its components are based upon an innate understanding of the phenomenon of heritage. This inherent sense of heritage should not be discounted and has much to offer in terms of understanding both the diversity and the personal stake holding that are hallmarks of heritage. However, when these “understandings” become the mainstay of the field and come accompanied by a, as yet, poorly developed set of methodologies problems arise. At present this is exactly where heritage studies finds itself. This is not to say that the work to date has been sloppy or ill-considered. Heritage studies as an established field is barely twenty years old (Fowler 1992, Hewison 1987) and in that time an enormous amount of work has been undertaken. On the whole it has been a vigorous and heady endeavour; however, this has also meant that some of the “details” have been overlooked. Notable among these is a comprehensive understanding of heritage sites as a cultural construct.

Heritage sites form some of the essential building blocks of heritage and have an important and significant role in the creation of individual or group identity and can be the key to locating ourselves in time and space (Corbin 2002:225; Davis 1999:9; Harris 1993:5; Teather and Chow 2003:93; Walsh 1992:150). One of the problems with the term “heritage site” as a category of type of place is that it includes so many very different types of space. As we shall see in Chapter 2 where we will examine this point further, this is one of the problems that have emerged out of the way that we presently think about heritage sites. For the sake of this current discussion, it is enough to know that the examples of heritage sites include any number of places which, as part of their primary mandate, portray a
past (or pasts). These might range from ancient monuments or museums to country houses or areas of natural and/or historical significance. Despite this great variation, as physical places, heritage sites are relatively easy to recognise; as a cultural phenomenon they are much more difficult to grasp. Heritage sites tend to be accessible places that can offer a vivid experience of the past and, most people, therefore, have at least an intuitive sense of what this sort of place is. Yet it is within this very familiarity that the pitfalls lie. Because these places are so readily recognisable (in their many different forms) there has been a failure to develop a coherent and holistic methodology by which to assess the heritage site as a cultural phenomenon. As a result, we are left without any kind of overarching or defining characterisation. Further, a look at the literature reveals that in recent years there has been a noticeable lack of works focussing on the nature of the heritage site. Since the late 1990s most authors have tended to focus on particular sorts of heritage sites—in essence they are doing advanced work without having fully established some of the basics. At present while there are discussion of heritage sites to be found within recent textbooks (e.g. Carman 2002, Howard 2003 and Skeates 2000) investigations into “the heritage site” tend to be missing. It is as though, having reached a stage in our understanding of some of the theoretical underpinnings of heritage studies, that we as researchers have skipped a step and are now investigating the particular without having established the nature of one of the most fundamental elements.

This is a critical oversight. Having a strong sense of the qualities that characterise a heritage site and, in turn, being able to discern how they contribute to the way that heritage sites operate as specific social spaces is essential knowledge. Without it, we will be significantly hampered in our future investigations of heritage. This understanding of heritage sites is so important to our large sense of heritage because of the nature of the close relationship between the two. Heritage sites offer one of the most visible and tangible manifestations of the larger and more abstract idea of heritage. The solid, physical features of heritage site
provide a space where individuals can interact with “the past” in a vivid fashion (Corbin 2002:225; Zeuner 1999:85). The buildings, monuments, objects and open spaces that make up a heritage site present a locus on which individuals can hang their personal narratives of identity and of “pastness” (Handler and Gable 1996, Teather and Chow 2003:94; Uzzell 1999). On a more site-focussed level, without understanding the heritage site itself, it is hard to break it down and examine its constituent parts. Focussing for a moment at the level of the site, this lack of a full appreciation of the heritage site as a place has serious repercussions because it will remain difficult to break down the heritage site and examine its constituent parts. In short, at present, there is no easy or established means to look at those “essential qualities” discussed above. This prevents the identification and evaluation of those underlying processes that accompany a heritage site over time. Also, not being able to pinpoint these universal processes makes any estimation of their impact (on sites) over time quite problematic. Not only do individuals’ perceptions of the past change, so too, over time, do sites. Whether this change comes about as a result of structural or interpretative needs or whether it is the outcome of changing ideologies, change as a factor and an ongoing process at heritage sites should not be ignored.

Returning to the first point, recognising that there are universal and underlying processes which accompany heritage sites over time is an important aspect of the task of analysing heritage sites, yet it remains under-explored. In part this oversight has developed because of the inclination for most researchers to regard a heritage site as a largely static (e.g., Cooper 1997:157; Laenen 1988; Shanks and Tilley 1992:85) out of context (Hewison 1987; Walsh 1992:137) and/or homogeneous (Prentice 1991) entity. Coupled with a view of heritage sites that is located firmly without the site, the result has been that a “sameness” has been imposed on heritage sites. One author, who has observed and clearly espoused this sense of sameness, notes in a discussion of open-air sites—what he calls
"museums of buildings"—that "when you've seen one Skansen, you have seen them all" (Howard 2002:67). This is somewhat ironic in light of the general acknowledgement of the great diversity of places that fall into the category of heritage site. Moreover, this trend probably lies at the root of the attempt to impose set lists of criteria upon different sites as a means of analysing those places. To date, no one has explicitly stated that heritage sites do not exist as a single coherent entity but rather are both the result of often quite different elements and, importantly, also of processes. Together, they can create a vivid, dynamic and changing landscape. In the end, I suggest it is only by concentrating on these individual elements (structure, artefact or property) that we will be able to gain a full understanding and a sense of heritage sites and how they may change over time. Focussing on those distinct qualities that create a landscape of heritage will advance our understanding not only of heritage sites but also of heritage as a larger phenomenon.

Thus, there are two critical components behind the research design of this dissertation. The first is the development of a flexible, coherent and consistent methodology by which to analyse heritage sites. The second aspect is, through the application of this methodology, to re-examine heritage sites with particular emphasis on (a) the processes that accompany them over time and (b) the relationship of individual heritage sites to one another. This, I suggest will leave us better equipped to deal with heritage sites which, in turn, will promote a greater understanding of the heritage site not only as a individual construct but also as a fundamental component of the phenomenon of heritage.

The means by which this will be undertaken is through the application of a new analytical concept: the heritagescape. This concept is predicated on the idea that all heritage sites are landscapes—be they museums, ancient monuments, open-air museums or any of the vast and varied places that have, as their primary mandate, a portrayal of the past by one means or another. The heritagescape will be discussed in detail in
chapter 2. For now, it is enough to know that there are two vital elements to the heritagescape.

First, the heritagescape is the by-product of three "guiding principles": (1) boundaries (2) cohesion and (3) visibility. Again these will be elaborated in subsequent sections but the key attribute of the guiding principles is that each of these three principles always will be present at every site. Like the heritagescape, the guiding principles themselves may be broken down. The guiding principles are made up of those elements that are present at every site as well as elements that are unique to each individual site. These elements are composed primarily of the tangible constituents that make up the landscape of heritage at each site. As we will see, there are also more ephemeral aspects to each of the guiding principles, but these too tend to be grounded in the physical components.

Second, rather than being focussed on an individual site (with the "template" subsequently applied to others) the heritagescape is a constant: an overarching construct. All sites will have a heritagescape in order for them to function as a heritage site; not all heritagescapes will, however, necessarily appear similar. The resonance that each individual heritagescape will have and, indeed, the final shape of the heritagescape will be influenced by the relative strength of each of the three guiding principles and by their relationship to one another.

Having established the means by which we will approach these questions, the methodology must be applied in actual case studies. To undertake to do this across the board and to attempt to look at all the different sorts of places considered to be "heritage sites" is clearly overwhelming. In addition, the time consuming analysis that this approach calls for only allows a few examples of each type of site to be analysed as part of this dissertation. Simply put, in order to obtain an adequate representation of the many different kinds of heritage site, the number of case studies would be unrealistic. At very least, this would obscure any trends that might emerge. There are two problems that would emerge if one attempted to obtain a representative sample of all, or even most of, the
different varieties of heritage site. At present, because there is no common language or method, most researchers' lists vary widely. Inevitably, this results in a sample which some would consider too narrow and others far too broad. More importantly, I suggest that not only are individual heritage sites specific entities unto themselves, each different sort of place that portrays the past has a specific appearance and a particular way of operating. Analysing sites from across several categories would ultimately mean that the sample number from each type would be so small as to preclude the identification of features which might mark a particular space. For this reason, this analysis will focus on one particular type of heritage site as an exemplar: the open-air museum.

As we will discover in Chapter 3, the investigations of open-air museums suffer from many of the same issues that plague heritage sites. Chief among these is an inability to arrive at a set of common terms which characterise open-air museums. At present, it is sufficient to understand that open-air museums use a combination of structures, open spaces and objects to portray an aspect (or aspects) of the past. Once the methodology has been tested in this focussed analysis, it will be easier to apply it on a much larger level. Open-air museums as an accessible and well-represented form of heritage site have been chosen as the case study for this examination of the concept of the heritagescape.

1.2 The Heritagescape

The first and most important element of the heritagescape is that it is created through the presence and interplay of the three guiding principles; it is these elements working together which create the heritagescape.

The concept of heritagescape is a specific idea that incorporates some of the basic constructs of landscape theory but which relates wholly to heritage sites. The heritagescape defines a particular space that is distinct from but at the same time is part of the larger landscape (environment) in which it is located. The guiding principles are the means
by which the heritagescape may be identified and analysed. The way in which these three underlying components interact will, in turn, determine the way that the heritagescape is manifested at different sites and in particular, how distinct and convincing it appears as a separate landscape.

There are two points essential to the understanding of the heritagescape and although they have been introduced above, they are important enough to bear further mention and elaboration.

The first, key quality about the heritagescape is that rather than defining a specific type of site, it will be found within all heritage sites. Second, the way in which the three principles (boundaries, cohesion and visibility) work together and the "strength" of one or more of them (relative to the others) will determine the importance and role of the heritagescape at each site. It is critical to the understanding of the heritagescape to understand that it must always be made up of all three of the principles—the absence of any one of cohesion, visibility and boundaries, means that heritagescape cannot exist; thus, by extension, neither will the heritage site.

As will become evident, a heritage site and its heritagescape will not always be precisely the same (for example each may have a different set of limits); however, they are nonetheless inextricably linked. Therefore, in order to be a heritage site, a place must possess a recognisable heritagescape. Having said that, it is equally important to comprehend that the way in which these guiding principles interact with each other rarely will be the same; it is this quality that will account for the different ways in which sites operate and will explain why one heritage site may be different to another. It is my contention that all heritage sites have a heritagescape; however, because of the nature of a site and/or its goals, it may not have a noteworthy or highly visible role in the way that people interact, use or perceive a particular site. It is, however, the resonance of the heritagescape that will contribute to the final appearance and operation of one heritage site relative to another.
This idea of the resonance of the heritagescape is important and requires further discussion. The heritagescape will be most like a traditional landscape and will be most evident in those instances where all three of the guiding principles operate at a level that is more or less equal. For example, sites such as open-air museums that most closely resemble a landscape may also offer a clearer sense of place and will be much more likely to have a strong and readily apparent heritagescape. However—and here is where the heritagescape has much to offer—not all sites, even those of the same variety, operate in the same way. Thus, in the course of this analysis we may see instances where some open-air museums will have a heritagescape that appears to be weak or is hard to discern. In such cases I suggest that this may be explained by a lack of strength of one or more of the three guiding principles. As a result, the other principle(s) will have assumed a much more prominent role thereby altering the way in which the heritagescape is manifested at that site.

This point about the strength of the heritagescape is particularly pertinent when we turn our attention to "enclosed" sites. Among the more important examples here are "traditional" (i.e., lying within four walls) museums. It is one thing to assert that all sites should be considered as a specific form of landscape (i.e., as a heritagescape) and another to understand how in practice this may initially be quite difficult to identify. On first glance enclosed sites would seem not to conform to the definition of a heritagescape. The most obvious problem here lies with the idea that a heritagescape, by definition, is part of its larger surroundings. Enclosing a site within a separate structure would seem to eliminate such sites from this discussion. However, I would argue that what happens with enclosed sites is that their boundaries relative to the other two components are so strong that it "overwhelms" them. In this case, the three components are not balanced and the resulting heritagescape is weak and plays a much less significant role than it would in a site where the three components operate with greater parity.
These two examples serve to demonstrate one of the most useful and important aspects of the heritagescape as a methodology. In the past, when faced with disparities between similar sites, we were left with few, if any, options to explain this. With the heritagescape, however, not only are we now able to identify this phenomenon, we also have been given the means to investigate it.

Returning to a much earlier point, it is important to remember that not all sites which have been traditionally grouped together will operate in the same, or even similar, fashion. In many “enclosed” sites—notably traditional museums—the structure of the surrounding walls means that the boundaries are much stronger than either visibility or coherence and may, in many cases, dominate. Looking at just one example as an illustration indicates that this does not work in the same way at all traditional museums. At the Museum of London a large bank of windows accompanied by signage enables the extant Roman walls (located outside the modern museum) to be incorporated into the display and landscape of the interior. Here the resonance of the boundaries is lightened somewhat while at the same time visibility is strengthened, making the interior and exterior landscapes work together as a much more cohesive space.

It is in situations such as the examples described above where the heritagescape comes into its own. In the past because there has been a tendency to rely either wholly or in part on a set of conventional divisions and categories, we have been unable to analyse sites as individual entities. Many of the analyses that have been undertaken to date have tended to become ensnared in the details and have lost the ability to look beyond these to the larger (and sometimes hidden) underlying similarities of heritage sites. This means that there is, within the field, an inability to answer fundamental questions coherently and consistently. As one example of this, at present, we are unable to understand how and why a historically themed attraction might be different from an open-air museum and why both in turn are different to a theme park. While seemingly simple, it is nonetheless a primary issue. Added to this is a problem that has arisen
out of a broad assumption that sites categorised together do or should operate in a similar way. This has left no context in which to explore the disparities between different sites—the Museum of London and the British Museum do not function or use the past in exactly the same way, and they therefore provide the visiting public with different experiences. Until now, there has been no means by which to explore such differences.

Finally, there are two underlying ideas that are important to the concept of the heritagescape. The first relates directly to the idea of the heritage site. Heritage sites should never be investigated or analysed without considering the larger context in which they are located and in which they operate. We have already established that as places they are distinct: heritage sites do not operate in isolation from other sites or places that portray the past. Thus although it is critical to recognise their particular qualities, it is equally important to understand how sites operate relative to and alongside each other. Failing to do this ensures the focus remains at the site level and makes it very difficult to compare one site to another. As a result a lot of old ground continues to be covered without the benefit of ever achieving a comprehensive sense of heritage sites. This approach becomes particularly troublesome when one is trying to determine the characteristics of and/or differentiate between those sites that seem to be the same but also are recognised (intuitively or otherwise) as being different. On the whole it becomes very confusing and tends to hinder any sort of reasonable analysis particularly when sites appear to be similar or seem to overlap. Out of this tends to emerge a series of ad hoc definitions and even more categorisation (e.g., Stone and Planel 1999, Trinder 1988, Young 2002)—to the point that the specific nature and individual qualities of the sites themselves are subsumed by the many categories and subcategories, which at present define heritage sites. I suggest that rather than trying to isolate heritage sites from each other, it is much more useful to look at the position that they occupy relative to one another.
The relationship of one, individual heritage site to the larger group of heritage sites (as a whole) may be thought of as similar to that between the heritagescape and the surrounding landscape. In both instances the smaller unit is a distinct unit yet, at the same time, is wholly integrated into the larger phenomenon. Thus, in either situation, to analyse one entity without taking into account the other only serves to create confusion and, I believe, has been the cause of the over-categorisation and the rigid definitions that have dogged the analyses of heritage sites undertaken to date. Again, because the heritagescape is a constant and not tied to a specific site, this problem is neatly avoided.

There is one other potential issue that that is directly related to the investigation of heritage sites and particularly of open-air museums. In the past, these sites have been judged against a series of criteria centring around ideas of “good/bad” or “real/not real”. This is neither the point of the exercise nor is it a useful means of analysis; certainly it is neither empirical nor is it usually replicable. Sites which researchers have deemed as “bad” or which have been dismissed as “nostalgic” sometimes turn out to be sites which offer vivid experiences of the past and which are embraced by visitors (c.f. Shanks and Tilley’s treatment of Beamish North of England Open-air Museum 1992). Obviously there is a dissonance here but “good” and “bad” are inadequate and unhelpful distinctions. The idea of the heritagescape moves us away from the traps caused by this sort of polemical treatment and allows us to examine why and how sites operate as they do. Further, it also allows us to look at heritage sites not as homogeneous and static units but rather as complex and evolving places.

Finally, throughout the course of this dissertation it will be come apparent there are several “indirect” issues—i.e., broader ideas and larger themes—that arise out the analysis of the case studies. Among the more notable are questions relating to the phenomenon of “authenticity”, the role and nature of change and to the idea of “place”. From the very beginning the threads of all three of these issues were woven into the specific questions that directed this research; however, as the research progressed
the subtleties and complexity of all of these issues began to emerge. Indeed, in some cases, it became clear that the ways that the majority of researchers currently and have conventionally dealt with ideas of authenticity or place or change (in the context of heritage sites) might also be due for a thoughtful re-examination. A detailed analysis of even one of these concepts would exceed the scope of this current work; however, there are some key points—among them a development of the related but distinct notions of “a place apart” and “a place of the past”—which have important roles in this analysis and which emerge primarily (but not exclusively) out of the results and subsequent findings that make up Chapters 4 and 5. All of these issues will be noted and discussed as they arise. Chapter 6 (Interpretation, Summary and Conclusions) will provide a forum in which to consider the roles that each of these ideas: authenticity, change and place play in the current analysis and the impact that they may have on future research.

In the end, the concept of the heritagescape gives heritage sites a common and fundamental component that allows different types of sites to be compared in a coherent, replicable and flexible fashion. Using the heritagescape as a baseline and examining how it is manifested within an individual site(s) should make it possible to understand three basic aspects: (a) how the individual site operates and portrays the past (b) how one (or more) site(s) operate relative to another and finally (c) lead to a better understanding of the heritage site as a larger concept and as a cultural phenomenon.

Having outlined the issues which underlie this dissertation and established some of the primary questions to be investigated we will now move on, in Chapter 2, to explore further the idea of the heritage site and to review the development of some of the main concepts in heritage studies. Chapter 3 will offer an in-depth discussion of the heritagescape as a method and as a concept. In Chapter 4 the methodology of the heritagescape will be applied to a set of 20 case studies drawn from Canada, the United States, England and Northwestern Europe. Chapter 5
will act as a summary of findings tying together the data that has emerged in the previous chapter. Finally, in the concluding chapter, Chapter 6, we will consider these findings both on their own and against the larger field of heritage studies.
Chapter 2
The Heritage Site: An Explanation of Terms

An important theme of the preceding chapter was that, as a term, "heritage site" is widely used but poorly understood. This fact remains, despite a wealth of literature and a considerable amount of thoughtful research devoted to this subject. What we have not yet discussed is the inclination of many researchers to discuss and investigate the heritage site in concert with the phenomenon of "heritage". In many ways there is nothing intrinsically wrong with this approach as both concepts, heritage and heritage sites, are closely related. What is a problem is that such discussions often result in these two different concepts becoming conflated; this only serves to obscure the unique qualities of each of these two separate phenomena. What often happens is that in the course of examining heritage, heritage sites will come under discussion without being named as such. This tends to blur definitions and leads to a lack of concentration on heritage sites as a distinct construct. This trend can be observed throughout the entire history of investigating heritage sites; researchers still seem to be searching for a way to consider these unique places.

2.1 Defining the Heritage Site: An Introduction

Before we look at what is not known about heritage sites, it is perhaps helpful to review some of the aspects about which people are in agreement. First, heritage sites are places that celebrate the built, natural or cultural heritage and which usually have as a central mandate some form of celebration and/or portrayal of a past or pasts. Furthermore, heritage sites have a central role in the way that individuals interact and

\[1\] It is acknowledged that sites which celebrate natural heritage may have a more central role with the portrayal of landscapes or of natural feature; however, these too all hearken back to a past and it is the past (or an original quality) of that natural site that has caused it to be marked out and protected.
interpret the past. They are largely acknowledged as places where individuals can identify with and locate themselves in the larger group history (Ashworth 1998, Devine-Wright & Lyons 1997:33; Piccini 1999; Teather & Chow 2003; Walsh 1992:103) and the material components of these sites are accepted to be key mechanisms in the creation and development of narratives which may arise out of such places (e.g., Handler and Gable 1996; Lowenthal 1985, 1998; Uzzell 1998:22). Clearly, heritage sites are an important and essential part of the larger phenomenon of heritage. Despite this we find that a clear understanding of these places and how they work remains elusive. As we have indicated in Chapter 1, heritage sites offer an inherent contradiction: on the one hand it is a term that is widely applied with a strong, innate recognition of its meaning, yet, at the same time, when pressed, few are able to define satisfactorily this elusive phrase.

Let us begin our examination of the term by looking at some of the different sorts of places that UNESCO has designated as World Heritage Sites. Even a very few examples hint at the incredible diversity of place. For example, officially designated World Heritage sites include built or cultural places including historic cities and city centres (among them Vienna and Dubrovnik); built sites such as the cathedrals at Chartres or Amiens and the Great Wall of China; archaeological or historical remains (the Viking site at L’Anse aux Meadows, Canada; monuments at Angkor Wat and Great Zimbabwe); places of commemoration (Auschwitz) and natural sites in many countries (Great Barrier Reef (Australia), Los Glaciares National Park (Argentina) or Mesa Verde (USA)). Heritage sites can also be smaller or more local (than World Heritage sites) and may consist of gardens, houses, or estates or they may be even simpler and be no more than a marked location at the side of the road. As there is such immense variation in the physical scale and the character of these places it is little wonder that it is so difficult to develop a scheme by which to analyse and, hopefully, better comprehend heritage sites.
In this thesis, the range of heritage sites that will come under scrutiny is far narrower. The primary focus of this analysis will be on built heritage sites and specifically on open-air museums and living history sites. These are very particular types of place and will be explored at length in Chapter 3. Once again, it must be reiterated that these sites are being used in this analysis simply as case studies and as a test of the idea of the heritagescape at a more manageable level. Thus, not only will we be able to gain specific and important information about a specific sort of built heritage site (i.e., open-air museums), it will also be possible to employ this methodology on a much broader scale. The heritagescape, as a means of analysis, in the future will be able to be applied to other sites of cultural and natural significance.

2.2 Research to date

In order to begin to examine the way that heritage sites have been considered and defined we need to go back nearly twenty years when the concept of heritage as a cultural phenomenon and a field of study was first formally used. While heritage and the heritage site are unique notions, because of their close relationship developments in the overall study of heritage tend to parallel those that occur in the evaluation of heritage sites. Furthermore, in order to gain a clearer sense of how heritage sites are viewed, it is important to appreciate how heritage has been perceived over time. Therefore in order to discuss heritage sites it is first necessary to spend some time looking at the history and development of the concept of heritage.

2.2.1 Heritage: The Wider Context

Two things need to be established up front. First, the following discussion of heritage does not presume to be a detailed or comprehensive study. Instead, it will merely be a brief introduction to some of the major trends that have occurred and may be ongoing within the field of heritage. It is intended as a means to establish the broader context of heritage sites.
Second, it is necessary to clarify some of the terms that will be used throughout this chapter and beyond within this dissertation. In most cases the way in which these terms are used is taken from the most common and best understood usage of each of them. However, given that many authors fail to distinguish between different terms and often use them interchangeably, for the sake of clarity they are outlined below.

1. **Heritage.** In the context of this dissertation this word will be used to signify the concept of heritage and will refer to it in its broadest sense (see discussion below).

2. **Heritage site.** This is a specific use of the term to designate an individual site.

3. **Heritage sites.** Used in this analysis the term heritage sites (except in cases of obvious pluralisation) applies to heritage sites as a cultural phenomenon; i.e., as a group. In some case this term might be further distinguished by the phrase “heritage sites as a category”.

4. **Heritage studies.** This term refers to the field of discipline currently established with the academy.

At its very broadest heritage may be defined as a positive entity and may refer to the sum total of landscapes, art and architecture. Beyond its qualities of reinforcing group or individual identities and reinforcing a sense of the past, heritage can offer security and well being (e.g., Devine-Wright & Lyons 1997:33) however, heritage can also be used as the means to break down all of these positive benefits. Heritage can be manipulated and can be used to oppress or obliterate other individuals' or groups' past(s) and can be used as the rationalisation for political machinations. Heritage is a complicated business.

Characterisations of heritage tend to be very much creatures of their own time; that is to say that they are heavily influenced by the politics of the moment. Definitions of heritage also tend to be shaped by whomever it is who establishes the interpretation; whether it is government, individual, institution or academy: heritage can be viewed in quite different ways. Likewise, descriptions of heritage will also depend on location and/or the
scale of the site(s). Within this, those who deal with heritage primarily from a management perspective may identify needs and issues that are not necessarily acknowledged by, say, a researcher within a university. Finally, because heritage has a very personal quality (both to groups and individuals) the way that heritage is described or considered in one part of the world may not apply elsewhere. Given all these influences, there is a certain desire and necessity for the understanding of heritage to remain fairly fluid. Yet, it is this very fluidity that sometimes results in the "vagueness" that surrounds our understanding of heritage.

When we begin to probe into heritage it quickly becomes clear that the same set of problems is encountered when we begin to attempt to characterise heritage. Again, there is a wealth of research that can tell us what heritage can "do" and there are a great many examples of what heritage "is". Currently, definitions of this sort are most commonly found within the many papers issued by both government and NGO agencies (e.g., English Heritage’s *Heritage Counts 2003*) and in textbooks focusing on heritage (e.g., Carman 2002; Howard 2003; Skeates 2000). Heritage is a great beast of a construct and trying to pin it down is very tricky. One author, somewhat ironically, noted that "[o]nce it is appreciated how many things there are to which the word 'heritage' is attached, from national institutions to garage doors, the word becomes absurd" (Hewison 1987:11).

While the field of heritage studies is young, the word heritage is much older, and over time it has had many different connotations. Most authors acknowledge that as little as twenty years ago, the word heritage was used in a way that was more related to the original sense of the word; i.e, denoting an inheritance from the past (e.g. Brisbane & Wood 1996:5; Canadian Heritage: 2001; Graham, Ashworth and Tunbridge 2000:1; Lowenthal 1985, 1996). More recently as the spotlight has centred on the study of heritage this meaning has expanded to the point that most researchers will agree that it can include "any relict survival from the past", that it can be applied to “non-physical aspects of the past" and that it may
include any cultural or artistic activity and landscapes or flora and fauna (Tunbridge and Ashworth 1996:1). But even here, this seemingly comprehensive list starts to get blurry at the edges when the same authors note that "[s]uch a package can be extended to include almost any aspect of national life which contributes to the effective functioning of society or to the favoured national image, and which is thereby worthy of note of preservation for the enjoyment of this and future generations" (Tunbridge and Ashworth 1996:2).

Robert Hewison, who early on recognised the difficulties inherent in the explanation of heritage, noted in 1987 that heritage was a word without definition "even in two Acts of Parliament" (1987:31). Apparently this problem still plagues us over fifteen years later. Canadian Heritage, (a department of the Federal Government) notes that "[o]ne of the challenges, then, in any discussion of "heritage" is to define what we mean, the scope of what we are talking about, and, ultimately what we see as the present and future challenges for heritage" (Canadian Heritage 2001:4). A simple enough statement in and of itself but one that describes an enormous mandate which, at best, is fraught with difficulty.

It is no wonder that heritage (and by extension heritage sites) is a vital concern and focus of governments and governmental agencies around the world. As an ideological resource, it can be used (for good or for bad) to support governments and political initiatives. In a more tangible sense these same assets are often at the heart of a country's tourist industry and can generate significant revenue at many different levels. In all, heritage has significant capital with both financial and ideological benefits (Howard 2002:64). It is therefore, not surprising that governments tend to expend considerable effort on understanding, defining and managing heritage resources.

Since the mid 1980s heritage has come under serious analysis and over time, the way in which researchers have approached the idea of heritage has changed. It is now possible to identify several different phases that have each governed our understanding of this phenomenon. The first
of these phases (which will be discussed further below) occurs in the mid-1980s when, a flood of literature emerges as heritage as a field of study become formally recognised.

In this early period many of the seminal works emerged out of Great Britain. Amongst the more notable research is: Robert Hewison’s *The Heritage Industry, Britain in a Climate of Decline* (1987), Patrick Wright’s *On Living in an Old Country: The National Past in Contemporary Britain* (1985) and David Lowenthal’s *The Past is a Foreign Country* (1985). Because of this trend a significant proportion of the early heritage literature tends to be shaped by the political and social climate of Britain in the 1980s. At this time heritage and heritage studies were often seen as a reaction against the sweeping modernism and change in the policies and politics of the late twentieth century. Perhaps, then, it is not unexpected that there was often a sinister—or at very least a cynical—overtone to the way that heritage was perceived. There was tremendous growth in the number of heritage attractions and enterprises at this time and again, possibly as a reaction to events occurring at that time, heritage was seen as a threat.

The other aspect to the perception of heritage in the 1980s was that theoretically it often was regarded as in opposition to history. It is a vital point that heritage, history and indeed the past are quite different phenomena and even today many authors still make a concerted effort to distinguish between these three concepts (cf Graham, Ashworth and Tunbridge 2000:20). Whereas today authors tend to treat heritage and history as quite separate but nonetheless related entities, in the earlier works one tends to see an emphatic separation between them. In some cases there is the distinct sense that history and heritage do not mix well: one can have either one or the other but not both. Since then this trend has been tempered considerably and heritage and history are, at worst, no more than uneasy bedfellows.

It was also in the late 1980s that the idea of the “heritage industry” surfaces in the literature. Inherent in the idea of heritage as an industry is
the concept of heritage as a resource or commodity and the attendant
commercialisation that comes with the promotion of the past. The degree
to which people adhere to this idea of an industry of heritage as a resource
can vary widely.

Whilst Peter Fowler claims to have been among the first to coin the
phrase “heritage industry” (1992) it is probably more commonly associated
with Robert Hewison and his 1987 work. Hewison’s conclusions and
branding of the heritage industry came about in the period of rampant
growth of heritage attractions and no doubt this was the origin of his rather
gloomy outlook. In this guise, heritage was seen to diminish and/or destroy
the past; instead of a “real” history, society was being fobbed off with
created or “faked” pasts. As Hewison saw it, in contrast to the natural,
ongoing process of the historical past, a fossilised past (in the form of
heritage sites) based heavily in nostalgia was all that was on offer

Today, most authors view heritage from a broader and more
optimistic perspective. Most recognise that heritage is a resource and
acknowledge a commodification of the past. While there are several
schools of thought—some quite complex—that range from thoughts on the
finite quality of the heritage resource (c.f. Carman 2002:23) to an
acknowledgement of the “heritage industry” as no more than the
commercial aspect of heritage “based upon the selling of goods and
services with a heritage component” (Ashworth and Tunbridge 1996:2),
overall none can be said to be as pessimistic in their outlook and analysis
as was Hewison in 1987.

In the late 1980s and early 1990s when Hewison and his colleagues
were discussing heritage, they were carving out the beginnings of the field
and taking those initial steps towards discovering a set of methods and
uncovering the principles and processes of heritage construction. Since
then, the study of heritage has evolved and broadened as new elements
and approaches have been incorporated into analyses. As the climate in
which we study heritage has changed, so too, have our perceptions altered.

When we look to more recent works we can see that heritage still tends to be described in very loose, non-specific terms that continue to centre on the intangible aspects of heritage. At the same time these definitions are often seen to expand beyond the more traditional association with natural and cultural heritage to the point that they can "encompass broader societal elements that shape our everyday lives, including our systems of government, health care and the justice and educational systems" (Canadian Heritage 2001:3). Moreover, at this time we can also see other elements creeping into the characterisations of heritage as offered by various institutions and agencies. The sense of heritage operating within a much larger and fuller environment also begins to emerge. Here, for example, we begin to see elements such as the environment become incorporated into the understanding of heritage: "[t]he heritage..." says English Heritage, "is where culture meets the environment" (Brisbane and Wood 1996:4) whilst a university-based heritage programme defines its mandate as a means to "enhance our capability at the interface between cultural and environmental subjects" (Fladmark 1994:xx)

These two examples are indicative of the different perspectives from which heritage is currently being approached. Previously, the study of heritage tended to be undertaken primarily by archaeologists or by museum-based researchers. However, with the development of the discipline, heritage is now being analysed in departments of geography and archaeology, in business schools and in tourism programmes, to name just a few examples. Its brief is now much larger and more diverse and this is creating a significant impact on the way that we now interpret heritage.

What we do see, even with quite recent work, is that few researchers locate their investigations at the level of the specific, individual and material elements of heritage. However, lately there is some indication that there may be a move towards the integration of the tangible heritage.
Some of the more recent papers offer evidence that there may be a leaning towards offering more detailed examples of what components contribute towards the larger sense of heritage. In policy papers issued by English Heritage (2000) and the Department of Culture, Media and Sport (2001) we see a focus on what English Heritage refers to as “the historic environment” (2000). What both these agencies are discussing when they refer to the historic environment is, in effect, heritage and in this case the heritage of Britain. These papers sum up the historical environment as intangible qualities found in the “the contribution to the cultural and economic well-being of the nation” (English Heritage 2000:4) which is “part of the wider public realm in which we participate” (Department of Culture, Media and Sport 2001). More importantly, they also detail the specific, material components of the historic environment “from prehistoric monuments to great country houses, from medieval churches to the towns of the Industrial Revolution” (Department of Culture, Media and Sport 2001). Furthermore, in Power of Place (English Heritage 2000) we can see a significant amount of effort spent in emphasising the importance of the individual elements within the larger historical environment.

The Canadian Government takes this a step further and in a 2001 discussion paper: Canadians and their Heritage: Some Trends, Issues and Ideas. A Dialogue on Heritage in the 21st Century (2001), they not only list examples of the various material components of heritage, they also distinguish between those aspects which different groups might recognise. The Canadian government differentiates between what heritage means to Canadians (presumably “the public”) and what heritage means to “professional heritage practitioners” (Canadian Heritage 2001:3). For the first group heritage “evokes thoughts of a visit to a museum...images of historic buildings: churches, historic homes, unique architecture, forts, reconstructed settlements and villages, even underwater wrecks” and increasingly it represents “Canada’s incredible natural spaces, national parks, forests and seaside” (ibid). On the other hand, for the “professional practitioners” heritage is centred more in elements such as preservation,
artefacts, research, access, exhibitions which, in turn, includes such material things as: artefacts, archives, published heritage and cultural products, built heritage, sacred sites, archaeology (Canadian Heritage 2001:3).

As well as this new focus on the individual elements of the historic environments, there has been, in the last decade, a shift in heritage studies and in the perception of heritage. There are vestiges of the earlier cynicism to be seen but now heritage tends generally to be seen in a more positive light. The question “what is heritage?” is still around and still a focus of analysis; however, this tends to be couched in terms that imply the need to protect, celebrate and encourage. In England (for example), the heritage that is being (officially) celebrated is more diverse both in terms of the type and age. Not only are we now asking, “what is heritage?” but many are now also enquiring, “who it is for?” (Graham, Ashworth and Tunbridge 2000:5; BBC News website, 30 October 2000). The idea of memories is now being acknowledged in some quarters (ibid) as an important quality to heritage.

However, at the end of the day while there has been a change in the way we think of heritage it could be asked whether anyone has answered the question: “what is heritage?”. This, I believe, is a crucial first step in the process of coming to an understanding of heritage sites and of their nature and the role that they play in the construction of the past.

2.2.2 The Heritage Site. The Specific Focus

The preceding discussion of heritage, which may seem, on first glance, to be a digression, is in fact quite an important aspect of the consideration of just what characterises heritage sites. As we have noted above heritage and heritage sites are inextricably linked but it is more than that. Within this brief consideration of how heritage has been approached over the past twenty years lie clues to an evolution in the epistemology of heritage sites.
The idea of the *historic environment*—that sense of a larger entity made up of individual components—can be thought of as a step forward. However there is the remaining problem that recognition is only half of the battle. The focus will need to stay on the “individual species” (English Heritage 2000) in order that we will be better able to consider the defining characteristics and universal qualities of heritage sites.

This now brings us to the central issue of what a heritage site is. Herein lies the key issue and the problem that is central to this analysis. In short, currently there is no comprehensive definition or characterisation of a heritage site. A quick glance at the index of any of the major heritage-themed articles and books usually fails to produce a single entry for “heritage site”. Instead, one will find countless other terms including “heritage visitor attractions” (Leask and Yeoman 1999), “heritage centres” (Carman 2003; Howard 2003; Walsh 1992), “heritage experiences” (Millar 1999; Walsh 1992), “heritage experiences” Prentice (1991) and “heritage properties” (UNESCO: http://whc.unesco.org). At first, this might seem a pedantic splitting of hairs; after all, clearly all of the above terms refer to what most people would immediately recognise as heritage sites. However I suggest that this profusion of terms is symptomatic of the much deeper issue of a lack of understanding of what qualities characterise heritage sites.

Over the past twenty years there has been a considerable amount of thoughtful work focussed on the heritage site. As it stands, this statement may appear to be in direct contrast to those discussed in earlier sections of this chapter. In fact while there has been a considerable amount of work involving heritage sites it can be grouped under three major areas of research, which while they are each important, none is directed towards gaining a comprehensive and coherent definition of heritage sites.

In the first case we see that researchers investigating heritage sites have tended to concentrate their efforts on heritage sites as they are being created and whilst there are some exceptions to this (Corbin 2002) on the
whole because of the way that the investigations and analyses are structured what is really being discussed is a specific instance of the construction of heritage (ie the construction of the past in the present). This means that researchers, to date, have tended to focus on those processes of transformation (e.g. Baxter 1988) wherein elements of the past are selected out in order to be celebrated and/or marked as part of the larger group heritage. This is of immense value but it is not the same thing as understanding what heritage sites are and how they evolve and change over time.

The second trend involves those instances where there have been studies of established or extant heritage sites. Here it is the strategies of interpretation and notably those which occur in the face of changing social mores and an evolving historiography (Handler & Gable 1996; Lowenthal 1998:135; Uzzell and Ballantyne 1998; Walsh 1992:97) that tend to come under scrutiny. In this case what is coming under discussion is the way that the past is presented rather than an investigation of how the site itself is changing.

Finally, while the importance of heritage sites is widely acknowledged, it has not followed that they are universally acclaimed. Among the criticisms levelled against heritage sites is that because they represent only aspects of the past that have been selected out, heritage sites offer a false sense of the past and portray a frozen, synchronic view of the past. Furthermore, claim many authors, the very act of selection that creates the heritage site also removes certain parts of the past from the historical process and pulls them out of their larger context (e.g., Fowler 1989; Hewison 1987, 1988; Walsh 1997:137). Thus heritage sites, for some, are perceived as static entities (Blockey 1999:15; Lowenthal 1985:243) which have been removed from the landscape around them and “frozen” (Bender 1998:26). Shanks and Tilley (1992:84) go even further and typify one site (Beamish) as “an agent of blindness” which fails to offer insight into the past. Drawing on Roland Barthes’ work, Shanks and Tilley claim that “to locate history in sites, monuments, museums, uninhabited
places isolated from the present 'suppresses at one stroke the reality of the
land and that of its people, it accounts for nothing of the present, that is
nothing historical'" (1992:84). Still other authors, when discussing heritage
sites, will differentiate between places which grow up "naturally over time"
and the created spaces of heritage sites (Walsh 1992:103). Created
spaces, argues Walsh (1992:105), lack those daily activities—listed by
Hodder (1999:134) as including: "cutting down trees, moving earth,
respecting older houses, living in and using the buildings" that evoke a
sense of place and which give places their "true identity" (Walsh 1992:105).

Over time there has been a concerted effort to try and deal with
heritage sites as a group. Clearly researchers have recognised that there is
a need to be able to analyse these sites in a meaningful manner and as
such there have been attempts to develop an appropriate methodology. At
present there seem to be two main options available. In the first case the
solution has been either to limit the scope of research to a very small
category of sites and/or to impose strict criteria upon the sites under
investigation (c.f. Stone and Planel 1999:xix). Others, faced with the
problem of developing a coherent strategy have compiled a list of sites that
becomes so enormous that it becomes unwieldy. In this instance the range
of sites is so great that it becomes almost impossible to assess one site
against another. In an extreme case this will mean that virtually all sites
that can be deemed to offer any sort of experience involving "the past" will
be grouped together. For one set of authors (Leask and Yeoman 1999)
heritage sites come under the heading of "Heritage Visitor Attractions
(HVAs)". Leask and Yeoman appear to have an all-embracing vision of
heritage-based experiences which allows them to see these
places—HVAs—as "vary[ing] enormously in type and form, ranging from
small-scale, locally based properties that form the basis of a country's
tourism product." (Leask and Yeoman 1999:ix). In another author's list of
"Heritage Visitor Attractions" (ibid) along with a more conventional list of
places such as "open-air museums, heritage centres, historic centres" she
includes "garden centres, casinos and marinas" (Millar 1999:5). No doubt
in an attempt to make her list more manageable Millar further sorts her list of HVAs into four major categories of attraction:

(i) natural,
(ii) man-made [sic] but not originally designed primarily to attract visitors
(iii) man-made and purpose-built to attract tourists
(iv) special events

Within these groups are found sites that might be considered as more traditional sites such as cathedrals and churches, stately homes and monuments but they also includes less conventional places like amusement parks and markets and fairs (1999:5).

The other major approach—developing a set of strict criteria and/or limiting the study to a very small category of site—draws upon one of the more common methods used in the investigation of heritage sites: the laundry list. Here, heritage sites tend to be thought of as a recipe which is made up of a set of fixed ingredients. Based upon this, apparently similar sites are then compared to each other on the basis of shared attributes (et Stone and Planel 1999). One of the major drawbacks to this method is that because the list of ingredients is so rigid sites that otherwise may be suitable may be eliminated from an analysis because they fail to fulfil some or all of the criteria. This approach also tends to result in a lot of small and distinct categories which, again, make it hard to effect inter-site comparisons. Furthermore, I suspect that using a set of criteria that immediately excludes a significant number of the sample will mean that we limit our ability to achieve a greater understanding of the phenomenon of the heritage site.

Finally, even when the heritage sites in question are ones that tend to fall into more “traditional” or acknowledged groups, it is not always guaranteed that all sites will be evaluated in the same way. In one example Shanks and Tilley compare a period room, a “traditional” museum, Jorvik Viking Centre and an open-air museum (Shanks and Tilley 1992:69). In the absence of an established and overarching methodology what happens
in this analysis—as in many others—is that not all of the sites end up being assessed according to the same criteria. Even the words used to describe them are different; without a common language it is difficult to think of these sites as similar sorts of places.

2.3 Problems Associated with Current Definitions

The first problem which emerges out of the issues and approaches that we have discussed is that much of the dialogue surrounding heritage sites seek to illustrate their attributes by citing specific sites; i.e., one can define a particular sort of site by drawing on a known site in order to define another, perhaps seemingly similar site. Using this approach a site like the British Museum becomes the exemplar for “traditional” enclosed museums, Stonehenge for ancient monuments and Skansen a template for open-air museums. Therefore, rather than developing a set of criteria or expanding our current understanding of new sites, what happens is that a set of criteria specific to one type of heritage site is “recycled” and used as the marker by which to judge other places. The result is that heritage sites become distinguished not as distinctive entities each with their own personalities but rather as versions of one single foundation site. This approach virtually guarantees that research centred on heritage sites will not advance further beyond its present position.

A second issue centres on the two main methodologies that are presently in use. A quick look reveals some inherent flaws. For those researchers who rely upon a comprehensive list of all the different types of place that might be defined as a heritage site, the flaw lies in the lists (of places) that are constructed. Inevitably these lists come under dispute—what is clearly a heritage site in one researcher’s rubric, for another has no place in any “serious” study of heritage sites. The second approach, the laundry list, also has its failings. This method is so specific and heritage sites so diverse that even with the most thoughtful criteria, immediately a large number of sites tend to be excluded from analysis, or else exceptions need to be built into the analysis at the beginning. The laundry list is not a solution. Not only do we, as researchers, recognise that
sites which may share the same "ingredients" are somehow not the same, we also realise that trying to assess sites that can be very different in appearance and/or purpose is extremely difficult to achieve successfully. More to the point, the laundry list (or recipe) approach is simply a comparison of features and in no way does it assist in identifying and understanding the underlying structures and comprehending the processes which occur at heritage sites over time. Once again, these approaches, like so many others, rely on a case-by-case assessment where the focus is on the individual site.

Thirdly, there is a trend that sees the field split between heritage managers and those investigating heritage within the academy. This leads to a discontinuity in the way that heritage is understood. To begin to truly understand heritage and particularly for this current investigation, the gulf will need to be breached. A thoughtful, long view approach to management decisions, policies and daily undertakings can only be achieved with a full understanding of the heritage site as a cultural construct. A better theoretical understanding of the heritage site will lead to benefits for understanding how we (practically) identify, operate and present heritage sites. In essence, as a field of study we need to come together and integrate both applied and theoretical elements into a generalised and coherent sense of heritage and heritage sites.

Finally, as we have noted above, because (to date) heritage sites have tended to be defined against each other, there is no replicable means of characterising a site based upon its own individual qualities—on its "personality" if you will. Adopting this sort of approach hides the underlying structures and it means that we will continue to have a disjointed sense of both the purpose and the role of various types of heritage site. On the one hand, it means that we are unable to distinguish clearly the differences between those places which portray the past. On the other, we have an opposing school of thought that sees all heritages sites, including museums, "historical theme parks" and monuments as essentially the
same sort of phenomenon (Ashworth and Howard 1999:82)—this, despite an innate sense that these two places are quite different.

2.4 Conclusion

It must now be clear that the phenomenon of the heritage site is in need of a serious re-examination. As it stands the term must be re-evaluated and agreed upon before it will be able to offer a useful means of categorising and thinking about heritage sites. A central aim of this dissertation is to provide a coherent methodology and an overarching characterisation of the phenomenon of the heritage site so that future, instead of relying on a variety of apparently interchangeable, but not always obvious, alternative names we will be able to use this term “heritage site” in a meaningful and transparent manner.

The task, then, of the analysis contained within this dissertation is first to examine this idea of heritage sites as unique social spaces and as a cultural phenomenon. We need to begin by trying to comprehend how sites (as a group) “work” and ultimately, we need to achieve an understanding of how heritage sites as a prominent medium for conveying “experiences” of the past operate.
3.1. Heritagescape as Method

It is easy, when thinking of the heritagescape, to forget that it is not only an explanatory concept, i.e., a new and flexible means of considering sites but that it is also a methodology for applying the idea of the heritagescape and its guiding principles to heritage sites, in order that we are able to understand how they “work”. This is a critical aspect of the heritagescape as without a structure and a methodology behind it this idea is liable to fall into the trap of older analyses where it would become no more than a descriptive aid. In other words, the heritagescape would exist simply as an interesting way to think about heritage sites but would lack any concrete means of analysis and assessment.

In this chapter we will look primarily at the means and criteria by which the concept of heritagescape is applied to heritage sites. The discussion, therefore, will centre on the criteria used to analyse individual sites and the techniques of fieldwork that were employed. It will also detail the selection process by which particular sites were chosen as case studies. First, however, there will be a short introduction to the theoretical approach that governed the fieldwork and the subsequent analysis. What is not included in this chapter is a description of individual sites; this can be found in Appendix I.

Before moving on to discuss the study group it is first necessary to locate this analysis within a larger context of intellectual thought. To do this it is important to discuss briefly the sorts of theoretical approaches that have been drawn upon and which have directed some of the approaches taken in this investigation. In this sort of undertaking, it is important that the ideas governing the analysis remain flexible and fairly broad. Ultimately, this meant that a number of different sources were drawn upon.
3.2 Theoretical Approaches Governing the Research

Thinking of the heritage site as a landscape has very much influenced this analysis. This sense of a heritage site as a landscape is not unique and in recent years a number of researchers have—at very least—begun to explore this notion and have tried to incorporate it into their work (e.g., Corbin 2002). Of these, geographer Paul Rodaway and his work with “themescapes” (1994:164) has offered the most developed sense of “scapes”. Importantly, Rodaway does recognise heritage sites (or “areas”) as one example of what he characterises as “visual geographies”—highly experiential and heavily iconic spaces that rely on strong visual cues to give (particularly in the case of themescapes) a sense of a “coherent wholeness” (1994:166). Unfortunately, Rodaway never moves the idea of the themescape too far away from theme parks and film-set landscapes and tends to characterise these spaces as never “anything other than escapism” (Rodaway 1994:167). As such, his ideas—while useful—simply are not comprehensive enough to address the complicated qualities and nature of heritage sites. Even Rodaway fails to grasp fully the complexity and individuality of heritage sites as unique social spaces. Furthermore, no one (to date) has been able to adequately account for important and ongoing processes that accompany heritage sites as they evolve over time. Somehow, even when the idea of the heritage site-as-landscape has been included in an analysis and even with the most thoughtful work, it has tended to remain as a synchronic concept rather than a diachronic approach. What is novel about the heritagescape, in contrast to previous work, is the way in which the analytical concept of landscape as a social construction is applied to the question of what qualities affect the heritage site as a convincing and coherent entity.

A heritage site is made up more than simply the tangible landscape: the “visit” itself is a critical element that, together with the physical components, creates a unique social space. The interaction between the site and the individuals and groups who come to the site and move through
the physical landscape is highly experiential and one out of which meaning (of place and identity) is derived. The heritagescape is just one such region where the "geographical experience" has begun in a specific place—in this case the heritage site—and has "reached out" (Tilley 1994:15), creating the unique experiential qualities and meanings encountered at a heritage site. Understanding how the experience and/or the illusion of the site is conveyed and, in turn, how the experience is "meaningful" is an essential part of this methodology.

This sense of the heritagescape clearly hearkens back to phenomenological approaches that have been used by a number of researchers (notably Tilley 1994) to investigate landscapes. Just as obviously, phenomenology is a complex set of ideas and not all of it applies to this investigation. What is key to this analysis are two aspects of phenomenology: first, the sense of a dynamic, experiential landscape and second, the relationship and interaction of an individual (or individuals) experience—in all ways and senses—to that landscape as they move through different physical spaces and places.

Angela Piccini (1999: passim) characterises this as a need to grasp the "embodied" experience of being in the world—in this instance, "the world" being the heritage site. However, capturing that experience in a way that is replicable and is "measurable" is not only difficult it is also a critical aspect of the methodology of the heritagescape. The problem is not unique to this particular method and has been encountered by researchers across the social sciences (e.g., Agrostino and de Peréz 2000). Achieving objectivity in circumstances where the researcher must act (in varying degrees) as both a participant in and a chronicler of the experience is never straight-forward. Not the least of the problems encountered here is the issue of personal bias and its potential effects on the data. Agrostino and de Peréz commenting on the process of observation (as tool) note that it is both a "measure of the observable data" and the type and the quality of the recording process that counterbalances the negative aspects (arising
out of personal bias) and allows the findings to be recognised and evaluated by others (2000:676).

Finally, it also bears mention that while the field methods used to identify the heritagescape mean that the analyst has a dual role of participant and observer—who like the other visitors will be experiencing an encounter with a past (and perhaps previously unknown)—the methods used in this research should never be thought of as a conventional participant-observer (or even observer as participant) approach to fieldwork (Agrostino and de Peréz 2000:676). Nonetheless, participant observation has generated a substantial body of literature that addresses many of the theoretical and practical issues and debates surrounding observation as a method and it is that strength which offers the greatest contribution to the methodology of the heritagescape.

These theoretical approaches and their implications and influences on this study will be discussed (in passing) within the body of the dissertation as they arise. Further and more detailed discussion will occur in the concluding chapter as the methodology of the heritagescape is evaluated in light of the findings arising out of this analysis.

3.3 Case studies. Selection of study group

In the following section the discussion will focus on the particular type of heritage sites that are being used as the control group for this analysis. In the following pages much of the discussion will focus on open-air museums; however, it must be kept in mind that that the idea of the heritagescape applies to all established heritage sites. Ultimately what we are trying to get at is what characterises heritage sites and what makes them "work". What sets the idea of the heritagescape apart from previous analyses is that it can be applied to a multitude of sites and does not simply focus on one type of site placed in opposition to another.

Given the enormous number of heritage sites currently in existence, it is well beyond the scope of a project such as this to attempt to investigate all the different kinds of heritage sites. The heritagescape is
predicated on the belief that there are (a) universal qualities that characterise heritage sites and (b) that is possible to identify the underlying processes and structures that are common to all heritage sites. Therefore, based on this assumption, the choice of the type of site used for a case study should not unduly influence the final results. It also means that it is not necessary to look at many different kinds of site and one sample group can offer sufficient and representative data.

Open-air museums offer several advantages that make them ideal subjects for this analysis. Whilst the criteria are involved and will be detailed at greater length below, open-air museums have been chosen as the focus of this research, in part, because they have unique qualities that will allow the exploration of issues central to this analysis. Key among these qualities is that, as institutions, they are constructed as experiential places where visitors are able to move through the site with the illusion of remaining in a specific landscape of the past.

In addition to their important experiential qualities, practically, open-air museums have several attributes that make them useful as case studies. Chief among them is:

(i) **Open-air museums are found throughout the world.** This factor means that a large and diverse sample of sites may be drawn upon to provide case studies. While open-air museums occur globally, the specific traditions found in different countries have developed out of a set of unique catalysts. This, coupled with the available body of sites, should ensure that that any results which may be due to individual cultural and/or temporal factors may be readily identified.

(ii) **Open-air museums are well-established institutions.** It is vital, when studying ongoing processes, that the sites are of a certain age—in this case they must be old enough to have undergone at

---

1 These institutions go by a variety of names (including folk museums, folk life museums and living history sites). In part, these terms are a by-product of the age and region of the world in which they are located; however, the terminology and understanding of these places—like heritage sites—is diffuse. For purposes of clarity throughout the course of this paper I will refer to them as 'open-air museums' with the understanding that in this context this is an inclusive term that embraces those sites mentioned above.
least one major episode of change (alteration) in order that we can see the site as an evolving landscape. Long-term processes will only become apparent over time and with changes in the physical landscape of the site.

(iii) **Open-air museums tend to be large scale and multi-component sites.** In order that change be readily recognised by those who visit the museum, a site will need to be of large enough scale and have a significant number of components. Both of these attributes are important to the analysis and both relate specifically to the guiding principle of cohesion. In the case of the latter attribute, a site must have enough components (primarily but not exclusively these will consist of structures and artefacts) to form a recognisable landscape. In terms of scale, it is important that the experience of “stepping back” or “stepping into” the past is complete. Simply put, there must be enough of the site (landscape) for visitors to be able to engage fully with it.

In short, as a body of sites, open-air museums have the rare quality of offering all of the qualities mentioned above and, also, offering a wide range of features, making them one of the most complex and diverse sets of heritage site. Other sites—whether historically-themed attraction, traditional museum or archaeological park (to name just a few)—may offer several or many of the above-mentioned features; however, none of them are able to offer the range of variables that are found in open-air museums. In some instances other types of sites may be limited to a small number of regions, may be too recent in their development or simply may lack the huge number of sites that one finds with open-air museums. Further, while open-air museums do go by a variety of names and are not always described and/or perceived in the same way; nonetheless, on the whole they are better understood and more widely recognised than many of the other types of heritage sites. Finally, these places hold a well-established position within the museum and heritage studies literature.

3.3.1 **Open-air Museums: background and history**
As we have seen elsewhere the sort of sites that are the focus of this analysis are known by a variety of names and definitions. This wide range of terms by which open air museums are known all give some clue that there are individual and important differences to each of these places. For the most part there are very good reasons why each of these similar institutions (including eco-museums, folk museums and living history sites) is identified as a specific type of site. Sometimes, these names hint at the geographical or cultural background of the place in question; it is much more common, for example, to find “folk museums” in European contexts than it is in North America. Likewise, eco-parks, which tend to be found mostly in France, not only portray the past, they also tend to have an environmental/ecological mandate. While there may be excellent reasons for assigning a particular term to one site, it nonetheless often means that with the different categories come different expectations and different means of discussing a site or sites. Sites which have “museum” somewhere in their description (i.e. open-air museum, folk museum) tend to be considered in a certain way as the word museum comes with a set of understandings relating to portrayal and display of the past. On the other hand, other places known simply as a “site” or which simply use their brand name as an identifier may not come with the overtones of education and may be open to different sorts of expectations. By the same token, these expectations are not limited to visitors. Various factors, including the establishment of separate museums (read: “traditional”, enclosed and displayed-based spaces) within a site, suggests that individual institutions also have a definite, and often differing, view of their role in portraying the past.

In part, this question of the names, terms and categories that are used to define such sites is an issue that relates to tourism and the position that open-air museums and other heritage sites occupy within the array of places that offer entertainment within the framework of portraying the past. At the moment, we will simply leave this issue for a later discussion in the concluding chapters and merely note that there is, in the minds of visitors
and researchers alike, a certain predisposition and/or expectation of what they will encounter at a place that has much to do with the terms with which it chooses to identify itself.

Throughout this dissertation I have chosen to use one term: open-air museum. This is simply for clarity and should be considered as a form of shorthand for all the different names by which these sites are known. As institutions open-air museums are well-considered entities and within the literature there exists a wide variety of names and definitions (Ashworth and Howard 1999:82; Leask and Yeoman 1999:iix; Stone and Planel 1999:2; Trinder 1984:88). As a rule, like heritage sites, they tend to be defined by an assortment of definitions most of which are based upon a fairly rigid set of requirements. Again, like heritage sites, open-air museums tend to be recognised intuitively but are much more difficult to define explicitly. Among the current descriptions on offer, Terence Young (2002:158n) distinguishes between amusement parks which are "synchronic venues...where the entire place exists at no particular time and, living museums, anachronistic sites...where the place is supposed to be a section of the past in the present". For the moment and for clarity's sake I will borrow from Matelic (1988:79) a very broad definition of an open-air museum as a place which "utili[ses] a combination of buildings, objects and open space to communicate their message to the public". Obviously the subject is much more complex than this but Matelic's definition is useful in that it provides a basis for identification and subsequent discussion and analysis of these particular places.

In the discussion below it will become apparent that not all authors define open-air museums in the same way and in those cases particular care will be taken to establish the context. It should also be noted that as the following is primarily a background and a history to the open-air museum movement, it will be somewhat limited and will focus on sites that have been customarily thought of and/or established in the tradition of open-air museums. This means that a number of closely related and very important sites will not be discussed within the context of this chapter. In
many ways this is one more illustration of the problems that occur with the current definitions and understandings of open-air museums and other heritage sites. This will be remedied in other chapters when once again the discussion is expanded outwards to look at heritage sites in general.

In an effort to develop a definition and a better understanding of open-air museums one author, Barrie Trinder (1984:88), identifies three types of open-air museum:

1. **Open-Air Museum.** “Essentially a collection of buildings that have been removed from their original sites and re-erected within an enclosed museum”;

2. **Site Museum.** “An in-situ monument which is presented to the public, possibly with the addition of some introductory and supplementary displays”;

3. **Network Museum.** “A relatively large area, in which many people live, work and follow their daily lives, containing a series of conserval features with an integrated system of interpretation”.

While there are problems with this set of definitions, Trinder’s categories are nonetheless interesting for a number of reasons. First, that Trinder felt the need to subdivide open-air museums is telling and illustrates the varied functions, forms and the complexity of these places. Second, by using the terms “open-air museum” both as sub-category of museum and also as an overall classification he illustrates the vast overlap in sites and demonstrates the pitfalls in trying to develop rigid lists. Finally by using the terms “museum” and “open-air museum” ambiguously and often interchangeably, he highlights the absence of standardisation and the general lack of understanding that is currently dogging this area of research.

**Case Study Areas: A Brief Background History**

Skansen, the Swedish folk museum located in 75 acres of parkland in Stockholm, is the oldest open-air museum in the world. Established in 1891 it was set up as a folk museum which preserved traditional Swedish lifeways and which protected traditional buildings and artefacts that were
threatened by modernisation. Today it is a multi-component site consisting of both parkland (with rare breeds of animals and plants, a zoo and an aquarium) and of 150 structures that make up a number of farmsteads and areas from the 18th through the 20th centuries. Its website (www.skansen.se) advertises that Skansen is “Sweden in miniature”. Skansen now stands as the exemplar and as the template of open-air museums and sites all over the world.

While the open-air tradition throughout the world can all be linked back to Skansen and perhaps even more broadly to Scandinavian antecedents, it is important to look at how that tradition is manifested in different areas. Whether the end product of cultural or temporal influences, “every museum is a reflection of the society which creates it as well as that which it portrays” (Trinder 1984:88) and, thus, each will have particular characteristics that are unique to the region in which an individual museum is found.

**Northern Europe and Scandinavia** Of the three regions that we will examine, the Scandinavian tradition of open-air museums is the oldest. As the first open-air museum, Skansen was used as a template not only for later museums in this area but also throughout the world. In some languages, open-air museums are referred to as “skansens” reflecting their origins and heritage.

After Skansen opened in 1891 we find that several more similar type museums and parks open up rather quickly in the course of the next twenty years. The majority of museums in these countries can trace their antecedents back to the latter years of the nineteenth century or to the first decade of the twentieth century. Each of the Scandinavian countries has at least a couple of examples of open-air/folk museums and most have many more. In Northwest Europe open-air museums form a significant portion of the sum total of museums and heritage sites in each country. Amongst those countries with a particularly strong tradition are the Netherlands and Germany with Belgium also well represented by a number of long-established open-air sites. It should also be noted that many of the
museums in France are known by a distinct name and tend to be viewed from a slightly separate perspective (c.f. Davis 1999). These "eco-museums" often may be characterised by an involvement of the public in their creation and by a focus on a specific locality (many are located on their "original" site). Some authors (e.g. Howard 2002:63; Walsh 1992:163) suggest that eco-museums can be characterised as "a museum of place" and that they are distinct in their mandate to integrate several fields (archaeology, museology, social history, natural history, geology etc) into the interpretation. Without dwelling on these specific types of outdoor site, it is worth a mention that as we delve into the descriptions of eco-museums it becomes immediately apparent that there is an overlap with characterisations of other types of site. Here again emerges the issue of not being able to offer a distinct (and workable) description of various kinds of place.

Turning back to European open-air museums we can see that there is a very strong trend towards the portrayal of an agrarian past. Further, many of these sites offer a celebration of folk traditions and cultures found in each different area (Chappell 2002:122; Harris 1993:2). What is perhaps notable is that whilst the North American and British sites tend to locate the past they portray within a very discrete area and may represent something as large as a county (e.g. Beamish offers "town" and "country" areas whilst Blists Hill portrays both rural/urban and industry/agriculture) they, nonetheless, more often locate their interpretation in more finite geographical areas. European museums tend to cover a much larger remit and many—like Skansen or Den Gamle By—will offer a representation of all or most of their respective countries.

The catalyst for preserving the old structures and traditions in Europe and Scandinavia can be linked to a period of increasing industrialisation and, in many cases, a surge in national identity as new political structures emerged (c.f. Conan 2002:96; Rvan 2001:personal communication). In many cases this trend was linked to movements among intellectuals, artists and other reformers who focussed their gaze on what
was becoming a fast disappearing past (Conan 2002:97). As such, it is not surprising that many of these museums are tied to a specific founding figure: Skansen to Arthur Hazelius, a professor of German history; Den Gamle By to Peter Holm and Bokrijk to Jozef Weyns. Many times this figure was a professor or teacher who for a variety of reasons set about protecting or preserving the past (Harris 1993:1). In America, with perhaps the single exception of Greenfield Village, which was both conceived of and financed by Henry Ford, most of the figures associated with American museums take on the role of donor. As we will see below John D. Rockefeller Junior was much engaged with the restoration of Colonial Williamsburg; however, this came about as a result of another man’s vision. In short, this personalised vision and creation of a (open-air) museum is very much a characteristic of open-air sites in Western Europe. Finally, in terms of an operating structure the Scandinavian and Northwestern Europe traditions of open-air museums are most similar to the Canadian and the British museums and are run as public and/or government institutions.

**United Kingdom.** Open-air museums in the United Kingdom all tend to date to the 1960s or early 1970s. St Fagans, The Welsh Folklife Museum in Cardiff, which was established in 1948, is the most notable exception to this trend.

The development of the British tradition of open-air museums, like its European counterpart, can be located in a set of specific political and cultural circumstances. In one author’s words, this can be summarised as a twentieth-century conservation movement which comes about as a result of “the loss of empire, substantial changes in artistic taste, a certain delight in eccentricity and a sense that many features which had been characteristic of British society for generations were on the point of disappearing.” (Trinder 1984:88). This, and the subsequent rise of heritage sites (including open-air museums) in the United Kingdom in the late 1970s and 1980s, is well documented by several authors including, most notably, Robert Hewison (1987) and Patrick Wright (1985).
Many authors recognise that there are, within Britain, two main groups of open-air museums: sites which have a particular industrial focus and those that have come about as a "response to the destruction of vernacular buildings" (Thomas 1988:68). Finally, there is some suggestion that English open-air museums are different to those in Ireland, Scotland and Wales (Thomas 1988: 68). These latter countries, it is contended, are closer to the European folk tradition whilst the English museums with their focus on industry and vernacular architecture are deemed to be a separate and unique tradition (Thomas 1988: 68). Whether this is so, is not clear; however, it cannot be denied that within the British tradition there is a particular focus on industry that is not seen elsewhere in the world. Two of the United Kingdom’s largest and better-known open-air museums, Beamish (Co. Durham) and Blists Hill, (Ironbridge) both focus on the theme of nineteenth-century industrial Britain.

Within the United Kingdom there is another large group of sites made up of places that concentrate on vernacular buildings. Many of these also have a component of experimental archaeology and/or building technology as part of their research and education brief. Better-known sites of this type include the Weald and Downland Museum (Chichester), and Butser (Hampshire). Often, these museums can be quite regionalised and have come about through local “enthusiasts” responding to the threat of destruction of buildings (Thomas 1988:68). Here the focus is on preservation and conservation and the site may be little more than a museum of buildings (Harris 1993:6; Howard 2002:67; Thomas op. cit.; Williams 1993:375). Although site interpretation is not a focal point of this analysis it should be noted that within the British tradition, until the last decade or so, there has been a tendency to shy away from costumed interpretation or historical tableaux. This does not mean that there have not been notable examples of costumed interpreters but their absence is often a distinguishing feature of British sites.

North America. The open-air tradition in North America tends to be somewhat older than that in the United Kingdom. Open-air museums in the
United States start to be established in the late 1920s and 1930s with those in Canada generally a little later and dating, with some key exceptions, to the late 1960s. As with the other regions under analysis these variations can be linked to certain, individual circumstances within each of these two countries.

While there are a number of American open-air museums that are operated by state or local history societies or even the National Parks Service (NPS)—a federal government agency—many are privately owned and operate as educational non-profit institutions. This stands in contrast to a number of European countries that have a national and/or public ownership of open-air museums. In part, this tradition has developed out of the very earliest days of American open-air museums that gained their financial support from leading industrialists of the day. Two of the United States' largest open-air museums, Colonial Williamsburg and Greenfield Village, were supported by two of America's leading figures of industry: John D. Rockefeller Jr and Henry Ford.

Although the late 1930s in the United States was a period of economic depression it was also a period that saw past ways of life (buildings, traditions, even towns) fast disappearing in the face of modernisation and industrialisation. Henry Ford was typical of the mindset of Depression-era America and, intent on capturing a simpler, happier time, he went about collecting structures that represented this. Buildings now on site at Greenfield Village include his family homestead, homes of notable and noble Americans and even new buildings recreated out of old (unrelated) materials that represent places from his childhood.

Today there are open-air museums in every region of the United States. These museums portray a variety of different aspects of the past and "...come in all sizes, shapes and themes. They can be farmsteads, re-created villages, industrial sites, mining or lumbering towns, forts or military sites, maritime sites, religious communities or archaeological sites" (Matelic 1988:79).
In Canada the tradition varies both in time and in the impetus for creation of these sites. As a broad rule the older sites tend to be found in the eastern half of the country where settlement occurred first. Many open-air museums in Canada are forts or fur-trade sites with a smaller number of “domestic” sites centred around nineteenth-century “pioneer” settlements. As in Europe and the United Kingdom almost all of the sites in Canada are publicly owned: either by local or provincial agencies or by Parks Canada, an arm of the federal government.

Finally, the establishment of a great number of sites in Canada can be linked back to the period around 1967 when Canada celebrated the centennial of the confederation of provinces and territories into the (then) Dominion of Canada. As in the United States, in Canada, open-air museums are noted for their variety of themes portrayed and in the emphasis on public and costumed interpretation.

3.4 Methodology of the Heritagescape

The selection of a site as a case study and its subsequent analysis exists at two different levels: *inter site* and *intra site*. Inter site criteria have been established as a means to ensure first that there is adequate representation of the many different types of sites and that they span the full range of cultural, temporal and geographical variables. The second level of criteria, intra site, is much more site specific and offers a set of data by which to assess the individual attributes of a site. This methodology differs from the “laundry list” approach in that the intra-site criteria is a means simply of determining which elements are present or absent at an individual case study site. In this way, it will be ensured that all sites are being assessed using the same criteria. It is the assessment of these individual elements (which will probably appear to be very different at each site) and the application of the guiding principles as a constant that will ensure that all the sites are being considered and analysed in equivalent terms. In other words, the emphasis is on the similarities between sites.
(rather than the differences) but also allows the distinct personalities of each site to emerge.

3.4.1 Inter-site Criteria

Potential case studies will be drawn from the body of institutions that identify themselves as and/or are commonly recognised to be open-air museums, living history sites and folk life museums.

Case studies have been chosen based upon three gross categories:

1. GEOGRAPHICAL REGION
2. AGE
3. SCALE

These three categories form the set of inter-site criteria and will determine the available body of sites from which individual case studies will be drawn. In turn, these inter-site criteria will allow the model to be tested in a coherent and replicable manner. Further discussion of these inter-site criteria can be found below.

i. Geographical Criteria

The sample has been drawn from three major geographical areas: North America, the United Kingdom (primarily England) and North-western Europe. Each of these three areas has a well-established tradition of open-air museums and, while there are similarities between these traditions, the catalyst for and the development of these institutions is unique to the individual region. As well, in each of these three regions the open-air museum tradition has taken hold to such an extent that there are a large number of sites, thereby, ensuring a large and diverse sample. The latter point is critical as it will help to determine whether any trends that might be seen on an inter-site level are due to cultural or temporal factors or whether they highlight the processes that are the focus of this research.

ii. Temporal Criteria

This category addresses both the age (of establishment) of the museum and also the issue of the time period(s) that is/are presented by the museum. Both aspects are fundamental in understanding the criteria imposed upon the selection of sites.
There has been considerable work that has focussed on the heritage site (and specifically the open-air museum) as it has been created (e.g., Merriman 2000:302). Many of the processes that accompany this transition have been identified and well documented. What has not been adequately investigated is the impact that change, in its many forms, has upon the landscape of an open-air museum or heritage site. The latter is a focus of this analysis.

To look at the ongoing processes of an established open-air museum, sites that are of a "certain age" will be used in this analysis. Having said that, I do not believe that it would be helpful to impose an absolute date in order to determine inclusion. Open-air museums were established at different periods in the three regions and an absolute date in one area would not be applicable to another. It is critical that any site that is chosen is of such an age that it has had a chance to undergo at least one major period of documented change (alteration). There is no way to develop a formula to characterise change in this sense; however, it is important that the alteration is of such a scale that it be readily recognised by those who visit the site as well as the institution itself. Likewise, in order to be considered for inclusion in this analysis a site needs to be old enough so that the processes of change can be tracked over time. As such, it would be unusual to include sites that are less than a decade old. Most case study sites will tend to have been established at a much earlier date (e.g., Skansen (1891); Colonial Williamsburg (1931); Blists Hill (1967). What is important is that enough time has elapsed for the site to have become established within its geographical and cultural environment and that it has become recognised and established within the minds of those who interact with it.

Importantly, within the three areas selected for this study, there are differences in the development of the onset of the tradition of open-air museums. The initial creation of open-air museums in each of the major areas dates to distinct periods and develops out of individual traditions. As we have seen, the Scandinavian and North-western European tradition is
earliest, beginning with the folk life movement in the late nineteenth century/early twentieth century. Within North America, the American tradition is earlier and dates to the 1930s and 1940s while in Canada most of the sites tend to emerge in the late 1960s. Finally, the British tradition overlaps slightly with the Canadian with some sites dating to the 1960s but several more dating to the late 1970s and 1980s. As such, these three areas offer a comprehensive survey of some of the major traditions and catalysts that lead to the development of open-air/living history museums.

The second temporal aspect concerns the period(s) of the past that is portrayed by the individual open-air museum. There has been a tendency to compare sites of a similar period; i.e., one prehistoric settlement with another prehistoric settlement. However, I suggest that this is unnecessary and merely complicates the analysis. If, as I suggest, there are universal processes and qualities to open-air museums, then it should be possible to identify these regardless of the historical time period represented.

iii. Scale criteria

The conditions outlined above dictate sites that are, by necessity, physically large and, more importantly, have enough components that the processes of change can be adequately tracked at the level of individual elements. As with the question of age, it is not helpful to prescribe a minimum size for sites. What must be taken into consideration is that the site has enough components (primarily structures but also artefacts and property) for the site itself to form a recognisable landscape. Again, an important aspect of this is that the site is of such a size that the experience of “entering into” or “stepping back into” the past is complete. This idea of “going back into” the past is fundamental to open-air museums and is, in some respects, what distinguishes the landscape and purpose of an open-air museum from that of a restored or historic city centre (this will be discussed in more detail when we return to this point in the concluding chapter). In order to experience fully this phenomenon of “going back” into the past, there must be enough of a landscape within the open-air museum.
so that visitors can engage with it. This suggests that very small museums will not, as a rule, be included in this study. However given that most established open-air museums tend to be relatively large, multi-component sites it is not anticipated that this will impact the analysis.

3.4.2 Intra-site Criteria

As noted above there is, within the larger set of criteria required to create a data set, a further set of variables—those that exist at the level of the site—that must be considered. This is a key point as it is here, at the site level, that analysis will take place and where the processes that accompany these sites will be most readily identified. Even before that, there are two questions that immediately present themselves. The first is a return to that overarching question of what it is that characterises an open-air museum. As we have seen, to date, the solution has been to draw up a rigid list of criteria that has then been imposed upon a site. This has clearly not been successful.

The second question is more specific to this research and revolves around the heritagescape as a method and how it is implemented. As described earlier the concept of the heritagescape is based upon the consideration of the three factors: boundaries, cohesion and visibility. However, the question remains how to identify these factors at the level of the site in such a way that is coherent, replicable and apparent to others. Many of the elements that will aid in identifying a factor like cohesion are evident at an intuitive level and once again we return to the key issue of how we translate this innate sense of recognition into a concrete and observable set of data. In many ways this is the most difficult aspect of this project. To answer this is to begin to understand the open-air museum and to understand the open-air museum is the first step in a better understanding of heritage sites as a particular cultural phenomenon. The intra-site methodology presented below is offered as a means to resolve this issue.

Before we discuss the intra-site methodology in detail there is one other critical aspect of the site-level analysis that must be considered. It is
important to understand that each individual site exists in two realms: the physical site and the envisioned (or ideological) site. This sense of a site in two (or more) parts is a departure from most of the previous research that has tended to view sites from the outside and to conceive of them as largely homogeneous places (e.g., Prentice 1991 passim).

Returning to the intra site methodology, the physical site is primarily centred on the material aspects of the site and is concerned with how the site appears in a physical/material way to an observer and/or visitor. As defined for this research, the envisioned site lies largely (but not exclusively) within the domain of the museum and its staff. Here is where an understanding of what the site was planned to be, used to be and may be in the future may be gained. This aspect sometimes overlaps with the physical site when staff consider current or future plans for the museum. However this overlap does not appear to be a significant factor in the analysis.

3.4.2.1 THE PHYSICAL SITE

The scope of this research does not stretch to visitor surveys. To undertake this along with the other analyses would be time consuming and potentially confusing. At this stage, I believe that any data which might result from that technique would not warrant the effort. As a result of this decision much of the determination of the physical site is gained through observation. While it may appear that the best approach would be to use a set of rigidly defined criteria—in essence a list on which items could be checked off—this hearkens back to the problems encountered in earlier analyses. Instead, I propose a similar but more flexible set of guidelines: a set of "site criteria" by which to evaluate the site

1. LIMITS OF THE SITE
2. SIGNAGE (INFORMATION)
3. PHYSICAL LAYOUT OF THE SITE
4. INTERPRETATIVE MATERIALS

Within each of these four "site criteria" there exists a set of standard questions that will guide the observer and will ensure that, in the future,
another can approach the site and evaluate it under the same terms. In turn, the data emerging out of the on-site analysis will be reconsidered in light of the guiding principles that make up the heritagescape.

To fulfil the site criteria will necessitate in-depth site visits and a complete photographic record. In this way it will be possible to track the observations of the observer.

i. Limits of the Site

This aspect is concerned first and foremost with the idea of boundaries. In order to investigate this criterion, a considerable amount of information will be obtained from the site itself: namely, the buildings, properties, paths and objects. However, an important component is the presentation of the site and most particularly the guide maps of the sites. As part of this aspect it is critical to ascertain where and in what form the map(s) is presented.

The main components of this category are as follows:

• How are the site boundaries manifested?
   Are the edges/limits of the site clearly visible and/or obvious? Is there an attempt to make the elements that mark the boundary “fit in” or are they modern, functional components?

• Internally is there a liminal area or a buffer zone around the edges of the site?
   How do these zones appear? Are they empty or unused? If used, for what purpose? Is this a place where one “goes out” of the experience? How permeable are the boundaries in these zones?

• Externally does a buffer zone exist?
   What is the relationship of the site with the immediate environment? Is there a transition to the “outside”? What does the surrounding environment look like—is it sympathetic to the site? Have efforts been made to exclude or include the surrounding area?

• Internal Divisions
   What form do these divisions take: fences, walls, natural barriers (e.g. a body of water)? What purpose do these divisions serve? Are
they a means of visitor management or traffic control, do they represent past boundaries or are they a means to separate one interpretative area (temporal, cultural or geographical) from another? Are they a means to demarcate the public part of the site from the private (closed) areas of the museum?

ii. Physical Layout of Site

Here, once again, we are concerned with boundaries but this category is all-encompassing and includes both of the other two aspects of the guiding principles: cohesion and visibility.

• How is the site physically depicted?

Is there an attempt to recreate a whole environment? Are secondary elements (e.g., gas lamps, hitching posts, fields etc.) portrayed or is the past evoked primarily through the arrangement of structures? Does the site have discernible areas—can the centre (core) be readily discerned? To what extent are streets or pathways (re)created? Are these concentrated in the middle of the site? Does the site appear full and/or complete? Does the site (visually) differentiate between “original”, “restored” “copy” or “reconstruction”? In cases where there are visible reminders of an older (or different) site how is this reconciled with the current site?

• Where is the site located?

Is the site removed or separated out from its surroundings in any way? If the site is situated on its original location where is it located vis a vis the original site or settlement? If this is a relocated site does the location relate in any way to the past that is being portrayed?

• Movement through the site.

Is there a clear route or routes through the site? Is this evident? Are routes based on past examples or are they modern components designed for museological purposes? Is there a hierarchy of routes manifested in the physical layout?

• Structures.
Are structures accessible i.e., can visitors enter them or does the site rely on “facades”? Do interiors match exteriors? Are the interiors made up of period rooms or of exhibition space? Do interiors “fit” with the outside of the building? How much of the site is inaccessible (private)? How much space within the site itself is reserved for non-public museum purposes? How are facilities such as toilets, catering or space for educational purposes incorporated into the site itself? Where are all of these located relative to the main area of the site?

• Visitor Centre.

Is there a visitor centre? What role does it play in the site? Does one need to enter via this facility? Is the visitor centre mandatory? Is the visitor centre located at the beginning or end of the site? What facilities are located here: museum, shop, classrooms, audio-visual presentation etc? If there is not a visitor centre how is the entrance to the site portrayed? How does one enter the site?

iii. Signage

This is an important factor and can be an immediate clue to questions such as traffic patterns through the site, limits or interpretative value. Signs can also contribute to the overall “feeling” or cohesion of the site.

• Location of Signs.

Are signs or notices present in the site itself or are they limited to the outside or orientation areas? If in both areas is there a difference in the style, placement or content?

• Appearance and Type of Sign.

Are signs used to “set the scene”: are they historical or old in appearance? Is there an attempt to camouflage utilitarian or directional signs (e.g., no exit, danger, private) so that they “blend” with the environment. Are signs permanent? Are signs information conveying—do they aid in the interpretation? If so, is the content factual (historical), anecdotal or both?
iv. Interpretative Materials

This category may also be drawn upon for information relating to the envisioned site. Often within guidebooks or other materials there can be found a description of the site that will aid in identifying what the museum believes about or hopes that its visitors will recognise in the site. As these materials usually contain many images and graphics they can be invaluable in determining site limits as perceived by the institution. Likewise clues to cohesion may be found within the maps and written material.

• Availability of Material.

Is a guide and/or a map given out at beginning of the visit? Is the map available to all visitors? If not, are guides/maps available for purchase? Does the site rely on free-standing maps (e.g., on signs)? Where are these located within the site? How does it relate to signage i.e., are road signs or a similar device used to direct or locate people?

• Maps, Site Guides.

What are the boundaries as portrayed on the map? Is the map of the site alone or does it also portray surroundings? What elements are included here? What additional information is visible on the map that is not available through other sources on-site? Is there a prescribed route through the site? Is change, construction or updating acknowledged within the site material?

• Other Interpretative Material (Movies, Audio-tours, Museum Displays).

Is a movie, slide show or audio tour a mandatory aspect of the site tour? If so, what information is conveyed? Is the time-span described in the interpretative material the same as the site portrayed? Is the site located within the larger past and/or within the larger environment or is it isolated? How do museum displays relate to the site?

3.4.2.2 THE ENVISIONED SITE

Information pertaining to the envisioned or ideological site is gleaned both from site interviews with pertinent museum staff and from
various documentary sources. Included in the latter are management strategies, mission statements, annual reports and most of the documents that relate to the creation or establishment of the site or museum. This latter set of documents comes in many forms and from many sources—some of which may be found outside of the institution. In these cases information may be found in resources as prosaic as newspaper reports about the sites or within the records of civic organisations that are involved with the institution.

Sometimes, a sense of the envisioned site can be found in the orientation pamphlets or in the more detailed guidebooks available in the on-site shops. Furthermore, in most cases, institutions are more than willing to make available most of the above resources. Finally, in cases where sites are undergoing re-evaluation there is a wide range of recently compiled material that relates directly to the "idea" of the site and to the overall goals and purposes of the individual institutions. In the same way that it was important to provide a set of clearly outlined "site criteria" for the envisioned site, so too it is important for the physical site. In this way it is possible to guarantee a standard methodology. As has been stressed elsewhere, because the sites vary greatly there is little point in drawing up a rigid set of standard questions. After all, questions asked at a site that has been created out of structures from a variety of locations will not be applicable at another site that has been reconstructed on its original location. Therefore, within a larger set of questions is a core group of inquiries that are guided by the following site criteria:

1. CREATION/ESTABLISHMENT OF SITE
2. MANDATE
3. SITE LIMITS
4. FUTURE OF SITE

2 In anticipation of the 2004 inventory of World Heritage sites, many institutions falling into this category have or are currently producing management plans (e.g., Ironbridge Gorge Museums Trust). Other museums faced with outside development and/or budgetary constraints are producing similar documents.
The list of questions—plus any impromptu questions that arise in the course of the interview—were recorded and are kept on file with the author. An example of the type of question lists that were used for interviews may be found in Appendix II. Also located here are brief summaries (by the author)\(^3\) of some of the major themes of the interviews. All information relating to the interview participants, the location of the interviews and the duration of each is also found in this appendix.

i. Creation/Maintenance of Site

Creation is a critical element in understanding how the site has changed. In order to identify the changes it is necessary to know how the site began and how it is that it arrived at its present incarnation. Here it is important to understand the motives behind the creation and design of the site. Along with the understanding the initial processes and ideas, it is also important to understand how the site (i.e., its staff) itself envisions change over time: faced with change, how is the essence of the site maintained in both a physical and ideological sense?

- Under what circumstances did the site come about?
  
  Who was responsible for the idea, the implementation? What factors are responsible for the original appearance; for the current appearance of the site?

- What was the original purpose of the site?
  
  Was preservation the main intent? How did presentation factor into the original plans?

- Is change a factor at this site? Is site fluid or static?
  
  If so, at what level (artefact, building or site) does change take place? How is change incorporated into the site plan? How is change incorporated into the public presentation? What is the motivation for change? Is there a hierarchy based upon factors such

---

\(^3\) When reading the interviews it must be understood that this summary in no way represents the whole interview, nor does it reflect the many subjects and opinions contained therein. Further, as a summary, it is very much the product of the author and it is critical to remember this fact. The summaries are presented simply as a very brief glimpse of some of the major themes or points that emerged out of the interview.
as age (of entry into the site), age of structure, rarity, original versus copy. Is this conveyed to the public? Does it influence signage?

ii. Mandate

Here many of the issues centre on the story or stories that are being presented to the public. How does the institution wish the site to be understood? How do they want visitors to view the site? Many of the answers to these questions can be found in various types of interpretation that the institution has developed and which take place on site. However there are also underlying and important questions that look at the motive behind the presentation.

• What is the story?
  
  Are there multiple story lines or themes? Have these changed over time? If so, how is this worked back into the central theme? What is being conveyed to the public in the story? Is it successful? Why were the themes chosen and by whom?

• What time span is being portrayed?
  
  Is the past being portrayed fixed on specific dates or is there a wide temporal span? Why? Is there an attempt to link the site or the story with larger historical themes?

• Preservation versus Presentation.
  
  Is focus of the story/site weighted towards presentation (i.e., interpretation) or preservation? Which governs change? Why?

iii. Limits of Site

The research carried out in the course of this analysis suggests that the way that the institution perceives the site and its boundaries versus the way that it appears (physically) can sometimes be two very different phenomena and it is here that much can be learnt about the site as a physical and envisioned entity.

• Site Boundaries.
  
  What are the physical site boundaries? What are the historical or legal site limits? How does the individual (within the institution) see the site in terms of boundaries? Does the site “fit” with its
surroundings? Is the site a landscape? If it is an “original” site how much is represented? If not, what determined site boundaries and is there a relationship to the land upon which it sits? Does the placement and/or type of signs differ within the site and around the site? What were the decisions behind placement, appearance and type of sign?

• Entrance to the site.
  Where does the staff/institution envision the entrance to the site? Is there a visitor (orientation) centre? What role do they ascribe to the visitor centre? How does it “connect” to the site?

• View or Sight Lines.
  Is the view drawn outwards or inwards? How does the institution (physically) see its surroundings? Does this aspect of the site have any relationship to the legal and/or geographical definitions of the site? Is the site urban or rural and does this affect the sight lines/view?

iv. Future of Site

It is not enough to track the changes from the moment of creation to the current moment in time; in order to fully understand the characteristics of a site (specifically an open-air museum) and how it changes over time the future directions must also be considered. Once again, here, evidence of the idea of the site can be found.

• Concept of Fullness.
  Will the site ever be “full”? Is there (physically) room to add more structures? If so, is it an enlargement or is it a case of “filling holes”? How much does the original concept or blueprint govern the idea of change?

• Site Expansion.
  Will the site expand? If so, what form will this take: creation of external buffer zones, new areas or new structures? How does a site expansion affect the immediate surroundings? How will this be incorporated into the extant site? Does change take place
throughout the site or more often at the edges? How will expansion affect the story of the museum or that presented to the public?

Within these site criteria will be quite specific questions that reflect those asked of the institutions. However there is, also, a set of questions that should govern the analysis of the data so that when observations from the physical site and information from the envisioned site are brought together, the guiding principles of the heritagescape may be reconsidered.

3.4.3. Fieldwork Methods

A key issue that emerges out of this preceding discussion is how is this fieldwork actually undertaken. At its simplest this may be summed up as extended site visits. Each of the major case studies was visited over a period of several days and only, in a very few cases, was the site visit limited to a single day. Most often this shorter visit occurred because the site was small enough that data could be gathered in the space of a day. In some extenuating circumstances, factors such as location, an obvious example being Alcatraz Island in San Francisco Bay that was accessible only by boat, meant that was only possible to spend a single day at a site. In such instances this variable is noted within the site descriptions found in Appendix I.

As part of the site visit, whenever possible, formal interviews were conducted with museum staff. In many cases, the interview subjects consisted of curators, site directors, and interpretation or education officers. A deliberate effort was made, when arranging these interviews, not to dictate specific staff. Each institution was contacted by email and most by phone whereupon a written and verbal description of the research and its goals was offered. Examples of appropriate staff members may have been suggested but in all cases it was left to the institution itself to determine which member(s) participated in the interview. The make up of the different interview groups varied somewhat across the different sites; at various times participants included the site architect, an architectural historian, the chief interpretative officer and director. In some
circumstances single person interviews were conducted with education officers, curators and other senior museum personnel. In one situation due to extenuating circumstances one interview was conducted over the phone⁴. The decision to leave the choice (of staff participants) in the hands of the institution was made in order that, again, the individual qualities of the institution and its organisational structure could be captured. It was rare that any one museum or institution had a management or research structure that could be compared equivalently; therefore, to have set particular job titles or roles as a criterion would have meant imposing an arbitrary structure upon the interview process. Instead, allowing the institution to determine the participants meant that information arose from sometimes-unexpected quarters. It also meant that the museum as a unique site was able to emerge which, as a result, gave a deeper and more resonant quality to the data which derived from the interviews.

Over the course of the fieldwork it was not always possible, or indeed necessary, to speak to staff at every site. While this obviously will have some impact on the way that a site is analysed because some of this same information often can be found in documentary sources, the absence of an interview does not invalidate the case study. Furthermore, because there is a human component to the interviews and the variable of personal opinion or perception found within the interviews, those sites that were analysed wholly by means of documentary sources were able to offer a useful means by which to compare the interview data. In sum, themes found within the analyses of case studies which include interviews may be validated or strengthened when they are also found in case studies which omit interviews.

Finally, the interview process was not limited to formal pre-arranged sessions. In many cases whilst touring the site, as a visitor, significant information arose out of casual conversations with interpretative staff and

⁴ The interview conducted with Edward A. Chappell, Director of Architectural Research, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, which was originally scheduled to be conducted in Williamsburg, Virginia during September 2002 site visit was postponed to November 2002 and conducted as telephone interview.
with other visitors. In some cases comments offered by visitors as they watched a demonstration, chatted with interpreters or with their companions gave clues to how the site was perceived by them. Whilst this may not be considered as a significant or authoritative source of information, it did provide another perspective—however brief—that contributed to the experience of visiting the site.

3.4.4 Fieldwork Methodology Summary

A considerable amount of time has been spent in the preceding sections detailing the sorts of features and the elements that are used, in the first instance, to evaluate an individual site and, in the second, to apply the guiding principles to a set of criteria.

In practical terms this is a multi step process that begins when a site is assessed on its own. At this point the analysis remains more traditional in the sense that in this initial stage the focus of the analysis is centred on the individual site one at a time and during this period, it will be evaluated on its own. Nonetheless, this stage is key as it is the time when the critical individual elements are highlighted. As we have seen earlier, this is the level at which it will be easiest to recognise the important processes—particularly that of change—which accompany heritage sites over time. In addition, having a good sense of what qualities make up an individual site mean that the task of identifying the universal qualities and processes of the heritagescape site will be more straightforward and will yield data that is characteristic of heritage sites (as a whole) rather then of a single heritage site. Even at this level—of the site criteria—the analysis focuses on the mechanics of the site; i.e., how the experience of the site is created rather than concentrating on the theme of a particular experience. As such, we are able to achieve the goal of concentrating on the similarities of sites rather than being distracted by the differences.

What this means is that at the end of a site visit and following the subsequent examination of the data there should be a clear indication of what sort of features work together to create the site in both a physical
(tangible) sense and also as an illusion of the past. The site visit and the engagement (with a site) that a visitor has provided the basis for the analysis: namely was the experience convincing? With this in mind it is then possible to look at the “furniture” (i.e., the physical elements) that comprises the landscape of the site and to begin the process of taking apart the experience in order to see how those physical elements together contribute to the whole experience. What will also emerge out of this stage of the analysis is the way(s) that the similar sorts of features operate and/or are used at apparently different places.

With a clear idea of the mechanics and the personality of a site, it is then possible to begin to develop the picture of the heritagescape. None of these steps is mutually exclusive and it may be that in the process of compiling data towards identifying the site criteria, a sense may already have developed of whether the heritagescape is, for example, built on a strongly cohesive landscape. Here is where we can see the critical role of the site criteria. Often, such as in the above example, a recognition that the site is cohesive is will first come as intuitive sense based directly upon the experience of the site. There is nothing wrong with this and, as we have seen, this intuitive ability to recognise the past and/or a site, is a hallmark of the experience offered by heritage sites. However, as we discussed in earlier chapters, this intuitive quality fails us in that it does not offer a replicable or quantifiable means of discussing heritage sites. It is the role of the site criteria to provide data that cannot only be quantified but also can be recognised by others and thus may be replicated.

In the end, because each site is examined at the level of its individual components it will be possible to undertake comparisons of sites at all levels. As noted above, the methodology of the heritagescape allows very specific features (e.g., visitor centres and/or site entrances) to be compared at a wide range of sites in order to answer a variety of questions either specific or general. Critically, because the heritagescape is made up of a process of assessment and evaluation and because the identification of the heritagescape (at a site) demands a clear sense of the components
that comprise it, it is therefore possible to compare one heritagescape with another. This, perhaps better than anything demonstrates the ability of the heritagescape to be "measured", despite its apparent abstract quality as an ideological concept. Because the heritagescape is both a method and a concept, the less tangible sense of the heritagescape as an idea can be tied to physical and often very evident elements in the physical landscape. Ultimately this means that there is a stringent, replicable and transparent methodology which also offers room for the intuitive qualities that are so important to open-air museums and which are a key aspect of the landscape of heritage offered by these places.

3.5 Discussion

Over the course of both this and the previous chapter the heritagescape in its dual role as methodology and concept has been explored. The heritagescape as a construct is relatively straightforward but in order to offer a sound means of analysing established heritage sites (and in this case open-air museums) it needs to be applied with rigour. The process of gathering together the data that will enable us to identify the heritagescape as it is manifested at a site, at all times, must remain open and self-reflexive. Heritage sites and particularly open-air museums are difficult places to grasp and, as we have seen, applying an inflexible methodology with an imposed structure is not an appropriate method of evaluating these unique, experiential spaces. At best, such an approach makes it difficult to compare one site to another and, at worst, it makes it impossible to identify the universal processes and qualities that are so important to comprehending heritage sites and to furthering our understanding of these and related spaces. Because the methodology of the heritagescape does not demand a particular set of specific features, the components of a site can be evaluated first in their own context and enable the "personality" of the site to emerge. Further, because it is the relationship between the guiding principles (all three of which will always be present in a heritagescape) rather than an imposed set of features, it is
understood that the heritagescape will not always be manifested in the same way at different places. This is the crux of the matter and is, again, the reason that open-air museums and other heritage sites will more often that not appear to be quite different, despite the fact that they are all accompanied by a set of universal processes.

In the forthcoming chapters, the methodology of the heritagescape will be applied to a wide range of case studies. This will first demonstrate that by applying this method it will be possible not only to analyse a number of very different sites but will also allow us to consider—via their own heritagescapes—the relationship between sites.
Chapter 4
Case Study Analysis: Results

4.0 Introduction:
In order to test this methodology and to fully demonstrate how the heritagescape can be applied to a broad range of heritage sites, we need now to turn to the case studies.

4.1. Outlining the Case Studies
The case studies are drawn from a set of twenty sites in six different countries: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, England, Sweden and the United States.

4.1.1 United States
In North America sites from both Canada and the United States were included. The five American sites were located in three states: California, Virginia and Michigan. The organisational structures of these places ranged from private not for profit institutions to a site administered by the National Parks Service (an arm of the Federal Government). Two of the sites, Colonial Williamsburg and Greenfield Village, have been operating for roughly sixty years, making them two of earliest of the open-air museums in America. Colonial Williamsburg portrays an eighteenth-century colonial city on the eve of the American Revolution. It has been created out of both original (restored) structures and of buildings reconstructed on their original foundations. Archaeological research has had a prominent role at this site. Greenfield Village celebrates American innovation and invention as seen through the eyes of Henry Ford. Centred around a commemoration of Ford’s mentor Thomas Edison the site is primarily made up of relocated structures which are tied to notable Americans and/or key historical events. These two sites are very large and both represent primarily urban spaces. A third site, Carter’s Grove (operated as part of the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation), is another large site; however, it represents three independent but related
rural/wilderness spaces. These three interpretative areas represent significant episodes in the history of land use at this large plantation property. As such, visitors can experience the partially reconstructed 1620 "Martin’s Hundred", an eighteenth-century plantation house (portraying the 1930s) and a Slave Quarters recreated through archaeological excavations. The site at Jamestown Living History Settlement is much smaller than either of the above two yet it too is a multi-component site which focuses on the theme of seventeenth-century settlement in America. Jamestown Settlement marks the original 1607 settlement of America by the English. It has three areas, a Native American village, three replicas of the ships that brought the settlers to America and the recreated 1607 fort. All of this has been created via historical (but not archaeological) data on a site located a few miles down the road from the original 1607 James Fort. Since 1994 James Fort has been the focus of excavations, which, at time of writing (February 2004), are ongoing, is located no more than a mile down the road. The final American site, Alcatraz Island, is generally thought of as a single-theme site and located on a small island in San Francisco Bay. To most visitors Alcatraz is known as a notorious prison, housing infamous criminals: an image that has been much enhanced/encouraged by Hollywood films. Today, Alcatraz is made up of original structures (some in ruins and not all accessible), the restored Cell Block and several wildlife areas.

4.1.2 Canada

The Canadian sites are all drawn from the Province of Ontario. This is in part is due to geographical constraints (which, it should be noted were also a factor in the choice of the American sites). However, more importantly, the sites in Ontario represent a diverse set of themes and are all long-established institutions. As with the American sites the range in the type of institution and the themes each portrays is wide. Two of the larger sites, Black Creek Pioneer Village and Upper Canada Village portray life in nineteenth-century rural Ontario. Both these sites are made up of original relocated structures which, in the case of Black Creek, are
situated around an extant nineteenth-century farmstead. This same theme is also taken up by the Scarborough Historical Museum with its collection of buildings that have been gathered together from the surrounding neighbourhood. Upper Canada Village is located in Southeastern Ontario whilst the other two sites are located on the outskirts of the city of Toronto. Fort York (again in Toronto) and Ste Marie Among the Hurons (in North-central Ontario) are both single component “walled” sites. Fort York locates itself within the early nineteenth-century during the years surrounding the War of 1812. It is a National Historic Site and is distinguished by its eight, original War of 1812 structures. Ste Marie is a seventeenth-century mission that was established by the Jesuits in order to convert the First Nations people of the area to Christianity. The fort at Ste Marie has been recreated on its original site through extensive archaeological research. Currently, its interpretative focus addresses particular issues relating to the portrayal of two (French and First Nations) separate cultures. Todmorden Mills Heritage and Arts Centre is a civic museum that is located in the Don Valley, in Toronto. It centres on the theme of industry of the town of York (Toronto) in the mid-nineteenth century. Centred around an original mill complex, it has expanded to include four structures relocated from various locations throughout Toronto. The last Canadian site, Benares Historic House museum is located in a suburb of Toronto. This seven-acre property was acquired in 1967 by the Ontario Heritage Foundation and subsequently was developed into a museum beginning in 1991.

Of the seven sites, four operate as arms of various civic governments. Ste Marie, Black Creek and Upper Canada Village all function as agencies of the provincial government. The latter two operate in collaboration with other agencies (the Metro Toronto Region Conservation Authority and the St Lawrence Parks Commission). Ste Marie, whilst almost wholly operated by the Province is owned by the Society of Jesus of Upper Canada.

4.1.3 United Kingdom
The four sites in the United Kingdom are all owned and operated by private foundations although each collaborates with local county and city governments. **Blists Hill Victorian Town** and **Beamish North of England Open Air Museum** are both large sites. The former is one of the nine museums that make up the **Ironbridge Gorge Trust** recognised as a World Heritage Site. Each portrays nineteenth century England; **Beamish** centres on life in the coalfields of Northeast England in two periods: 1825 and 1913, while **Blists Hill** focuses on industry in Victorian England. Both sites are made up of relocated structures situated around original buildings and landscape features. **Flag Fen Bronze Age Centre** near Peterborough is a multi-component site made up of preserved archaeological features, museum buildings and reconstructed structures and landscapes of Bronze Age Britain. **Bede's World, The Museum of Medieval Northumbria** is located in the northeast and focuses its themes on the life of the Venerable Bede. The entire site is reconstructed, portraying an Anglo-Saxon village (reconstructed based on archaeological data from a variety of unrelated sites) and an experimental farm. Bede's World links itself (thematics) to St Paul's Jarrow, a church and monastery associated with Bede which is located next to Bede's World. The Monastery is an English Heritage site and stands as ruins connected on the ground by bricks marking out the footprints of the missing structures. At the time of the 2003 visit, there were petitions being put forward which advocated the inclusion of the “twin” sites of St Paul's and Bede’s World onto the World Heritage List of Sites.

### 4.1.4 Scandinavia and Northwestern Europe

The Scandinavian tradition is the oldest and amongst them one site, **Skansen**, is widely acknowledged to be the world’s first open-air museum. It is currently run as a private foundation. Advertised as “Sweden in miniature”. Skansen represents 400 years of folk traditions in Sweden and portrays traditional houses and buildings relocated from all over the country—many of which are farms or rural settlements. Skansen also includes an aquarium, zoo and natural history museum as part of the site. **Den Gamle By** in Århus, Denmark, also has a wide chronological remit.
Similar to Skansen, it portrays four centuries of Danish buildings and traditions. Most of the structures have come from all over Denmark, although there is a significant number from Århus and the area around. This site is located around a millpond and portrays a largely urban setting. The **Viking Houses**, located near Århus, are part of the prehistoric museum at Moesgård. These three structures gathered together within a fenced-in field have been recreated as examples of Viking buildings.

The final site is located in northern Belgium in the Province of Limburg and is an extremely large site. Forming part of a "commune" area (with Botanic Garden, parks and recreation areas) **Bokrijk** is a scale model of the province of Flanders. All the structures have been relocated to this site.

Further information and a full description of the sites including size, location, age, and general information such as the themes and time periods portrayed may be found in Appendix I. Site maps (from guidebooks and pamphlets) have been reproduced and may be found in the section following the figures.

Finally, one note about the figures numbers that are found within the text; it will become immediately apparent that the numbers do not follow consecutively. It was decided that it was important to present a visual account of the sites that would exist as a separate but complementary record. As such, the photos have been grouped thematically in order for readers to compare the site criteria at different sites within the context of the guiding principles. The aim of this approach is to offer the reader both a textual description and also a visual analysis.

4.1.5 Site Visits and Background to the Methodology

Each of the twenty sites was visited at least once for a period of no less than one day and no more than three days. As noted elsewhere (see chapter 3) the duration of the site visit was dependant on several factors including size, location and access to site. Interviews were conducted at eleven of the sites. An informal conversation developed between the
author and curatorial and/or interpretative staff at four of the remaining nine sites.

The choice of specific case studies was based upon those inter-site criteria outlined in Chapter 3. Within that framework efforts were made to maintain an open-ended list of sites in order to achieve a random sample of different sorts of sites. Early in the investigation it was decided that rather than developing a rigid list and investigating a small sample of sites that keeping the list of case studies open-ended and flexible would ensure that a greater variety of sites would be included in the analysis. This approach was adopted as a means to avoid imposing an outside (arbitrary) structure on the data. There were several added benefits to this methodology, not the least of which was that it left the door open for sites, which may have been unknown at the outset of the research, to be incorporated into the analysis. In this way, a site such as Flag Fen Bronze Age Centre, which may not be considered a conventional open-air museum but ended up contributing significant information to the analysis.

Within the discussion that follows are seven sites that are not defined, either by the institution itself or by others, as open-air or living history sites/museums. Initially, these places (Alcatraz, Bede's World, Benares House Museum, Flag Fen, Scarborough Historic Museum, Todmorden Mills and the Viking Houses at the Moesgård Museum) were not selected for in-depth analysis. However, as each of these sites will demonstrate, their inclusion contributed significantly to the discussion and to the understanding of the heritagescape. There was no discrimination between these sites and the other thirteen and, indeed, a series of interviews, both formal and informal, was undertaken at several of these seven sites. It is important to note that every site that was visited in the course of this research plays a part in this analysis and discussion; at no time was there a culling of sites that didn't seem to "fit". It should also be noted that during the course of research significant changes took place at three of the case study sites. One site, Flag Fen, was visited twice (in the course of other work) with each visit a year apart. During the course of the
intervening year the site underwent significant changes as part of an ongoing programme of alterations. As well, Greenfield Village underwent significant construction and re-structuring as part of major infrastructure upgrades at the site. Although it was not possible to revisit this site, when appropriate, attempts were made to consider these changes by researching the new interpretative materials and web site. Finally, Carter's Grove, which was visited in September 2002, was closed to the public later that same year. Budgetary concerns coupled with low visitor numbers and a reconsideration of interpretative strategies at Colonial Williamsburg were cited as reasons for this decision.

In order to provide a coherent structure to this discussion and to ensure that the focus of the dialogue remains on the guiding principles the discussion below will be split into three major sections, each reflecting the three guiding principles: boundaries, cohesion and visibility. Within that framework both the envisioned and the physical site will be analysed in order to determine the way in which individual elements work together at a site to create a specific heritagescape. An extensive list of the particular characteristics and the elements outlined in Chapter 3 will not be at the forefront of the discourse that follows; instead, it will underlie a more generalised summary of the points. To focus a discussion of the results would be lengthy, complicated and confusing. By summarising the data under the three guiding principles we can refer to the elements and factors contributing to the principles and, at the same time, examine their role within an individual site. Thus, the discussion will incorporate aspects of the methodology that lead to the identification of both the physical and envisioned site. In this context, the format will be largely descriptive a fuller, more analytical summary will follow in the subsequent chapter.

4.2 Boundaries

As we have established in chapters 2 and 3, the marking off of a site is a seminal act that has much to do with defining the place and contributes to
shaping the heritagescape. Among the many different roles that boundaries have on a site, two important ones are (1) the marking off with physical elements of the limits of the site and (2) the defining of entrance(s). This latter aspect is a critical component of any heritage site; not only does it define the physical/visible point at which one crosses over or enters into the site, it is also a vital element in setting up the experience of the site (and thus of the past) that is to come. The recognition or sight of the visible boundary also sets up the divide between what is and is not the site. Knowing where the visible boundary is and how individuals react and recognise it will enable us to begin to comprehend the envisioned site.

4.2.1 Boundaries as a Means of Transition: The Entrance

In order for open-air museums (and similar sites) to exist successfully and convincingly they must exist as both a place apart and as a place of the past. These are two quite different types of place and it cannot be assumed that a site will automatically incorporate both of these distinct types of space. As part of the process of introducing visitors into this new space, they must be moved into the site in such a way that removes them visually and mentally away from the present, modern place from which they have just come. The entrance is an essential component in establishing a set of expectations and/or perceptions and in enabling the visitor to enter into a new and perhaps unfamiliar space.

The type of entrance chosen by a particular site will depend on a set of factors not all of which necessarily are weighted equally. These factors range from issues such as the site topography and the type of site (in terms of both theme and purpose), to the means of visitor access. For many sites this last factor usually translates into the question of successfully moving visitors from the car park into the new space of the site in a reasonably fluid manner.
Many museums choose to effect the transition—the movement from present to past—by means of a structure. Depending on the way that an individual site views this device, these structures tend to be known most often as either “Visitor Centres” or “Entrance Buildings”. In many cases, there may not be a great deal of difference between these two differently named entrances it is simply a reflection of the way that an individual institution views the role of this structure. Again the way that a site/museum understands the role of this element often will influence the appearance and, sometimes, even the location of the entrance. As we shall see, many of these sites have an entrance that is marked by a building in a style that has little to do with the theme of the site located behind. While this may, at first, appear surprising when one considers that the entrance structures often are used as a sort of liminal space (or corridor) into the site and must therefore “fit” with both the site itself (the “inside”) and with the modern space (the “outside”) it is not unusual to find that many entrances will have a modern and often slightly anonymous style.

As we shall see when we discuss specific examples below, the entrance structures can range from small, single-storey buildings (e.g., like that at Greenfield Village) that do little more than house admission booths to a much more elaborate structure that offers a variety of amenities and interpretative programmes (Colonial Williamsburg’s Visitor Centre is perhaps the most powerful example within this analysis).

What does seem to be a shared characteristic among the majority of the sites visited is that a main purpose of these structures is to block the view of the site from the outside. No doubt this can serve to heighten the anticipation and thus help create a positive, or even, a stronger experience. The “outside” of a site often can present a brutally modern vista so it is both desirable and necessary to not only block the site from view but also to block elements like car parks or motorways. This separation is especially important in the first moments of entering into the site when the experience is still in the process of being set up. What is important to remember is that, as with so many aspects of this analysis, it is not whether one entrance is...
better or worse than another. Rather, the question is: what sorts of decisions lie behind the choice of entrance?

Let us now turn to an examination of the entrances at the case study sites.

The first site, Black Creek Pioneer Village, has a fairly bleak access route and the roads surrounding the site are wide and busy. A large ice rink/entertainment complex sits directly across the street from the car park. While the site may be accessed by public transport it is much more common for visitors to arrive by car or by coach.

The entrance building at Black Creek is a long low red brick structure with glass doors that sit beneath a small overhang created by a large gable (figure 1). This feature, combined with a sloping path that is carefully landscaped with wildflowers, gives the visitor a clear sense of being directed into the building. Inside, the interior space consists of a wide hallway that runs from the glass doors at the front/outside to a set of glass doors facing onto the site. The corridor is bounded on both sides by an admission desk, a shop, theatre, coffee bar, the offices, an art gallery and a set of display cases with nineteenth-century farming implements. Finally widening just before the doors onto the site. At the time of the site visit (August 2001) there was considerable and very visible infrastructure work taking place. Perhaps in an attempt to prepare the visitors for this a large map entitled "Here We Grow Again" sat near the doors. This display identified areas of the site undergoing construction work and offered a brief explanation of the reasons for the projected changes. A list of daily site activities was also located near here.

Exiting the building the visitor finds him/herself on a gravel path. From this vantage point the site is not yet visible and the most prominent feature is the "Pioneer Patio" a large outdoor picnic area with plastic tables and chairs. Journeying up the path one arrives at a crossroads with both a modern information board and an obviously old mile marker sign (preserved behind glass). Here, the visitors get their first glimpse of the
site; in the near distance is a barn and further on one can see the end of a
dirt high street lined by a boardwalk.

The entrance (onto the site) is one of the shorter ones in this study
and even though one must follow a bit of a path from the building to the
site, it is nonetheless somewhat of an abrupt transition. Whether this is due
to the presence of recognisably modern features (e.g. the outside picnic
area) at a crucial stage or the physical layout of the site is a question we
will return to later.

Architecturally, although the entrance building at Ste Marie Among
the Hurons (figure 4) is somewhat similar to Black Creek, the museum has
chosen to make the path from outside to inside somewhat of a longer and,
in some respects, a more vivid journey.

Ste Marie can only be accessed by vehicle and the entrance is via a
long driveway that runs off a major motorway and which is shared with the
neighbouring Wye Marsh Wildlife Sanctuary. The road is carefully
landscaped with the pine trees and granitic boulders native to that region.
As one drives along this road the noise of traffic diminishes. Once at the
car park the visitor is faced with a long low building painted yellow with a
glass walls and doors and faced with fieldstone. There is little in the way of
landscaping with just a few small boulders and groomed plantings. The
path into the building is wide and the grade even with that of the car park.
The only clue to the site inside is a very large medallion with a traditional
and somewhat cartoonish image of two men: one a bearded French Jesuit
and the other a First Nations (Native American) man.

From the outside the entrance to Ste Marie is unassuming and,
again, the site itself is invisible from the car park. The interior of the
entrance building at Ste Marie is set up as a large foyer and, unusually, is
oriented with the long side running across, rather than into, the site. A shop
is located on one side and on the other is a museum focusing on First
Nations people in Ontario and the archaeological excavations that have
been undertaken at Ste Marie. As the visitor enters the wall directly ahead
is covered with scenes of life at Ste Marie and feature characters in a style
similar to that seen on the medallion outside. The critical thing, in terms of moving visitors into the site, is that most visitors (and nearly all first time visitors) are channelled through one of the movie theatres showing an introductory film about Ste Marie.

This audio-visual element is a key component and is fundamental to the experience awaiting the visitor. The important point comes at the moment when the slide show ends. With the dramatic scenes of the “fort” being consumed by flames (as it was lit in advance of the enemy attack) are flashed still in front of visitors’ eyes, the screen slides up to reveal the gates of the (reconstructed) fort (figure 5). Suddenly, visitors are faced with a dramatic and very “real” vista. This is a key step in the process of moving visitors from the present. Interestingly enough, even at this point, the visitors do not enter directly into the fort from the theatre and must still traverse a wide swath of green space before approaching the gates of the reconstructed site itself (figure 6). One curator refers to this as the “interim” space (Vyvyan 2001). While most of the interim space is empty, adjacent to the fort gates there is a small plot of land set aside to grow corn (maize) just as the fort inhabitants might have done so in the past.

In this way by the time that one, as a visitor, walks beneath the low roof of the entrance and into the reconstructed north court of Ste Marie there already have been a multitude of clues, most of them visual, of what it is that visitor may encounter at the historic site.

**Fort York** can be reached either by car or by public transport but the main (front) entrance is one that is suited more to vehicles than to pedestrian traffic. From the street bordering its south face the Fort is almost invisible as it is tucked in beside the Fort York Armouries, a more recent Department of National Defence facility. For a number of years a gate with “Old Fort York” in openwork was the only clue to the location of the historic site (figure 31). More recently, the City of Toronto, which owns and operates the site, has added a green sign with the site name. This sign not only identifies this site, it links (by its design) the fort to the other City of Toronto sites. From this point, the main entrance is via a long driveway that
winds under an elevated motorway, past a large berm and an open grassy common before ending near a tree nursery in a gravelled car park. This is where visitors first catch a glimpse of the site itself. Beyond the car park is a high iron fence through which the dry moat and outer walls of Fort York can be seen.

A similar (to that at the street) green sign sits just inside the gates and encourages visitors to enter into the site itself via a wide gravel path (figure 32). This path first leads through a gate in the outer walls and then continues past a wooden gate (between two low brick buildings) the length of the fort where it continues out through the opposite gate. However, rather than following this obvious route, visitors are diverted to one side though a small door to the canteen/museum shop. If the weather is nice visitors will then move outside to a cluster of vista boards and benches, if not they congregate in the shop waiting for the guided tour.

This is a very abrupt entrance into the site and there is little to locate the visitor. Furthermore, should the visitor arrive via public transportation they would be likely to enter across a footbridge leading to the back gates of the Fort where, because the property is surrounded by a modern chain link security fence, visitors must ring a buzzer in order to gain entrance. Entering this way means that to get to the museum shop one must walk through the fort—essentially moving backwards and without any preparation through an unknown landscape.

Beamish, the North of England Open-Air Museum sits in contrast to the entrance at Fort York. Instead, it uses the device of a graduated entrance. Interestingly enough, much of the preparation here takes place on what we would think of as the “outside” of the site; i.e., before one reaches the entrance building. Most visitors arriving at Beamish come by car or by coach and to some extent this, along with the topography of the local area, has been a contributing factor in shaping the way that one enters into the site.

It could be argued that the experience at Beamish begins at, or soon after, one leaves the main roadway. Here, the entrance is marked by a
large artefact, a steam hammer, that acts as a gateway to the site through which vehicles and pedestrians must pass (figure 7). Clearly visible from the roadway, the steam hammer is topped with “BEAMISH” in large letters. This means that from the road not only are visitors presented with something that is clearly old and apparently industrial but also by passing under the gate, visitors are almost immediately offered an expansive vista of the countryside with the historic site itself sitting in the centre (figure 8). This artefact acts as a giant gate and is one of the first clues or signals of the site.

As the drive down into the car park is considerable, the view of the site holds for some time until it is replaced in the foreground by a large stone building (figure 9). At Beamish the entrance building—unlike some of the examples we have already discussed—is contemporary with the period(s) of the site. Originally a railway station the entrance building is accessed via a set of wide stone steps and through a small plaza. The original, main doors of the station have been replaced by glass doors which, when closed, reflect back the trees and woodlands upslope of the hill. Perhaps to reinforce the original function of this building, an engine sits at the top of the staircase.

Coming into the entrance hall, visitors find themselves in a small lobby; to one side is the glass wall and exit door of the museum shop, to the other the admissions hall and in front, large brown wooden doors, which, except for the arrival of large groups, tend to remain shut. Within this small lobby are large over-sized photos of the village; each features full colour, current day visitors engaged in “typical” site activities against the sepia-toned backdrop of the site and the costumed interpreters.

The movement into the site at Beamish is achieved through at least two stages. In the first instance there is the graduated entrance that starts at the road and carries on through the entrance building to the point where one comes out on the “inside” of the site. At Beamish the surrounding environment (i.e., the vista) is a key element in the setting up of the entrance. The gateway lays the ground work creating a sense of
anticipation; the view and vista as one is coming down the hill and through to the entrance structure build upon this. At Beamish, the process of movement into another space is heightened by the fact that from this point, the site, which has already been glimpsed, is now completely hidden from view and to enter one must move around a very solid and obvious wall.

For the final step—moving the visitor from outside to inside—the visitor is channelled into a small corridor housing the admission booths. From there it is just a few steps past some undecorated walls and a small café until visitors end up on the other side of the brown doors, in a large corridor lined with “old” commercial signs and, importantly, with a large-scale map of the site on the wall opposite. It is via the doors at the end of this wide corridor that the visitor will finally arrive on the “inside”. The corridor, while not actually “in” the site, is already a space apart—a sort of a middle space.

While the corridor and pathway from it do lead onto the site, at Beamish because of the topography, there is one further step. Because of the steep grade of the site, the view immediately outside the visitor centre is of a tramway and trees. The colliery village and drift mine sit below and from this vantage point only the rooflines and smoke from the chimneys can be seen. In order to get to the actual interpretative areas, visitors need to walk quite a distance or take one of the trams or other historic vehicles. We will return to this point when discussing the layout of the site.

Moving away from Beamish to a site that uses a modern structure as an entrance, Blists Hill Victorian Town, employs a modern glass and iron building structure set within a small plaza that, in turn, sits above the car park (figure 16). The site and indeed the car park cannot be seen from the main access road as Blists Hill sits at the top of a large hill. What can be seen (from the road) is the red and black themed sign that matches those seen at the other Ironbridge Gorge Trust museums and, as at Fort York, offers a form of “brand recognition”.

The entrance building at Blists Hill is part of a large structure that wraps around the plaza which is, itself, capped by three large white sails.
The lower panels of the building are painted in a matte iron red and blue that evoke an industrial feeling as they call up the colours that were often found on large pieces of steel machinery. To further capitalise on this idea, three nineteenth-century iron sewer pipes have been upended and painted in bright colours and sit at the entrance of the plaza at the top of the stairs. These artefacts also feature in the guidebook that may be purchased at the shop.

The interior of the entrance building consists almost wholly of the shop. It is through here that visitors pass (and in the winter purchase their tickets) in order to access the historic site. Within the plaza there are large signs advertising special events ("Meet the Victorians" was on offer at the time of the site visit) and a large board indicates which of the buildings are open that day. Unlike some sites, even at this point, there are few clues as to what one might expect from the visit.

The trip through the building and the transition from "outside" to "inside" is very quick at Blists Hill. By the time one emerges on the site-side of the building the only transformation that has taken place is a visual one (i.e., the car park is no longer visible). However, further on the visitor is faced with a path that slopes slightly upward and which is bordered by a white picket fence. At the top of the incline is a metal sign, painted black and white, which reads "Blists Hill". This, says museum staff (Dix-Wilson 2001), is to give visitors the idea of coming into town from the countryside. And indeed, from this point, the first view is of a Victorian High Street crammed with shops and businesses. Almost immediately the visitor, if not actually in the middle of the site, is certainly at a point where he or she can engage with it.

The next several examples to be discussed also all rely on modern structures to move visitors into the site. In no way should this be considered as a category and, as we shall see from the discussion below, the ways in which these buildings are employed at each site represent specific choices and decisions undertaken by each site.
**Flag Fen Bronze Age Centre** has recently built (opened January 2002) a new entrance building, the “Heritage Centre” as part of the extensive changes to the property (figure 33). This entrance now forms part of the Green Wheel cycleway project and is in high contrast to the old entrance with an access road that passed through an industrial park. In short, the construction of this building and the relocation of the entrance have effectively turned the site around so that the main entrance is now situated at what used to be the “back” of the site.

Access to Flag Fen is primarily by vehicle and visitors now enter the site via a country road that runs through the Fens. The Heritage Centre sits adjacent to a gravel car park but is separated by water and accessed via a small bridge. Reflecting the theme of the site, this structure was designed to look like a Bronze Age roundhouse. Inside, there are large-scale colour photos of re-enactors dressed as Bronze Age people carrying out daily tasks. This building houses little more than a small café and a shop and there is very little interpretative material. However, what is significant is that the wall of the building that faces onto the site has been replaced by a bank of windows. As such, the outside landscape of the site visually becomes part of the interior space of this Heritage Centre and, in this way, offers some important groundwork for the experience to come.Exiting the building the visitor finds him/herself on a dirt path surrounded by the natural landscape of the Fens and at the edge of the view that he/she has seen from inside the building. At the time of the site visits there were only a few signs to aid visitors in their journey from the Heritage Centre into the site; however, site staff indicated that this was a priority in the upcoming developments (Pryor et al 2002).

In contrast to Flag Fen's Heritage Centre, which evoked by means of its architecture, the theme of that site, the entrance to **Greenfield Village** at the Henry Ford Museum in Dearborn, Michigan is much more ambiguous. Greenfield Village is part of a complex that includes the Henry Ford Museum, an IMAX theatre and the village itself. Deliberately located in the heart of the industrial complex of the Ford Motor Company.
automobile plants, the site again is accessed by vehicle off a main motorway. The entrance is marked by high iron gates and more prominently a tall illuminated sign that reads "Henry Ford Museum/ Greenfield Village/ IMAX Theatre/ Automotive Hall of Fame". The first stop for visitors is most likely the large entrance building where the rounded walls of the IMAX theatre provide the most prominent feature of this structure (figure 25). Inside, is a large lobby with pixel board signs and admission booths (resembling those at large cinema complexes). There is direct access to the shop, the museum and the theatres from this lobby. To get to Greenfield Village; however, the visitor must either exit the way he/she entered and drive or walk beyond this building across a large green to the entrance of Greenfield Village. Failing that one can continue down the large corridor papered with posters advertising the village and the museum, eventually exiting near the village entrance.

This dedicated entrance is much smaller and consists of a red brick building with a small portico (figure 26). At the time of the visit the exterior was draped in red, white and blue bunting. To one side there is a wrought iron fence and a gate set in brick through which one can catch a glimpse of the site that lies beyond.

The outside of the Greenfield Village entrance is not marked in any way. Inside, there is a partition wall forming two rooms. The first, smaller room contains information and pamphlets about the Henry Ford site and local attractions. There are toilets here, a bank machine and a phone for a taxi. On the other side of the partition walls are a series of admission booths and in the centre portion a series of glass doors that open onto the site. Whilst the admission booths are somewhat visible from the first room, the view of and through the glass doors is obscured.

Again, this is a very quick trip from present to past. Significantly, even when one has passed through the entrance, the visitor is still not actually "inside" the site. Once outside the building the visitor finds him/herself in a large open space. To one side is the Benson Ford Centre, newly constructed in the same "sympathetic" red brick style as the
entrance building; to the other side is the shop, a single story clapboard building and beyond that is a large green and white information board listing activities, the location of amenities and where to purchase tickets for one of the many rides around the site. From this vantage point most of the visible buildings are modern. It is not until one crosses the railroad track (located further down the main path) that the older structures of the site start to become visible. This main road leads to a large intersection, with a statue of Thomas Edison, and it is here that one seems to find the (geographical) centre of the site.

The most common way to arrive at Bede’s World in Northumbria is via vehicle. To reach Bede’s World it is necessary to drive out of the town of Jarrow through a suburb and an industrial park. Site access is via a car park and along a short path or though a set of low gates off the main roadway (figure 10). The entrance building here is long and low and both the architecture and the landscaping suggest a definite Mediterranean influence (figure 11). This sense is reinforced inside the building. Immediately inside the doors, is a small foyer with a scale model of Bede’s World, a photo and various plaques (including one indicating that this is Catherine Cookson land). Beyond that one finds a rotunda, open to the sky, with a round blue-tiled pool in the centre. Around this space are a series of long windows that offer views of both the site and the adjacent Shell Oil plant. The admission desk and the shop are both accessed via a corridor leading off this rotunda and whilst it is possible to access the historic site directly, the museum sits right across the hall from these desks and is an obvious traffic route.

There is no video presentation in this visitor centre although there are ample audio stations located throughout the museum. The museum is focussed closely on the Venerable Bede and therefore does not offer many indicators of the experience that may come once visitors are within the site. In fact, it is a bit of a leap of faith to connect the “typical” Anglo-Saxon village and farm with the museum from which one has just come. Given that the visitor centre is entirely focussed on the latter and the outside area
of the site wholly comprised of the former, there is a certain dissonance between the two parts of the site. We will return to this point in a later chapter when we discuss the site findings.

Again there are glass doors facing out on to the site. The entrance building and museum are on a high point of ground so as the visitor exits he/she is presented with a view of the experimental farm and the Anglo Saxon village in the background. Large berms have been built up around this area—in part to obscure the view to the Tyne and the activities of the port—and the path into the site leads through the farm and to village at the far end. Exit is via the same doors and back through the entrance building.

The **Benares House** as an historic house museum is different than from the sites discussed so far. This site is centred on a nineteenth century farmhouse and outbuildings. Although it consists of three buildings and the property making up the farmyard, the interpretation and the focus is on the house. Unlike a number of historic house museums in Canada and the United States, Benares is distinguished by being located on a large plot of land and by the presence of an independent Visitor Centre.

Located in a residential suburb the house, which is situated well back from the main road, was partly hidden from view by a line of bushes and could only be accessed by means of a dirt farm lane. In the late 1990s when this site was developed as a museum these plants were removed and a Visitor Centre with a new (paved) access road and car park constructed. The Visitor Centre here offers an introduction and is a means to locate the site within the larger historical context. From this building visitors must walk towards the house and farmstead, moving around the side to enter the house via the back door. Because the weight of the interpretation rests on the house there is a focus on that building over the other structures. Whether visitors spend a great deal of time in the yard is unknown but what is important that the house is presented in the context of space extending beyond the walls of the house itself.

The next three sites: **Colonial Williamsburg, Carter's Grove** and **Jamestown Living History Settlement** are all located quite close to each
other in southern Virginia. Until its closure, Carter’s Grove was part of the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation and was operated along with its 18th century town site.

Jamestown Settlement defines itself as a “Living History Settlement” that portrays seventeenth-century life at Jamestown Island (the oldest permanent English settlement in the New World). The original site is located a few kilometres away, on Jamestown Island, and is part of a United States National Historic Park. As noted above, there are three components to Jamestown Settlement: a 17th century Native American village, “James Fort” the palisaded 1607 settlement and three 17th century replica ships. The entrance building, therefore, has a complicated remit.

The entrance building is accessed via a large car park but sits well back from the pavement. In front is a small, bricked plaza, with large trees and red and buff coloured banners. The building presents an empty and somewhat bleak red brick wall towards the outside with a set of glass doors below a large gable. The exterior is somewhat softened by a series of banners depicting seventeenth century themes (Figure 12). Inside, thanks to the gable it is lofty space and consists of a wide lobby with a shop and other amenities. Directly ahead is a set of glass doors leading out onto another plaza. Here, a path lined with State and local flags and several plaques and memorials leads from the plaza and entrance structure past the museum and eventually into the core of the site.

At the time of the site visit (September 2002) there was ongoing construction for a new “Visitors Services” building. In order to get to the museum—which admissions staff urge visitors to visit before seeing the site—one must leave the entrance structure and go out into the plaza, turn left and towards the site. While the site map (map 13) suggests that this a natural turn, in fact on the ground it is much easier to bypass (deliberately or accidentally) the museum.

At Jamestown Settlement, there seems to be a two-step entrance (assuming that one does visit the museum). The first step away from the car park is through a virtually empty entrance building. There is little, if any,
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At Jamestown Settlement, there seems to be a two-step entrance (assuming that one does visit the museum). The first step away from the car park is through a virtually empty entrance building. There is little, if any,
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Having noted that there are few clues to the experience awaiting visitors at Jamestown Settlement it should be noted that for most people who visit this site, there is a sort of a "brand" recognition of the name and place. Perhaps for that reason the site does not need to invest in visual clues along the entranceway.

Lying six miles east of Colonial Williamsburg’s Historic Area, Carter’s Grove operated under the aegis of the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation and, as such, is listed in the site guide and on the map alongside the in-town exhibition sites. However as it is (1) located some distance from the main site(s), (2) has its own entrance building, (3) thematically and chronologically it covers different remits and (4) unlike the Historic Area which is completely restored, the various areas at Carters Grove are represented in different ways, it was decided to treat this place as a separate site.

Carter’s Grove is a very large, multi-component site which, in addition, to the eighteenth-century plantation house, slave quarter and the seventeenth-century settlement mentioned above, also includes a semi-subterranean archaeological museum which was constructed in the late 1980s. The museum sits beneath a small artificial hill near Martin’s Hundred.

Carter’s Grove can only be accessed off a main motorway; however, the return trip (to Williamsburg where most of the visitors originate) may be made along the “country road” that follows an old carriage track through swamps and woods. Returning to the entrance, the site is marked at the
roadway by a sign that includes the Colonial Williamsburg name and the distinctive font used by the Foundation for all their signs and commercial enterprises. The route off the motorway leads down an old farm lane that has been subsequently widened and improved. Along the way one encounters a Virginia State historical plaque at the side of the road and passes by fields of Colonial Williamsburg’s rare-breed oxen. The car park, like the road, is gravelled and the entrance is partially hidden behind a heavy growth of trees and bushes. The building itself is a very low structure made of rough concrete which sits in a small hollow (figure 17). A short path winds around and under first growth trees and native shrubs leading to a bank of floor to ceiling windows that make up the outside wall of the building.

Inside, the building is not particularly large and as the theatre and displays lie off to one side it could be quite easy to bypass them in favour of the glass doors leading onto the site. The smoked glass windows and the low ceilings combine to make the interior quite dark, even on sunny days.

Again there is a graduated approach to the site entry and as visitors leave the entrance building at Carter’s Grove they find themselves facing a long bridge over a deep and narrow ravine (figure 18). Besides the obvious purpose this bridge has a key function in moving visitors further into the area of the site where they can choose which interpretative area to visit. Crossing the ravine helps to set up the experience so that by the time one encounters the slave quarters—the nearest site to the entrance the car park, the entrance building and other modern visual memories are well behind you.

Last among those sites that use an entrance building type of structure to move visitors away from the present, modern world is Colonial Williamsburg. The Visitor Centre here sits at an extreme end of the type of building employed for this purpose. If for no other reason than sheer scale, Colonial Williamsburg’s Visitor Centre sits apart from most other
sites indeed it could be said that it is more of a complex than a simple entrance way.

Colonial Williamsburg represents life in a colonial city on the eve of the American Revolution. Unlike a number of other sites that we have discussed so far it is built on the original town site. The streets and properties are original and the structures have either been restored or reconstructed on their original footprint. In part, because of this and because the town of Williamsburg continued (and continues) to grow up around the site, the Visitor Centre is located some distance away from the Historic Area (figure 13). Until quite recently it was difficult to access the Historic Area by foot. Prior to the 2002/03 season the main access to the site was via shuttle buses that run between the Visitor Centre and various points in the Historic Area. Pedestrian access was difficult and was via a path and across a busy roadway. To remedy this situation and to enhance access to the site (from the Visitor Centre) a bridge was constructed in 2002 to span the roadway (figure 15) and lead directly into a (previously) side entrance. The Visitor Centre itself was also reoriented in preparation for the bridge construction. This means that the interior route from the main entrance is now via a long, wide passage hung with colonial style flags (figure 14). At the end closest the doors (and therefore furthest from the site) the way is lined with shops and a coffee bar. Towards the middle of the building is an information desk and behind it a narrowed passage with revolving pillars of photos of life in the “colonial capital” and in the background eighteenth-century fife music plays. Beyond this is a cross passage which is oriented on line with the main street of the town and maps and details about ticket options. Next, one comes to a long line of ticket booths where visitors can purchase tickets and make arrangements for dining, lodging and special evening events at Colonial Williamsburg. Finally one comes to the “end” of the building and to the bridge. This area also houses further displays (including video and slide shows) about the “people” of eighteenth-century Williamsburg and, importantly, the two
theatres for Colonial Williamsburg’s video presentation “Story of A Patriot”, billed as the longest running movie in the world.

It is not just within the building that one encounters this full-on treatment and preparation for the site; from the moment visitors get out of their cars they find themselves walking along a pavement bordered by (modern) State flags. The Visitor Centre entrance sits below, in a plaza but from a vantage point mid way along the flag bordered path, one can look at a fountain which sits below the pavement and on the slope down to the plaza. The fountain itself is made up of a raised background that has a map of the Eastern seaboard of the United States. Following the line of water down the slope one notices another map, this one accessible from the plaza that sits on a table and offers a more detailed map of the Historic Area of Colonial Williamsburg and of the surrounding area. This lower plaza is, with the exception of the fountain, empty. Off it sit the large glass doors of the Visitor Centre topped by a canopy. As one enters the building, again fife and drum music is heard.

This is a very vivid experience and by the time one exits the visitor centre at Colonial Williamsburg the level of anticipation is high and one should be fully cognisant of what a visit to eighteenth-century Williamsburg might entail. The visitor centre even offers photos of “colonial people” so you might have the sense that you recognise interpreters and/or characters that will be about the town. The point about this visitor centre is that it is (or was) so distant from the site that it raises questions not only about the entrance(s) onto the site but also what the implications there may be arising out of the great distance between the centre and the site. Does the visitor centre offer such an intense experience because it needs to carry over a long physical distance or is it simply operating as the epitome of a visitor centre, removing one from the past and fully setting the visitor up for the experience of the past? If the latter, what then does this say about the importance (to the museum) of creating a place of the past?

Before addressing the question of entry points within the Historic Area, let us return briefly to the bridge. Clearly the issue of carrying over
the preparation (for the experience of the Historic Area) is one that was of concern to museum staff. Perhaps for this reason, it was decided to line the walkway of the bridge with plaques. Each one had lettering in two directions; one for those entering the site, another for those leaving. At the visitor centre end of the bridge the plaques read “YOU ARE LEAVING THE 21st CENTURY/WALK BACK IN TIME” and, for those returning: “YOU ARE RETURNING TO THE 21st CENTURY/DEMOCRACY, A WORK IN PROGRESS”. At site end of the bridge, visitors go into the Historic Area will find: “YOU ARE ENTERING THE AMERICAN COLONIES/EIGHTEENTH CENTURY” and upon departure: “YOU ARE LEAVING THE AMERICAN COLONIES/BECOMING AMERICANS”. The points in the middle are filled in with milestone events in American history over the past three hundred years.

The question of the entry points—never mind the issue of a main entrance itself—to the Historic Area of Colonial Williamsburg is tricky. In September 2002 it was anticipated that the opening of the bridge would result in what was formerly a small side (or even back) entrance being elevated to the main entrance point for the Historic Area. Whether this works or not remains to be seen; however, given that the perimeter of the Historic Area is no way fenced, nor is pedestrian access restricted, the success of this venture may not be guaranteed. Furthermore, there is a long tradition of visitors entering the Historic Area at any number of points; the buses stop at many different locations and the choice of stop has tended to be based upon factors such as the location of the key attractions, shopping opportunities or hotels. The point here, is that spending time in the Historic Area of Colonial Williamsburg does not require the visitor to “enter into” the site in the way that we have seen with other sites in this analysis. This is an important point and one that will be examined in a later chapter.

Not every site chooses to effect the transition into the site via an entrance building and some will forego the entrance-building device all together. In such usually they will rely upon a small gate, turnstile and/or
ticket booth to mark the entrance. The discussion that follows will examine several sites that lack entrance structures.

The Danish site, **Den Gamle By**, is located at the intersection of two busy streets in the city of Århus. The main part of the site sits in a basin between this intersection and the Botanic Gardens and from the street is only partly visible. At the corner itself, where buildings are quite close to the grade of the street it is surrounded by a white board fence with the site name painted in large blue letters (figure 22). Access to Den Gamle By tends to be via public transportation or by foot so there is not a car park. Instead the visitor enters off a city street down a wide sloping path. At street level there is an early twentieth-century kiosk with current site information posted on it and nearby is a restaurant located in an historic structure. As one descends towards the entrance booth the site becomes increasingly apparent. Because of the grade, while clearly visible from street level, the view nonetheless tends to be of rooflines or of the back side of the buildings. As one moves closer to the ticket booth the number of buildings increase so that by the time the visitor has arrived at the booth and gate there is definite sense of being surrounded by buildings (figure 23). It is about this point too that the road surface changes from tarmac to cobble stones. With this a sense of place begins to emerge—no longer is the visitor looking into the back of a site, he or she finds him/herself on a main street.

The ticket booth, itself, is located to the one side of the roadway and visitors are funnelled past the window by means of a small section of split rail fence. The road itself is blocked simply with a barrier. As this is neither a permanent (it is lifted every night after the buildings close) nor a substantial barrier it does little to impede the view down the street. Here, although there are not any visual or physical blocks to the “outside” the site has nonetheless managed to create a sense of a distinct place.

**Upper Canada Village** also uses a ticket booth and controls access via a set of turnstiles. Upper Canada Village, however, is located in a rural area and is situated off a main motorway between a two small towns in
Southeastern Ontario. As part of a self-proclaimed “Heritage Park” the site sits well back from the road and is accessed via large landscaped gardens. It is adjacent to the Pioneer Memorial site and the Cryslers Farm National Historic Site. As one moves through the Heritage Park towards Upper Canada Village, the view is of manicured lawns, a large car park and various outbuildings (in a sympathetic (nineteenth century) but nonetheless clearly modern style). With a landscape of picnic tables, coaches and vending machines there can be no doubt that one is very much in a place of the present.

Unlike the entrance booths at Den Gamle By that tend to blend into the landscape, the turnstiles and ticket booth at Upper Canada Village are a prominent part of the view (figure 27). The booths sit between a board fence (running from a berm) and an open-rail fence that extends to the historic structure housing the shop. Thus, although this entrance leads right off the car park and a wide area which houses the shop and the vending machines because the admission booth is set ever so slightly back there is a bit of a sense of following a directed path. Immediately inside the turnstiles are a couple of modern park benches which sit underneath four large vista boards which are attached to the wall of the shop and which celebrate the fortieth anniversary of the site (as an institution). There is a shop entrance here but as it is a one-way door by taking this route one will not be able to re-enter the site.

To actually get to the historic site—which is visible and quite close to the entrance—the visitor has two options. The first is the path straight ahead which takes one across a low, cement bridge that spans the canal. This choice means that the nearest building is located a bit further away than those accessible via the second path. There is a sense, perhaps not strong, of physically moving along a path towards the site. At Upper Canada Village, rather than arriving at a centre, or dense part of the site, it is clear that visitor is entering into the edge of the historic site. This is also in contrast to Den Gamle By where the journey is much more subtle and one tends to “arrive” into the site. At Upper Canada Village the entrance
tends to be in a series of stages, from the edge ultimately towards the middle.

The second option, after the turnstiles, is to turn left and travel via one of the dirt roads that run throughout the site to a set of nearby and prominent structures sitting along the eastern side of the site. Remarkably, give the scale of these structures, there is no clue from the outside that they sit a few hundred metres from the car park. Deliberate landscaping (berms) and careful planting along the edges make the site invisible from the outside and the car park invisible from the inside of the site. In some ways this second stage is much more similar to the way visitors are moved into Den Gamle By.

Yet another site, Skansen in Stockholm, foregoes an entrance-building sort of structure. This site—due to the particular morphological features of the site has quite a complicated entrance pattern. Skansen although located on one of the islands in the Stockholm archipelago, is clearly situated in an urban environment. The “front” entrance to the site sits along a main street on the Djurgården. Even the second entrance that gives out onto a park is also clearly located in the city. Skansen can be accessed two ways: by ferry from the centre of Stockholm or via a long bus route. Again, there is no car park.

Arriving via ferry means that, upon embarkation, visitors find themselves in the middle of the Tivoli—an amusement park—and one must move through this setting to the cross street where Skansen is located. The front gates are located quite close to the street itself and the space between the pavement and the gates is filled with vendors selling souvenirs, some old-style telephone booths (also seen within the site) and to one side of the entrance is the “Skansen Butik” (Museum shop). The entrance itself is made up of a long line of ticket boots topped by a striped awning which, in turn, is topped by a bright red illuminated sign with “Skansen” in a jolly sort of font (figure 20).

The gates lead onto a large, terraced plaza. In the foreground is a 3-D model of the site and to either side various amenities including toilets
and pram rentals. Up the few stairs are a series of booths selling food, a combination restaurant and museum, a fountain and most strikingly a sheer rock face rising tens of metres to the top of the hill. To enter the historic site itself, one must either take an enclosed escalator or walk up a winding and steep path to the side. This escalator is housed in a building which has, at the bottom, trompe l'oeil paintings depicting a street full of old buildings. On the way up the escalator the walls are covered with posters for current events at Skansen. Finally, at the top, one arrives in a large, circular building with a few displays, a site map and a large window facing back onto the city.

Entering the main site via the escalator takes one into a corner of the town quarters—the densest and most obviously defined of all the Skansen areas. To one side is a period-type restaurant and to the other, perched on the cliff are the glassmaker’s workshop and a modern retail unit. Street signs, vista boards and cobbled streets all mark this space. By contrast entering via the footpath lands the visitor in a corner of the site near the South Skåne landscape and the coach/disabled car park. Unlike the other entrance point this route means that the visitor ends up in a sparsely populated area of the site and near to a large terrace with a modern restaurant and stage area.

What is intriguing about the Skansen entrance is that the main entry point is much less dramatic and less notable than the other or what the museum calls the “back” entrance. As one staff member noted they have “problems” all the time with people confusing the two gates (Blent 2003). The side entrance is also the one which people arriving by bus are most likely to encounter (figure 21). This second entry point consists of a small plaza at the end of a park roadway. Rather than a gate separating the plaza from the outside, here, visitors enter into the u-shaped external court. This is a substantial structure with a (closed) shop to one side and the gates to the other. Immediately ahead is a large niche in which a bust of Skansen’s founder, Arthur Hazelius, sits. At the base are floral plantings. Atop the booths is again the name, Skansen, this time in iron.
Once inside these gates one is again faced with an enormous hill and rock face. There is little here save for an animal pen which is hidden behind the structure housing the funicular (tramway). It is possible to climb up to the site but it is a very steep journey and the path not immediately apparent. The easiest and most logical choice is the funicular, which costs 1 kroner (2 for a return journey) to ascend. Of course these multiple entrances which are made necessary by the site topography means that, as a visitor, one needs to enter the site several different times in several different ways. This point will be elaborated when we discuss the limits of the site and how they are recognised.

Bokrijk, located in Northeastern Belgium, sits somewhere in the middle of these sites, as it possesses both an entrance gate type of entry point as well as a small entrance building. The main entrance of this site appears to be from the south: the main bus stops, the railway station and one of the two main car parks are all located here. This entry point is the one which people are most likely to encounter, particularly if they are tourists following guide maps. The entrance to the site itself is located through a passage between two buildings (one a café). The doors into both of these structures are located on the site-side so that visitors arriving at the site are faced with two buildings but no immediate signs of entry (figure 28). This means that there is a low-key or subdued movement into the small courtyard where the ticket booths are located. Once clear of these buildings the visitor is met with a line of silver-coloured and somewhat futuristic looking ticket booths (figure 29). Beyond, a tree-lined wide dirt road can be seen to stretch off into the line of trees in the far distance while to one side and in the distance, one can glimpse rooftlines.

Although the ticket booths mark the actual line of entry to Bokrijk, it is not entirely evident that one has come onto the site. In order to reach an obvious area and/or a cluster of buildings visitors need to continue down this dirt road for a considerable distance and, while one can turn off to either side and visit interpretative areas to either side of the road (again at quite a distance) continuing in a direct path means that one has to go
beyond the tree line before arriving at a space that evokes a village green space. Here one finds several exhibit buildings, the museum shop, an outdoor café and can take a ride in a pony drawn cart. Until this point the overriding sense that most visitors will experience is of emptiness. What is interesting is that despite this sense, there is, at the same time, a sense of being in a different, if not distinct, space.

There is a second entrance to Bokrijk which is located to one side near the back of the site (figure 30). It is risky to relegate this to a back entrance because whilst located in a side corner furthest from the entry gate this entrance leads from a large and well-used park and conservation area and it is also the entrance closest to the Youth Hostel. As well there is also a very large car park and restaurant located here.

As with the front entrance the style of building and entrance is very modern. In many ways this is a more elaborate entrance built into a single story structure containing a theatre for the audio-visual presentation and a tourist information centre. Once through the turnstiles, the visitor arrives in a court formed by the turnstiles, the mirrored wall of the entrance building, the wrought iron fence bordering the park and, directly ahead, two stone gateposts (noted on the site map) that mark the entrance into the historic site. On certain days (notably weekends) a costumed interpreter staffs a waffle cart just outside these gateposts.

There are a variety of entrances into Bokrijk and in many ways it is hard to group them. In some aspects they are graduated entrances with ample time to adjust to the process of going into the site. The first entrance offers a much more subtle journey and happens over a long period as one walks along the main road to the central area. At the second entrance this transition is both more obvious and shorter but even here, though the journey to a “full” part of site is shorter, it is still a process that occurs over time and space.

Finally there are three sites, Scarborough Historic Museum, Todmorden Mills and the Viking Houses that have neither entrance building nor clear (i.e. by means of a gate or turnstile) entry point.
Each of the three sites without a distinct entrance point are spatially very small and contain very few buildings. The first of these is located at the Prehistoric Museum in Moesgård, Denmark and is comprised of three reproduction Viking Houses only one of which could be entered into at the time of the site visit. There is no relationship between these houses other than that each represents a particular type of structure. All three sit within a plot of ground enclosed by a wood fence and with the entrance via an opening in this fence. Filling the exterior space is a plot of ground for crops, an archery target and a spot for outdoor fires. By adding these external components the museums has managed to link the three separate buildings together and, as a result, it has created a distinct space—a site.

The second of these sites, the Scarborough Historical Museum, is a bit bigger and a bit more formally laid out. This site sits in a large city park in a suburb of Toronto and is marked on the main road by a large blue and gold sign. This small place consists of four buildings located within a rail fence (figure 24). Most of these structures are original and have been moved to this location from elsewhere on the park property although one, a drive shed, is a reconstruction built at 1/4 scale (due to space constraints). The buildings in this museum are open and staffed by costumed interpreters. There are small gardens, boardwalks between buildings and other stage setting devices. The site is located near a wading pool and near the park car park. There is no admission and visitors again follow a path and opening through the rail fence. Beside this entrance, is located a large and readily recognisable Provincial Historic Site marker. Inside the site one of the buildings contains museum displays and offers pamphlets and other interpretative material; however, this building is not marked out nor are visitors particularly directed to it.

The last of these three sites is also located in Toronto. It sits in a valley that has been designated as a conservation area and therefore is still heavily wooded. A major motorway runs near by the site but because of the topography it is difficult either to see or hear it. The Todmorden Mills Heritage Museum and Arts Centre is made up of a complex of
original industrial buildings (part of a nineteenth-century brick works and mill) and four buildings moved from sites nearby. Entrance is via a long, gravel driveway (figure 19). To get to the car park (it is quite difficult to access this site via public transportation) one must drive beyond the site and cross a bridge to a car park. Visitors must then return to a grassy area near the entrance (from the main road) and cross the grass to the buildings. The nearest building operates as a museum display and information centre. At Todmorden not all of the buildings are open all the time so visitors must arrange with staff for a tour. The structures are augmented by gardens, a flagpole and the train station which has a length of rail track running alongside. It is difficult to determine a dedicated entrance to the site; obviously the road in is a strong candidate and for visitors coming to the local theatre company the historic houses may represent a secondary area off to one side. The site also includes a wildflower preserve and visitors hiking through the valley again may come for this purpose and thus may enter the site from another direction all together. Todmorden presents some interesting questions and ones that can be better addressed when we have examined issues of site cohesion and visibility.

The final site that we will discuss in this section is Alcatraz Island, As it appears to lack both an entrance building or a definite gateway and it has unique landscape features which contribute to the shape of the entrance, it will be discussed alone. Alcatraz Island, located in the middle of San Francisco Bay, was first occupied in the nineteenth century by the military that established a fort on site. It is; however, much better known as the site of a United States Federal Prison which operated there until 1963. Because of its location access and entry to the site present unique problems. Visitors reach Alcatraz Island via boat service from one of the piers located in Fisherman's Wharf, a popular tourist area of San Francisco. Great ceremony accompanies the boarding of this boat and each visitor (or group) is photographed before setting foot on the boat. It could be argued that the moment one sets foot on the boat is actually the
point of entry to the site. Following this line of thought, the boat trip across the bay with Alcatraz always in view would be part of the journey leading into the site. Dramatically, just before docking visitors are greeted with a large sign that appears to be original and which reads “WARNING. Persons procuring or concealing escapes of prisoners are subject to prosecution and imprisonment” (figure 2). Likewise, it could be argued that the moment visitors leave the dock and step onto the island itself is the point at which one enters the site. Arrival is in a large open space flanked by the prison buildings and rocky slopes of the island. Nearby, the dock is a white building and a sign with “Alcatraz Island/Golden Gate” emblazoned on it in the recognisable United States Parks Service logo (figure 3). Beside this is a kiosk where for $1 US each visitors may purchase one of four different themed guides to the site.

Park Rangers greet each boat and direct visitors through a large arch into an interior space to watch an orientation video. From here the visitor can visit the adjoining shop or the museum (located somewhat out of the way) or proceed directly to the site. This final choice takes visitors up stairs and through tunnels until they come out on the paved and winding path that leads upwards to the main attraction of the site, the cell house. Obviously, as it is an island, the exit and entrance off is strictly controlled and visitors must ensure they board one of several timed departing boats. In some ways, Alcatraz could be seen as both a site without a defined entrance and as a site with a graduated entrance, depending on which of the entrance theories one espouses. We will return to this point later in our concluding chapter.

4.2.2 Boundaries as Definition: Site Limits

As we have just seen, the entrances perform a key role by moving people onto a site and thus into a different place. However important this is, it is also important to both maintain and to build upon this sense of place; to do that we need to look at how the site is
marked out and defined. Establishing a visible set of limits has two main purposes: one practical and one interpretative (or ideological). The ideological purpose concerns the space that is defined by the museum as the site. In all likelihood the markers of this boundary will have more to do with the themes and place(s) portrayed than with any practical considerations. On the other hand, there are sound reasons for marking a boundary that have little to do with the site as a place of the past, or as a place away. Counted among these are criteria relating to health and safety requirements, legal access and the opportunity to use boundaries as a means of traffic control; thereby ensuring that visitors can be channelled through the various public spaces and, at the same time, away from work or private areas of the site. Finally, boundaries also may be imposed and marked not by the institution but rather by the natural features and surrounding topography.

In the discussion below two sets of boundaries will be considered: the “legal” boundary and the understood limits. The former boundaries are defined as the place that is recognised legally and/or by agreement as the edge of the site. The latter boundary is the physically marked boundary that museum has established in order to demonstrate the edges of the public or accessible area(s). Each of these types of limit comes with its own set of complications: neither is straightforward and each plays a particular role for the different groups that interact with the site. For visitors, the legal boundaries may have little or no prominence and, in fact, may never knowingly be encountered whereas, for the museum staff, it may be these limits that hold the greater resonance. Further, the legal and understood boundaries may never intersect. In the case of the understood boundaries, again, there is the question of how each group recognises them and what role these limits and markers play in shaping the heritagescape for both the visitors and the institution.

There are different sorts of boundaries found at each heritage site and not all mark the exterior limits. Interior boundaries or divisions are an important component in a site’s make up; however, these relate more
closely to the cohesiveness of a site. As such, they will be featured in the treatment of cohesion that follows this. In the meantime, let us return to the case studies in order to consider this question of site limits.

At some sites the boundaries appear quite clear cut. Two cases, Ste Marie and Fort York are both enclosed by prominent walls/palisades and each would appear to possess a straightforward set of limits.

As we have seen above, the entrance to Fort York is first via the gate in high iron fence and latterly through the canteen in one of the exhibition buildings. Nearly all of the actively-interpreted space at Fort York lies within the stone walls and, although visitors can see out, it appears that few visitors use any of the areas outside the walls. No doubt for many visitors the walled space represents the Fort in its entirety. Indeed the map handed out to visitor depicts only the walled fort area (map 11). From the perspective of the museum staff the site is considerably larger and includes “everything that lies within the iron fence” (Benn 2003). This is reflected by a number of interpretative decisions including a guided tour that takes visitors on top and outside of these walls. Furthermore, the National Historic Site as designated by the Canadian Government extends to the common and burial ground that visitors pass enroute to the site. While future development plans call for the creation of a heritage area and the reconstruction of the original landscape around the fort, it is evident that, at present, neither the museum nor the visitors acknowledge these larger limits in terms of “public” space.

The marked boundaries at Ste Marie (figure 37) are even more prominent than at Fort York. Two factors: the height of the palisade which makes it is almost impossible to see outside and the rigid traffic pattern through a limited number of small gateways all contribute to a strong feeling of being enclosed. Again for visitors, it appears that this walled areas is the whole site. Here, too, there is some dissonance that arises when museum staff is consulted. More than one staff member when defining the site included the “interim” space (Vyvyan 2001) and one (Carter 2001) even included the adjacent Wye Marsh that is linked
(historically) to the fort. Interestingly, whilst the map (map 15) does show the interim space and entrance structures, other than a thin sliver of river pictured at the top of the map, the site as depicted consists primarily of the area within the palisades. In no case is the space between the site and motorway counted as part of the site.

It is not always entirely clear where the institution situates the limits of the site at Greenfield Village. The guide map for Greenfield Village depicts Greenfield Village as well as the Henry Ford Museum and theatre both located outside the gate to the village. The village as depicted covers an area bounded by train tracks in the back and side and by a brick wall in the front. The area where the Firestone Farm is located lies outside the tracks and here, the artist has added a line of trees to mark this edge allowing the drawing to "fade out" outside the farm house (map 12). Perhaps significantly the site legend is imposed upon the drawing in this area. On the ground the front and sides are marked by low red brick walls (figure 45) whilst train tracks run along one side (figure 48). Although they are physically very obvious, it might be questioned how "strong" they are as much of this area is located to the far side of the train tracks or is encountered in the space immediately inside the gates (before any of the historic structures are encountered).

Judging from the movement around the site, it seems that for many visitors, the boundaries (as depicted) operate as actual limits to the site with few people venturing to the space beyond the tracks. Further, based upon the site visit (one day of which took place during a popular "Old Car Festival") it appears that there is another set of limits that are not marked on the map. A large grassy area, identified as the "Activities Field", runs behind the main street of the interpretative area designated as "America's Homes". There are no marked boundaries here but the empty expanse of

---

1 An attempt was made to conduct interviews at this site; however, as this was against museum policy formal interviews did not take place. A series of spontaneous, informal discussions with two members of staff arose during the course of the site visit.

2 It must be noted that the new site map that is currently in use does restrict the area shown to that which lies within the gates to Greenfield Village. However, as the site visit
this space seems to discourage visitors. Even on a busy day, this area appeared underused. Visitors who do set out across the field will find themselves in an area housing the Henry Ford Academy and other clearly private buildings. Taking the road along the opposite side of this field exposes the visitor to modern black and white signs that prohibit visitor access. Passengers on the train will be similarly affected as this area has a clear sense of a “behind the scenes” or work area of the site; an impression which is reinforced by the orange plastic fencing that borders the far side of the train track. Train conductors, who use this area to bleed the boilers of the steam engine, tell their passengers that they choose this location as it is not a visitor area. Here is a case in point of a set of boundaries that is neither marked nor recognised by the institution but which nonetheless carries a resonance for visitors and, indeed, for some staff.

Some sites have limits that are implicit. At Carter’s Grove once through the entrance and across the bridge it is rare for the visitor to encounter a boundary fence or an overt indicator of the limits (map 7). Instead, through a combination of the natural landscape and manipulated natural features, visitors are made aware of the edges. The most obvious limit is the steep cliffs that mark the banks of the James River (figure 33). Obviously visitors cannot venture past the low chain and signs but it is interesting to note that the museum has placed a telescope here in order to enable visitors to look out beyond the site onto the river and far shore. The two other large sides of the site are densely wooded which, combined with the clearly marked paths and a programme of mowing which leaves public areas cut short and “other” areas with long grass, visitors are unlikely to venture beyond the museum-defined area.

The one place at Carter’s Grove where boundaries are more evident is in the space that runs behind the stables and slave quarters and which is closest to the road and, thus, the “outside”. Even here, natural features are

took place prior to these changes, the discussion will refer to the documents and devices in place at the time of the site visit in September 2002.
the most common form of boundary. Again, the natural topography and vegetation define the site; the area behind the slave quarters is heavily wooded and there has been no attempt to clear the underbrush making it a very unfriendly space. Further along, by the stables, where the grass is short and the site more manicured, a fenced orchard and more underbrush form part of the boundary. Near here, access down a dirt road (leading into the distance) is marked by a low sign hanging on a chain between two posts.

**Jamestown Settlement** also has two edges marked by wooded areas and these are dealt with in a couple of different ways. In the area adjacent to the interior plaza (near the entrance building) the chain link fence marking the edge of the site is quite visible and despite plantings along the fence between the site and the car park, the car park is still quite obvious. This marked edge of the site becomes less evident as the visitor moves towards the Powhatan Village area but this also may be because the path leads away from this edge towards the Fort area.

Along the edge adjoining the Fort the limits of the site are less clear. The Fort tends to act as both a draw and as the end of the journey. In addition to its main gates, there is also an “exit” that leads outwards from the site onto an empty area bounded by trees. Whatever the actual limits of the site, the fort walls seem to act as the edge.

The remaining boundaries of Jamestown Settlement are formed by the James River. Here, because this area centres around three ships (which visitors can board) the site edge extends beyond the riverbank and might be better located around the edge of each ship and around the end of the dock that extends into the river.

The guide map (map 13) provided at Jamestown shows no limits to the site. Instead, the site is depicted as a series of buildings and interpretative areas strung along the cement path that runs out from the visitor centre and circles around the Powhatan Village to the ships, the Fort and back to the entrance buildings and exhibition galleries.
Down the road from Carter's Grove and Jamestown Settlement, at Colonial Williamsburg’s Historic Area boundaries are an all-consuming issue. The Historic Area is centred upon the original, grid pattern town site as laid out in the eighteenth century. The site sits in the midst of a modern city and whilst vehicle traffic is limited (during daylight hours) in the main area of the site, there is regular (and sometimes heavy) traffic on the city roads that bound the Historic Area. One site map represents this area shaded in darker green-brown colour with the hotels, visitor centre, shops and research centre and library marked but on a light grey background, whilst another (map 8) looks more like a standard, tourist-style map of a city.

Museum staff (e.g., Carson 2002, Chappell 2002) tend to define the site as the area made up of the Historic Area and as described this tends to be a bit smaller than that shown on the map and tends to be tied to the four main streets that make up the main section of the Historic Area. Even with options such as Carters Grove, the Visitor Centre and the other museums that are located outside (but nonetheless quite near) the Historic Area, one member of staff remarked that Historic Area [as defined above] is “98% of the visit” (Carson 2002).

Colonial Williamsburg Foundation (CWF) owns vast amounts of property in and around the twenty-first century city of Williamsburg. Much of this is for development, maintenance or other behind the scenes purposes and will never be encountered by visitors. Some of this property has been acquired to act as a buffer zone or to create “view sheds” which replicate eighteenth-century vistas. Administrative, research and storage structures are all located off site with those closest to the Historic Area separated by careful plantings and barricades at the end of the streets. Given the amount of the Foundation’s landholdings it is quite difficult to describe the legally defined property. For visitors, the city roads surrounding the site probably are the most significant boundaries. There

---

3 Significantly, the Director of Archaeological Research was the only member of staff interviewed that described limits to the site that moved out beyond the Historic Area.
has been little attempt to soften these edges; visitors arriving at one of these cross streets will find wooden lift gates that warn of oncoming traffic. Thus, even though the opposite side of these modern streets presents a similar landscape of 18th century houses (nearly all administrative buildings) by having to acknowledge the vehicles, the site, in effect, ends at this point. Having said that it appears that there could be some variation for those visitors who are staying in Foundation Hotels and resorts (all of which are marked on the map). In a similar vein, the Merchant’s Square shopping area sits between the main site and the Wren building, one of the “important” buildings at Williamsburg, so it may be too that for some visitors this retail area, constructed in a sympathetic colonial style, sits within their site limits.

In the late 1990s the museum attempted to fence off areas of the Historic Area. This short-lived enterprise was met with overwhelming disapproval and made the national press as protests came from across the United States. This raises the question of whether Colonial Williamsburg is defined by its perceived lack of boundaries rather than as an overtly marked out space?

The Danish site, Den Gamle By, also sits in the middle of a city but it approaches the question of its limits somewhat differently. The site occupies a roughly square-shaped property; two sides abut streets (one, Viborgvej, a major route) and sit near a busy intersection, whilst the remaining sides lead onto the Botanic Gardens (map 9). A park lies adjacent to one corner separating the site from the busier of the two nearby intersections.

In general, this museum uses fences to mark out the edges but also, importantly; it relies on the natural topography. It is possible, with a few exceptions, to see over or through these fences and in most cases the fences are constructed of wood. On the side street, Eugen Warmings Vej, there are chain link fences along the street but these are usually “softened”
with plantings and are, for the most part, located behind the backyards and along the back (street) side of buildings (figure 38). Where this street meets the busier Viborvej the site has located two period buildings: one a restaurant, the other, a theatre. Neither of these buildings is an exhibition space; both are used for modern, albeit sympathetic, purposes. In this way these structures serve to further separate the core site from the modern streetscape. It is here too that one of the few high fences (which completely blocks the view) is located. By situating the theatre and the restaurant in this location the museum has created a passage which is bordered on both sides by period buildings, yet is also a space where the visitor is approaching but has not quite entered the site. It is much more likely that the interior fence/boundary that runs behind the houses and within the site itself and along the inside of the passage will be recognised by visitors as the edge of the site than the edge formed by the meeting of the two city streets.

As on the street side, there is an exit from the site into the Botanic Gardens and here, too, there is a continuation of the millpond that was encountered in the historic site. Again, this side is marked with low fences and a line of trees and plantings that define the two spaces of the site and the Botanic Gardens.

The most interesting set of boundaries are those that run behind the main square (Torvet). Here, there is a very steep grass-covered slope which rises sharply up from the buildings running along this edge. In the distance and far above one's head, a windmill dating from 1792 and part of the site but located in the Botanic Gardens can be seen. What makes this edge so significant is that beginning in 1999 the museum decided to complete the landscape of the “town square” by adding an additional structure. The seventeenth-century “Mintmaster's Residence”, is a large and imposing structure and in order to incorporate it into this space, not only did other buildings have to be removed but also a large section of the
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4 This was seen by the Foundation as a means both to increase outdoor interpretation and also to control the number of non-paying visitors who were using the outside, admission-
hill, which formed one of the edges of the site, was removed. In essence, the established and visible boundary was moved outwards. This action says much about the boundaries and the role they play at this particular site. It is a point that will be explored in greater depth later as we look at the resonance of the heritagescape at this site.

Although **Black Creek Pioneer Village** is located in a city, it is adjacent to a conservation area. This means that, although the site is sandwiched in between three major urban streets, on the fourth side it is bordered by a ravine with treed slopes (map 2). Museum staff (Brent and O’Byrne 2001) define the limits of the site as the area bounded by the three streets and understand the property in terms of the original land purchase by the Metro Toronto Conservation Authority in 1956. Here, the boundaries as understood by the museum and as marked out do not necessarily match. Most parts of the site sit well back from these streets and visitors are not likely to see or hear traffic noise in most of the interpretative areas. The church area, which is an original building with an in-situ cemetery, is an exception to this and here not only are the sounds of vehicles audible, in some places passing cars and trucks can be seen (figure 35). In particular, this is most apparent over the low fences of the cemetery. There are chain link fences in this area; however, they tend to lie beyond a set of inner wooden fences. It may be notable that this area is one of the more distant areas (from the entrance). It is quite easy for visitors to wander into work areas. Although these are marked by wooden fences, there are several open areas where it is possible not only to see in but also to gain access (figure 34).

The other, ravine, edge is much less evident and there are few, if any, boundary markers. The site flows into the natural surrounding environment with the creek and underbrush marking the less accessible (and indeed off-site) areas. One of the roads running through the site is depicted on the map as running down slope of the occupied area of the site.
into this natural parkland. It seems that for the institution, at least, this boundary is somewhat fluid.

Until now, the case studies that we have considered have had boundaries that are marked primarily by imposed, tangible markers. However there are also those sites whose boundaries are almost wholly determined by the topography of the landscape in which they are located. One of the most obvious examples of this is Alcatraz Island where the physical site limits and the island are one (figure 36). There is very little disagreement between the marked boundaries and the boundaries as depicted in the interpretative material and presumably as understood by the museum (map 10). The city of San Francisco, clearly visible in the near distance, plays a prominent role in all of the interpretative material and thus it must be asked whether, in the eyes of the museum, the boundaries as understood may extend out beyond the physical limits of the island.

While not as dramatically outlined as Alcatraz, Blists Hill also has particular topographical features that influence its boundaries (map 5). It must be remembered that Blists Hill sits in the middle of the much larger World Heritage Site that takes in all of the sites of Ironbridge Gorge. As one curator (at Blists Hill) put it “you can wander through lots of Ironbridge Gorge without knowing it” (Dix-Wilson 2001). This immediately suggests that there will be a dissonance between the site as viewed by the museum and as recognised by visitors.

Blists Hill sits at the top of a deep gorge with steep slopes dropping off and rising on all sides of the site. Throughout Blists Hill the grade is steep and variable. Due to the old mine workings lying throughout this area there is a considerable problem with subsidence. This means that buildings need to be located away from the “edge” of the site and in fact, over time, may need to be moved. In recent times at least one structure was lost to subsidence when it dropped off over the cliff.

The side of the site that parallels the high street is very apparent as the ground drops off sharply. Further into the site (i.e., away from the
entrance) the ground slopes down to meet the valley floor and, here, the edges become less well defined. The fences marking the site edge are not always visible and because the area beyond is wooded, there is little to suggest that the area beyond is a different space. Thus, while they may be seen from the “outside” of the site, they tend to blend when one is within the site area. There is one confusing point in town where, despite the obvious cliff edge, there is an original bridge that spans the gorge. Although it is no longer accessible (due to safety reasons) to visitors, it is nonetheless a bit confusing as it appears to lead off the site.

The edge that forms the left side (when facing away from the entrance building) of the site is somewhat harder to discern visually. On the one hand, the Brick and Tile Works, which are original structures, sit at the foot of the slope and according to the guide map mark the edge of the site; yet, a canal runs between this point and the central area of the site also suggesting an edge (figure 52). As this canal extends beyond the Brick and Tile works and along built up areas of the site, this idea is reinforced. This edge is also hard to determine in the area near the Blast Furnaces. These archaeological features are built into the hill and appear to as a “wall” of the site. In fact, the site boundaries lie behind these features and are marked by an iron fence at a point well above and behind the furnaces. Though apparently not well visited, the area is accessible either by climbing a set of steep stairs running beside the furnaces or from the path running alongside the canal.

Blists Hill as it exists on the map extends from the entrance building beyond a distant point marked by the Hay Incline Plane, an original industrial feature. Interviews with staff suggest that this point is considered to lie within the limits of the site. However, on the ground, once past the Squatter’s Cottage (which sits alone in a sparsely populated area of the site) and well before one reaches the Incline Plane, visitors encounter a large white iron gate which, when the site is open, sits ajar (figure 51). The combination of this gate and an apparently empty path through a heavily wooded area gives a strong impression of the edge of the site. On a lesser
point, at the time of the visit, in late November, staff at the entrance noted that few events were happening beyond the central area of the site and drew a line in biro on the map across the crest of the hill. In essence this created another "limit" to the site—invisible on the ground but prominent in the mind.

The topography at Skansen is similar to that at Blists Hill in that many of its limits are determined by the landscape. Skansen as we have noted is located on an island, Djurgården, in the Stockholm archipelago. Unlike the other island site, Alcatraz, Skansen occupies only a portion of the island and rather than standing alone it is located amid city streets, parks as well as other attractions. Importantly the island is accessible both by vehicle (via a bridge) and by frequent ferries. Djurgården rises sharply from a flat coast to a very steep centre with outcropping of rocks throughout. Skansen occupies almost all of the top of the steep hill in the centre of the island and overlooks both the harbour and Stockholm in the near distance. Although all the entrances lie at the base of the hill (figure 32) museum staff at Skansen tend to define the site as the bits that sit around the top of the peak (e.g., Wikander 2003) leaving out the main entrance plaza (with museum), the second entrance and the third point of entry via the building museum on the northwest side of the site. The map (which must be purchased) depicts the site sitting against a white background with no reference to the larger environment (map 14). Each of the entrances is included although there is no indication or suggestion of the grade.

From the top of the hill, it is only occasionally that the visitor is able to glimpse the limits of the site. Fences tend to be low and open and because of the grade, visitors often find themselves above the fences and therefore looking over them (figure 44). It is little wonder that they tend to fade against the view of the skyline of Stockholm. Here, the edge of the hill and the topography appear as the dominant influences in determining the site limits for both visitors and the institution.
**Beamish** is yet another site where the local landscape has a leading role. Admittedly its topography is nowhere near as dramatic as either of the two sites above but it nonetheless is very much a product of its local landscape. The actual public site, as defined by the perimeter fences, fills the bottom of a large valley. In terms of landholding the property extends from the steam hammer at the entrance beyond Pockerley Manor on the one side and out literally almost as far as the eye can see to lines of trees in the distance. To the opposite side (nearest Home Farm) there is a modern house that can be glimpsed among the trees but here, too, the site extends well beyond the occupied areas.

Much of the movement throughout Beamish is via period trams or omnibuses which run around the large, empty and inaccessible field in the centre to the various interpretative areas. What this appears to do is to throw the main pedestrian traffic out towards the edges of the site which may, in turn, suggest that the tram tracks form a more resonant boundary than the wooden fences which surround the property (figure 39).

One interpretative area, the Home Farm complex, lies up a slope and across a public road. This forms a strong visual boundary and must impact the way that Home Farm is viewed and understood by visitors.

A look at the guide map (map 3) reveals that the museum envisions the site quite differently. Looking at the map handed out to each visitor, there is a tendency to see the five main interpretative areas sitting around the tram tracks like beads on a string and, to some extent, there is a sense of this as one moves about the site. However, the artist has included a river on this map so that the tram tracks become less of a defining feature and instead the site appears enclosed by the river. In the latest edition of the Beamish guidebook (published autumn 2003) this is even more prominently depicted. Yet, the visitor at the site will probably never see the river. Only once, when standing at the chain link fence in a space behind the railway station, was it possible to even hear the river. This is a very clear example of what can be very strong differences between the physical site and the envisioned site.
In contrast, **Upper Canada Village** sits in a rural area in a relatively flat landscape—any hills are low with gentle slopes. The site is situated between a main roadway and the St Lawrence River and to one side is a wooded area, to the other the park and historic site that make up the “Heritage Park” in which it sits. The St Lawrence River, which marks the southeast edge of the site, was created as a result of controlled flooding in 1950s and now forms part of the St Lawrence Seaway. It is a busy marine route and large ocean-going ships pass the site several times a day. The side of Upper Canada Village that winds around from the car park towards the motorway has been defined by large turf covered berms planted with trees and bushes. The remaining edges of the site are defined by the functional/interpretative areas of the site. Upper Canada Village is meant to represent a nineteenth-century village in rural Ontario. As such, the core area is devoted to houses and businesses centred on a village green. Farms, factories and trade sites are located around the perimeter of the site (notably in the area furthest from the entrance). What this means is that for visitors travelling along the “country roads” of Upper Canada Village the boundaries are formed by the fields that run back from these lanes (figure 41). Typically, visitors would not go into these fields especially as they sometimes contain animals. In this respect, the fences and by extension, the fields mark a limit of the site. However, the actual limit (as defined legally and by the museum) of the site is marked by a line of trees that sits above a gentle slope. All of these boundaries are somewhat passive; most are not obvious and, indeed are often barely visible and form more of a background than a foreground element.

The map does little to suggest where the site limits may lie (map 16). Whilst the river, canal and mill pond are all coloured in a dark pinky red, the land—regardless of whether it is part of the historic site or not—is several shades lighter. This means that in terms of the village itself, the site simply fades off the edge of the page. Further, all of the components of the **Upper Canada Village Heritage Park** (including Pioneer Memorial, the
miniature train, the car park and other "outside", modern elements) are treated in similar fashion.

Like Upper Canada Village, Bokrijk, located in the Belgian Province of Limburg, is set off a main road, situated between two cities. Whilst this area is not necessarily rural, the site is set in a large park and conservation area. The front of the site borders the car park and stretches around on one side where it is bounded by a public park and the Botanic Gardens. The limits between the site and the public part are marked by a low iron fence and, again, are planted with low bushes and, in some cases, trees. Similarly, along the "front side" of the site (the side that borders the entrance and the car park the edge of the historic site is marked by a high wooden and chain link fence (with green plastic woven into it) both of which block the view out.

Apart from these areas it is unlikely that visitors will ever knowingly encounter most of the western edge of the site. Bokrijk as a site is very large and contains vast areas that are simply "empty" and made up of woodlands and fields. To walk through much of Bokrijk is to evoke walks in the countryside or through the woods. As a result there are large areas that simply stretch off into the distance. Perimeter fences, when visible, tend to be located along the farmsteads or at the back of house sites making them look less like markers of the legally defined site and more like "real" farm fences (figure 40). The site as depicted on the map (map 6) is no doubt very much bigger than many visitors will ever experience on the ground at Bokrijk.

Further, one of the interpretative areas, Oude Stad, is located at the end of a very long dirt road. The entrance to this road sits in a relatively sparse, wooded area of the site and is marked by a white wooden gate that is latched open (figure 50). This gate (like the one at Blists Hill) gives the impression that this point might be an edge. In fact, at another crossroad near the distance Oude Stad, it is a green iron fence which is similarly latched open that causes some confusion as it is not entirely apparent that this is a behind the scenes work area.
Here too, many of the boundaries at Bokrijk are passive boundaries with the spaces immediately inside them marked by fields, pastures, woods, or other empty spaces.

As a visitor to **Flag Fen** it is actually quite difficult to recognise the limits of the site. Although there is a clear site area marked on the map and in the guidebook it is much less clear on the ground. In fact, in some ways there is the distinct impression that the site blends in with the surrounding Fen landscape and stretches off into the distance with only the factories to one side marking an edge (figure 42). The marshy ground that is run through with ditches acts as much as a limit to parts of the site as do any museum-defined boundaries. Apart from hedgerows running along the prehistoric droveway and the rail fences near the entrance of the site there are few visual indicators of the edge.

Two of the small sites, the **Viking Houses** (map 17) and the **Scarborough Historic Museum** have boundaries which, in large part due to their size, are always visible. Although one is constantly aware of the rail fences marking the edges, because the surrounding landscape at the Moesgård Museum is somewhat more sympathetic than the urban environment at the historic museum the boundaries do not seem as prominent as they do at Scarborough. At the latter site there is almost a sense of being crammed, along with the structures, into too small a space (figure 46). At the **Benares** site, the boundaries are almost always in view as well. However, at this site, two things seem to give the site a different feel. First, there is considerable planting around the fences and many of the original trees still stand. This means that any fences, rather than being the sole and quite obvious markers are part of a group; in essence, a mini-landscape of features which define the site. Second, again, because much of the focus is in the interior of the house it appears that the most frequently encountered boundaries are the road which runs along the front of the property and the fence along side the old farm lane entrance.

**Todmorden Mills** continues as a somewhat vague place. Not only is the entrance of the site difficult to identify the limits are similarly
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As a visitor to Flag Fen it is actually quite difficult to recognise the limits of the site. Although there is a clear site area marked on the map and in the guidebook it is much less clear on the ground. In fact, in some ways there is the distinct impression that the site blends in with the surrounding Fen landscape and stretches off into the distance with only the factories to one side marking an edge (figure 42). The marshy ground that is run through with ditches acts as much as a limit to parts of the site as do any museum-defined boundaries. Apart from hedgerows running along the prehistoric droveway and the rail fences near the entrance of the site there are few visual indicators of the edge.

Two of the small sites, the Viking Houses (map 17) and the Scarborough Historic Museum have boundaries which, in large part due to the their size, are always visible. Although one is constantly aware of the rail fences marking the edges, because the surrounding landscape at the Moesgård Museum is somewhat more sympathetic than the urban environment at the historic museum the boundaries do not seem as prominent as they do at Scarborough. At the latter site there is almost a sense of being crammed, along with the structures, into too small a space (figure 46). At the Benares site, the boundaries are almost always in view as well. However, at this site, two things seem to give the site a different feel. First, there is considerable planting around the fences and many of the original trees still stand. This means that any fences, rather than being the sole and quite obvious markers are part of a group; in essence, a mini-landscape of features which define the site. Second, again, because much of the focus is in the interior of the house it appears that the most frequently encountered boundaries are the road which runs along the front of the property and the fence along side the old farm lane entrance.

Todmorden Mills continues as a somewhat vague place. Not only is the entrance of the site difficult to identify the limits are similarly
ambiguous. Todmorden sits in a valley and is bounded on one side by a steep and heavily wooded slope. On the other side, the edge is formed by the motorway and by various natural and created landscape features. The fact that visitors can come onto the site via nature trails and cycle trails throughout the Don Valley means that rather than having strong visible boundaries the limits tend to fade into the wooded areas. Certainly, the cluster of buildings sits in a cleared and well-mowed area but beyond this it is hard to discern any edge to the site.

*Bede’s World* (map 4) has few fences. In many ways this is due to its location on a high point of land overlooking the Tyneside ports. The berms with the dirt path surround the Anglo-Saxon village and farm so that these two areas sit well enclosed by the rounded slopes of the berm. Even those people walking around the top of the berm will encounter few fences; on the river side most fences lie several metres below at the base of the slope and on the Shell Oil plant side, fences whilst at the same approximate grade are separated by a grassy area. What Bede’s World has done is that they have “recreated” the ancient topography (of the period) thus creating an old and/or sympathetic landscape on which to situate the site. Within that space, the museum has used wooden fences around the main area of the site to carve out a distinct space (figure 43).

### 4.3 Cohesion

The boundaries and that break in the boundaries which forms the entrance way are important components in establishing the outline or the area of the site as it may exist for the various groups and individuals who interact with the site. However, the process by no means ends here; having moved the visitors onto the site and established that site as a place, the question then arises of how the institution goes about sustaining the experience. In the simplest terms, this means that the site must not only look like a different place (than that from which the visitor has come) but it must maintain that sense throughout the site: the illusion
of being apart and/or in the past must be held. As one curator put it, when describing her site, “Here, the streets are rooms too.” (Kjær 2001). This is a critical, perhaps the most important, aspect of open-air museums and sites which portray the past. What this means that rather than the paths or the streets or properties just being spaces between the buildings and as a means to get about, they must hold the sense of being in the past as one moves from building to building or inside space to other space. When this is missing, the visitor tends to shift in and out of “the past” and the experience becomes much more like the “viewing” of the past that occurs in traditional museums with their display cases.

There is any number of ways and means to create a “whole” experience and as we shall see in the discussion below, different sites choose from and employ a number of different devices. While some museums will elect to include smells and sounds as part of their historic environment, others will rely upon only tangible elements, including the landscape in which they are located, in order to convey a visual sense of the past.

4.3.1 Cohesion: Setting the Stage

In many cases, the specific elements that contribute to cohesion are very basic and simple. Individually, these elements are just props or objects. Together, they can create a strong sense of place which, in some instances, will be strong enough to allow visitors to enter fully (in a participatory or experiential sense) into the illusion of the past. In certain landscapes of the past where the cohesion is particularly strong it will combine with the visibility to allow intrusive or modern elements to be subsumed so that their role as a visible aspect of the landscape is much reduced and, in essence, fades into the background. As indicated above there are a variety of ways to do this and some sites will go beyond visual clues to set up a complex sensory experience. Among the case studies we will encounter the full range of experiences. Initially, it
may appear that the larger sites will have an obvious advantage in setting up the experience as it will usually require a greater amount of time to move through a bigger or more densely occupied site. Thus, it would be logical to assume that this would contribute to maintaining a sense of place, i.e., the more of a place one encounters, the more real it may seem. To a certain extent this may be true but on the other hand, because these are more complicated or more spread out, these larger sites may need to expend greater effort in order to link the elements. Conversely, there is a temptation with some of the small sites to view them simply as a display of buildings, merely a traditional museum without walls. I would suggest this is an oversimplification and I would argue, based on the case studies analysed, that few, if any, sites are without some level of cohesion.

Returning to the heritagescape, I believe that those sites which appear not to hang together are those heritagescapes in which cohesion is much weaker than either the boundaries or visibility. In short, both large and small sites have benefits and disadvantages when it comes to setting up an experience. The section below will consider these and explore the ways that individual museums choose to create a unified, cohesive experience.

Turning immediately to a small site, among the case studies Todmorden Mills has not emerged as a "strong" site. Among other things it seems to have an ill-defined purpose and fulfils many different roles; however, even here there is evidence of an effort to make the site hang together. Rather than the four buildings merely sitting in the grassed spaces, the museum has attempted to bridge the spaces between them. All of the buildings have paths or stoops that evoke the nineteenth-century period to which the houses belong. Outside the kitchen of the Robinson house, there is a "heritage garden" which is planted with heirloom seeds and species. The plants have been placed in traditional patterns and are tended and harvested using 19th century methods. For visitors to the kitchen this garden assumes a place on the mental landscape as interpreters in the kitchens make mention of the herbs and vegetables that they are using and which have come from the garden. Even without going
inside, the garden and the space outside the site has become part of the place.

The railway station with its few metres of track also hints at attempts to locate the structure (figure 74). One might argue that this small stretch of track, clearly going nowhere and running over grassy lawn is unsuccessful and unconvincing; however, this is not the point. Rather than evaluating the site and its elements in terms of “good” or “bad”—neither of which are very helpful or explanatory terms—what we are doing here is looking at how the institutions try to create a sense of place and the illusion of the past. Even the flagpole that is located some distance from the buildings is weathered wood and sports the Union, rather than the Canadian, flag helps to contribute to the overall experience.

**Scarborough Historic Museum** has a very hard brief. It is located on an extremely small fenced in plot and the four structures sit no more than metres apart. In fact, the space is so tight that the drive shed has been rebuilt at 1/4 scale in order to physically fit the property. Notably within this space there is a variety of building evoking all the different types of structure that one might expect to see in a village. Of course, it also means that spatially the site is a bit off so that the rural log cabins sit next to more urban-style houses and the carriage house sits at the front (rather than the rear) of the property. Despite all this, rather than leaving this small area between structures empty, the museum has made concerted efforts to fill these outside spaces. Near the log cabins there is wood piled up for the fires and there are spaces planted with wildflowers and where the grass has been left long (figure 70). The plantings reflect the function of the structures with which they are associated and wooden walkways link most of the buildings. These board walks (figure 59), in particular, help to convey a sense that one is within a single, connected space, while the choice of the wood evokes a past time. This sensory experience where a sense other than sight is used to help to create the illusion is a vital device and one that remains under-explored in the literature surrounding open-air museums and other heritage sites. We will return to this point in the
following chapter when we consider how all the elements discussed here (in this chapter) work together to create heritagescapes.

Benares, as an historic house museum, is perhaps atypical to other such museums in that it has property and several other buildings around it. It does not appear that this museum has attempted to integrate many new elements into the outside spaces. What they have done is preserve exterior elements such as the bake oven, the dairy and a garden space. This house seems to have carried the cohesion that it had as a family home and farm and when it was developed into a museum it appears to have come with an inherent sense of place.

The Viking Houses, unlike most of the sites above, have interiors that are almost wholly inaccessible. The exception to this is the Stave Church which is open. Visitors entering into the church will find a large open space with raw wooden benches and a dirt floor. Whilst largely empty, the church is a loaded space and has a strong sense of being a place apart. What is notable at this site, which in many ways is very similar to a display of building types typical to the Vikings, is that the museum clearly values the in-between areas. Rather than leaving the three buildings to stand alone in a pastoral setting, a tilled area, a fire pit and an archery target have all been set up to fill up the area (figure 76).

In some senses Bede’s World shares a number of features with these small sites. The site inhabits a very small area and consists of only three Anglo-Saxon buildings. Furthermore, as a visitor one never really forgets the very visible Shell Oil plant or that the busy Tyneside port lies just over the berms. The farm occupies the area of the site nearest the entrance building whilst the “village” the most distant. Between them run tarmac paths with a pond and stream linking both areas. Wooden bridges and marshy areas around the pond contribute to creating a landscape. Furthermore, the site, overall, does not appear to possess that tidiness that characterises so many museums and which hints at a dedicated pattern of mowing the grass. Instead, there are bare patches around the grassed
areas and the ground outside one of the buildings the ground is spotted with slopped mud (apparently from building work).

The berms around Bede’s World clearly are used as means to obscure the view outwards to the port. However, they also appear to have another, more interesting role as a means by which to extend the illusion of the past to the physical landscape itself. It is significant that the path around the top of the berm is marked on the map. Often such features are excluded but here they are clearly part of the interpretation and seem to considered part of “the site”. The pathway atop the berm is dotted with props among which a stone Celtic cross is the most prominent and which all link back to the Anglo-Saxon village. Even more interesting is that in their effort to recreate Bede’s landscape the museum has recreated the much older barrows that would have been present only as remnants in the Anglo-Saxon world (figure 47). Not only is this site trying to draw visitors to a past landscape, they are in turn acknowledging the past landscape of that (created) space. Even with all the visual pollution, there is both a very strong sense of place and a sense of the past at Bede’s World. Here, perhaps surprisingly, there is a strong sense of cohesion and of the site as a distinct place. Whether this is because it stands in stark contrast to its surrounding or whether its because it successfully uses the physical elements of the site to build up a sense of place, or whether it is a combination of both is a complicated issue. Taking this further, it could be argued that the experience at Bede’s World is in some ways stronger than that at the adjacent site of St Paul’s where there are standing remains of the Venerable Bede’s monastery. Despite the attempt to give a sense of the structures by marking the footprint of the missing buildings in brick, there is a considerably different sense (and experience) at this “real” site.

Bigger and/or multi-component sites also have much to offer to this analysis. Jamestown Settlement as a site consists of three different and distinct areas and it is perhaps because of this that there is an on and off sense of the past. Each of the areas individually presents a sense of the past and some sense of place; however, the question remains whether
these areas are drawn together or whether they remain as a set of three \textit{individual} spaces. The spaces between the Native American Village and the Fort and the Fort and the Ships have very little in the way of stage setting devices. In most cases these are limited to a somewhat standard set of signs and vista boards located throughout the entire site. There is virtually no attempt to create a past environment around the ships and the dock has more in common with a pier at a resort than as the home of three seventeenth century ships. The ships themselves operate like three separate buildings and visitors venturing into the interior areas can see, touch and even sit on reproduction items. Again, because of the brevity of this experience the question remains as to what kind of experience the ships offer. Here, the role of modern elements such as the rubber mats on the ladders, the safety strips along the door tops and the Perspex donation box located on deck come into question. Is the experience of the ships strong enough to subsume these intrusions or do they have a more “visible” role alongside the period items?

There is a strong attempt to create an environment at the Native American Village and perhaps, if it were larger, this attempt would succeed in drawing visitors into an experience of the past. Significantly, almost as much interpretation and stage setting takes place outside the structures as it does inside. There are cooking and work areas outside and debris litters the hard-packed dirt. Inside, regular fires ensure that the space smells different and items like the furs which lie on the beds, the herbs and vegetables drying and other artefacts all give visual clues that this is somewhere different. As a space there is a certain resonance—unfortunately it is all too brief an experience and perhaps because it is too easy to move out of this space, as an experience it does not endure.

Of the three areas, the Fort at Jamestown settlement probably offers the most vivid experience. In part, this is because the other areas of the site and the views outside are blocked by the high palisade surrounding this space and also because it is much larger than the other
two areas. Nearly all of the interior spaces are accessible here and most objects can be handled—this is an important device as it creates a very strong interactive experience. Outside, the spaces are well used and full (figure 64). Chickens wander throughout the fort and even into the buildings and, like the Native American site, there is an "untidiness" to this space. The remains of fires dot the space and wood and it is filled with sounds, smells and sites that all suggest that visitors are located in a past time. Modern work areas appear to be absent from this space.

**Beamish** is similar to Jamestown in that it is made up of several smaller sites. In this case, the four main interpretative areas are split between two different chronological periods 1825 and 1913 (map 3). All of these areas at Beamish lie at some distance to the other and are tied together by the tramlines. Within each of the areas it is evident that there is careful attention to detail. In the town area, the streets are cobbled and period post boxes, lamps, power lines, signs and fences line the streets. Here, as at Blists Hill, the shop windows are changed seasonally and the windows reflect both the goods sold and acknowledge events taking place around the country and the world. Not all of the buildings are accessible to visitors and a considerable amount of the interior spaces (notably in the terraced houses) is blocked off with specific and directed routes through the building. However there are also particular touches at this site, not the least of which is the "TO LET" sign on one of the terrace houses, which do contribute significantly to creating a vivid environment. Visitors travelling outside the town enroute to Pockerley Manor may notice a structure which is boarded up with dirty windows and which has a slightly dilapidated appearance (figure 127). It is not clear whether this is a space that is awaiting future development and/or whether this state of dilapidation has been encouraged as an interpretative device. That such a question exists suggests that there must be a certain resonance to the town experience.

Even the orientation of the tram tracks play a role in creating a sense of place. On the one side, nearest the outside edge of Beamish the tracks turn just as past the town; for visitors on the High Street, the effect is
of trams suddenly appearing around a corner which tends to add a depth to the vista and takes the focus away from the fact that beyond this point, the streetscape and the town end. In the other direction, towards the centre of Beamish, with a view made up of the field and the railway station the tram can be seem to come from a distance. This is similar function but this time the sense is that the tram is arriving from the countryside located around the town. Together all of these devices give the Town a strong presence at Beamish (figure 55).

Likewise in the colliery village there is a very strong sense of place and of the past. The site as an experience is enhanced by the opportunity to venture into the drift mine which offers a much more creditable experience than that experienced in the solitary cell at Alcatraz (see below) and by the dusty roads and pile of coal. Overall, with the exception of some of the pit cottages the access to interior spaces is much better in this area. Gardens are planted and tilled over seasonally and garden sheds appear ramshackle. Located as it is at the base of the large hill this area is self-contained with view sheds that are exclusively directed towards the site.

Pockerley Manor and the Home Farm are both distant from the core of the site. In this way they stand alone and in some respects bear more resemblance to the historic house museum than to an open-air museum. In both areas, whilst the interiors work, the exterior is perhaps less well attended. Notably both areas have pens which clearly recently (in the life of the museum) housed animals but which, equally obviously, have for some time been abandoned. Leaves, weeds and rubbish can be found inside the pens and there is little question that they are no longer in use. Pockerley Manor has the redeeming feature of being able to see the rest of the site and has a view unimpeded by modern elements. Located across the road from the site and away (visually and spatially) from the rest of the site, there is not a strong sense of “connectedness” at Home Farm.

In between these areas, the site is less clearly tied together. As discussed above, this is most apparent on the Pockerley Manor side of the site where the visitor must move through an “empty” area of mowed grass
and pavement. Here, the only link back to the site and its nineteenth/twentieth century environment is the tram tracks that run along the edge. The site is much more “real” and the illusion stronger in the area across from Pockerley Manor where a stand of trees has been left untouched and signs warning off poachers dot the landscape. This would suggest that even though there is limited pedestrian traffic here, the expanse of ground between the town and the manor house is just too great an area to be left without some sort of tangible link back to the site. However, while it may be that the illusion is not completely severed here, it could be argued that it is certainly not sustained.

Moving to the other, Home Farm, side of the site one does not encounter this same emptiness. Looking into the centre of Beamish visitors can see the town, glimpse the colliery village and indeed have a sense of most of the rest of the site. The problem here that there are several points along this route where modern features intrude and perhaps even take over. Here, the barns for the trams, the administration buildings and archives with parking lot, a work area and the very modern breeze block toilets all feature as part of the landscape. Individually, none of these features is particularly distracting: any one of them could be incorporated into the background of this space. Together, they act to create a sense of walking in and out of the experience of the site.

Carter’s Grove offers yet another version of a multi-themed site. The plot of land that which makes up this site was originally part of a “hundred” a term denoting parcel of land given to the earliest seventeenth-century settlers in the Colony of Virginia. It has been continuously occupied since then and each of the three interpretative areas represent different points in this long history. Because of the different treatments employed in recreating the Martin’s Hundred area and the Slave Quarters visitors are almost immediately presented with virtually irreconcilable visual contrasts.

At Martins Hundred each of the structures is linked by standard signs and by wooden barrels that offer a recorded commentary available at the push of a button. Visitors can walk freely in and amongst the
reconstructed remains. While the accessibility to the remains is good and visitors can fully interact with them, the site nonetheless remains at a distance because of the technique of presentation. Not only are the structures alien to most people’s experience, because they exist as the partial skeletons of buildings (figure 79) the chance to interact and the opportunity to create a place “away” is limited.

The Plantation House has a particularly strong sense of existing as an independent entity. No doubt this is due in part to the fact that all of the experience takes place within its four walls and, as such, the visibility is even more limited than at the other interpretative spaces. Nearly all of the items in the house are original so few areas are accessible and because only a guided tour is offered the experience of the house is heavily managed. There is little opportunity to bridge the gap between display and interaction. Despite this, there is evidence of the effort to create an environment and in one example a radio in the kitchen plays a tape (on a loop) of 1930s music and news announcements. As well, the large garden which sits between the house and Martin’s Hundred is pointed out and visitors are encouraged to see the garden. The location of the garden suggests that it may have a modern, museological function as a way to move people between the house and Martin’s Hundred.

The Slave Quarters, of all the areas at Carters Grove, is most like the conventional open-air museum and, here, there has been a concerted effort made to create a whole environment. The paths and ground are covered with oyster shells, pens contain chickens and a garden sits between the cabins. Inside, reproduction artefacts, many of which are deliberately “old” or broken (as an indicator of the poverty and the very straitened circumstances under which the slaves lived), are scattered about (figure 80). Here, there is full accessibility and visitors can wander at will throughout the interior spaces. A visit to the Slave Quarters is usually prefaced by an orientation talk and costumed interpreters can be found around the site. The Slave Quarters offers a full sensory experience: the smell of wood fires, the dirt floors and the rough, uneven paths of oyster
shells underfoot all take visitors to a place of “the past”. The problem is that the experience is brief and it may be that it does not adequately allow visitors the opportunity to move away from the present and enter wholly into the illusion. In the end, rather than appearing as a single but diverse site, Carter's Grove gives a strong impression of three very separate sorts of places, all of which happen to be located in the same place.

Flag Fen is yet another site made up of multiple spaces relating to the Bronze Age settlement of the Fens. Much of the site consists of preserved archaeological remains and of museum-type displays (e.g., the buildings containing the remains of “Sea Henge”). Among these spaces two need further discussion.

The Preservation Hall is a modern structure built around the remains of a 3000-year-old timber platform. It serves both interpretative and preservation purposes and visitors may view the platform from a raised walkway that wraps around the archaeological feature. No doubt mindful that enclosing this feature has removed it from its environment the breezeblock walls have been painted with a scene of the landscape of the Bronze Age Fens, including the rest of the platform depicted as stretching off into the distance (figure 81). There is, of course, never any doubt that this is merely a representation but I would argue that it is also more than that. This painted landscape serves both to remind visitors of the landscape from which they have just come and also to locate the inside of the hall back into the larger environment.

The second area that we will consider consists of several Bronze Age round houses that sit within a grassy area enclosed by low hedges. This hedge serves to mark this area as a specific, defined space. Outside, other than the houses themselves there are few props. Inside, the space is which has some furniture and other objects is dark, smells of wood smoke and is wholly different in shape and appearance to spaces that most Westerners are accustomed to. Because the exterior space is largely empty and does not contain many elements that create a particular Bronze Age landscape, there is no dissonance between the interior and exterior
spaces and one finds a sympathetic landscape. Further the fact that most of the visible landscape around Flag Fen is unchanged is an important component in this site; it may not hold together as well as some others in this analysis but there appears to be some link between the site and its larger environment. This is an important point.

A visit to Ste Marie Among the Hurons tends to feel like a credible experience. As one curator suggested the thing that sets this site apart is that visitors “can walk where the Jesuits walked” (Vyvyan 2001). She clearly believes in the “real” qualities of this place. As we have seen there are several deliberate devices which help to set up the experience and factors, such as the lack of signs and toilets in the historic site and the need to traverse the interim space, are important contributors to creating a place. Ste Marie also has the advantage of being in almost unchanged surroundings and this helps to define the site.

Inside, there are ample stage-setting devices to be found throughout the fort; the bark and wood shavings in work areas litter the ground, gardens and a cemetery help fill the exterior spaces. Although not all of the interior spaces are accessible the vast majority are and visitors can wander almost at will into most rooms and most structures. Again, this is an important aspect in creating an experience rather than a visit.

Ste Marie conveys a strong sense of place but here, too, there are discordant elements to be found. In the first court, the two fenced off fireplaces and accompanying signs and the remains of stone walls which run nowhere and/or intersect oddly with the reconstructed walls all present a sense of confusion—particularly as the latter does not have a sign (figure 69). It must be recognised that Ste Marie is not easy to move through and it can be confusing to make one’s way about the site. The reported phenomenon of visitors not realising there was more to the site than the first court (Vyvyan 2001) begs the question of whether the site does hang together and it is simply a consequence of the nature of the small entrances (via the palisades) that causes this trouble or whether it is a larger issue of the strong first court overwhelming weaker areas.
spaces and one finds a sympathetic landscape. Further the fact that most of the visible landscape around Flag Fen is unchanged is an important component in this site; it may not hold together as well as some others in this analysis but there appears to be some link between the site and its larger environment. This is an important point.

A visit to Ste Marie Among the Hurons tends to feel like a credible experience. As one curator suggested the thing that sets this site apart is that visitors “can walk where the Jesuits walked” (Vyvyan 2001). She clearly believes in the “real” qualities of this place. As we have seen there are several deliberate devices which help to set up the experience and factors, such as the lack of signs and toilets in the historic site and the need to traverse the interim space, are important contributors to creating a place. Ste Marie also has the advantage of being in almost unchanged surroundings and this helps to define the site.

Inside, there are ample stage-setting devices to be found throughout the fort; the bark and wood shavings in work areas litter the ground, gardens and a cemetery help fill the exterior spaces. Although not all of the interior spaces are accessible the vast majority are and visitors can wander almost at will into most rooms and most structures. Again, this is an important aspect in creating an experience rather than a visit.

Ste Marie conveys a strong sense of place but here, too, there are discordant elements to be found. In the first court, the two fenced off fireplaces and accompanying signs and the remains of stone walls which run nowhere and/or intersect oddly with the reconstructed walls all present a sense of confusion—particularly as the latter does not have a sign (figure 69). It must be recognised that Ste Marie is not easy to move through and it can be confusing to make one’s way about the site. The reported phenomenon of visitors not realising there was more to the site than the first court (Vyvyan 2001) begs the question of whether the site does hang together and it is simply a consequence of the nature of the small entrances (via the palisades) that causes this trouble or whether it is a larger issue of the strong first court overwhelming weaker areas.
Upper Canada Village, like many rural sites, also benefits from largely unchanged natural surroundings. Creating and maintaining the illusion of the past is clearly a goal at Upper Canada Village and whilst the map (map 16) may include modern elements once inside the site there is a clear attempt to create a sense of place and a sense of the past.

There are very few signs in the historic area and those that are there are almost exclusively of the period. Street signs are on wooden posts located at crossroads (figure 56) and signs advertising upcoming events are printed on buff-coloured card apparently on a hand press. None of the buildings is signed in any way and the maps are vital for negotiating one's way around the site. Even signs prohibiting entrance or warning of danger tend to be in an "old" style. A case in point is the bilingual signs found in the Cheese Factory. Although this seems ideal, because there is little definition between "modern" signs and "past" signs, it is sometimes confusing to know if an event is upcoming or whether it is a prop describing a long ago activity (figure 108).

These touches extend beyond the signs. In the general store, barrels are marked with "Bellamy's Mill, Upper Canada Village" despite the fact that both these names are fictional (figure 84). Again, in the Cheese Factory modern steel vats and heating required of current health and safety and food preparation laws are covered by weathered old-looking boards.

Along the back roads of Upper Canada Village the grass remains long along the fence lines and wildflowers and weeds grow freely. The roads themselves are dirt and in the summer heat can be dusty and dry. As well as the roads there are paths running throughout the village that, at the time of the site visit, were well used by the visitors.

These stage-setting devices are also found within the annual events. Upper Canada Village, like many similar sites, has chosen to include a cemetery as part of its interpretative features. This cemetery comes complete with "real" headstones (from the Lost Villages) and only a very close look reveals the museum accession tags. No graves live
beneath these stones. Each year, the museum recreates a funeral and offers various programmes dealing with this days-long event. Death notices go up with the current day and month but with a year located within the thematic/chronological brief of the museum and each year it is a different character who “dies”. The carpenter has a coffin on display, mirrors in the house of the deceased are decked with black cloths and, perhaps most dramatic of all, in the churchyard a new grave is dug (figure 129). Visitors to the site over this period can see boards covering a “hole” and dirt piled up beside.

There are two different sorts of modern structure within the village. The first is the Harvest Barn restaurant. This structure is deliberately set back off the street and located behind most of the other buildings on the east side. There has been an attempt to make this building resemble a nineteenth-century barn and the roof and sides reflect this. The front is glass and bears a modern sign. Around the side, again somewhat hidden but as part of the picnic ground, one can find water fountains and other modern elements. Apparently it is possible to add sides to the building to “completely disguise” the barn (Cazaly 2002)

The other modern elements are toilets. Apart from the restaurant/cafes these are housed in small, purpose-built modern structures are meant to resemble small sheds. Other than this Upper Canada Village does not appear to make a lot of use of street furniture despite the obvious effort spent on props.

There are clear signs of attempts to create an environment at Blists Hill and this museum chooses not only to rely upon visual props but also incorporates some of the sounds and smells of Victorian England into the site experience. Almost immediately, visitors to Blists Hill will notice the smell of coal hanging in the air. Throughout the day the various steam engines and boilers run and the smell of hot iron, wood-burning fires, printer’s ink and other “typical” Victorian odours forms a background to the site experience. All of these machines also make a great deal of noise so
whether it is hammering iron or the sound of large engines the site can, at times, be quite noisy.

At Blists Hill there appears to be a high priority on recreating an environment (Dix-Wilson 2001) although curators will readily acknowledge that some of the “ordinary” street features (e.g., hitching posts, lamps) are missing (ibid). Outside the printer’s shop sign boards with the “latest” editions of the paper advertise contemporary events (figure 61). Headlines refer to disease befalling local regiments and detail “contemporary” battles taking place in Boer War. This device serves both as a means of reminding visitors where they are in the past and also as a way of filling up the street so that it becomes a vivid interpretative and/or interactive space.

For several years up to (and including) 2001 the museum had developed the practise of dropping a century from the date; i.e., visitors arriving at the site in 1999 would find themselves in the year 1899. As Queen Victoria died in 1901, clearly 2001 was the end of this programme. During that year visitors would find shop windows decked in black crepe with pictures and tributes to the dead Queen. The newspapers and these windows both serve the important function of locating visitors in a specific time and place and at the same also locating them within a larger, national or even global context.

At Blists Hill even buildings that are closed contribute to maintaining the illusion of the past. In one instance advertisements were placed in the window of the closed sweet shop and the opening hours displayed in old looking fonts on faded cards. Elsewhere, on the corrugated iron fences around the ironmongers yard there are weathered advertisements and notices—all carefully designed to give the appearance of age and wear (figure 123). Shops that are open are tended by staff in period dress, products of the period line the shelves and even the tills (where items may be purchased) are “old”. Interestingly, in the Blists Hill shop, as in other, period shops at similar sorts of sites, there seems to be an effort to mix the ordinary with the exotic. Thus, whilst one might find products that are older versions of an item that a visitor has personally used or has a link to
through an ancestor, there also may be products that are alien and, perhaps, even distasteful to the modern visitor. A sort of tension between familiar and distant tends to arise out of this.

Like the cemetery at Upper Canada Village, Blists Hill has also simulated an experience of the past. In order to portray a working mine at the museum has restored an engine house and used a standing head frame. The process of building up the steam to power the cage (lift) which then descends into the mine and returns (at the call of a bell) to the surface is a key part of the interpretative experience. Yet, for a variety of reasons, there is no mine. Instead the cable from the head frame alternately slackens and tightens, as the cage descends no more than a few metres below the surface.

As well as the many relocated structures at Blists Hill the site also includes archaeological features as part of its landscape. This means that the museum has had to make a series of decisions about how they will treat each of these elements and, in turn, how they are incorporated into the larger site. Here the archaeological features are prominent and sit in contrast to the stage setting of the recreated village. Of these the Blast Furnaces are the most significant remains and exist as partial ruins sitting in the hill (figure 66). Instead of sympathetic or contemporary style signs, the area surrounding the furnaces is bounded by a low iron fence and has a modern vista board in front. As well as explaining the features, the board has photos and nineteenth-century style drawings. Clearly, these objects are on display and indeed, there is a different feel to this area of the site.

There is a second archaeological area situated across the canal from the main town and industrial area. Whilst there is a period (style) sign with “Brick and Tile Works” on a board fence marking the edge of the site, the only remains of this structure are the low brick walls (no more than 3 or 4 bricks high) marking the footprint. Moving into this main area of the complex the visitor encounters the extant structures and machinery of the brickworks. Again, visitors find modern vista boards and most of the entrances blocked by wire fences, making many of the interior spaces
inaccessible. There is a strong sense of abandonment here, which is strengthened by the isolation of this part of the site away from the central areas of Blists Hill. That this area should feel so empty is notable, particularly as this vantage point offers a sight line across the valley, taking in the only unspoiled nineteenth-century view offered by the museum.

In many ways cohesion is the critical factor for the following two urban sites. Both **Fort York** and **Den Gamle By** are located in the heart of cities. In both instances they are in environments that could easily overwhelm the site and deaden the experience and whilst they stand in contrast to their surroundings and are thus distinct for that reason, this is not quite the same as defining a place or, more particularly, a place apart.

Of the two sites, **Den Gamle By** is, by far, the larger and more complex. Portraying “the old town” it is made up of streets and squares and neighbourhoods. The time and effort it takes to navigate the paths and streets at Den Gamle By has an almost immediate effect of creating a sense of place. The experience at Den Gamle By is very vivid despite the fact that a tower block overhangs the site and distant traffic lights can be seen from the core areas of the site. Although it is made up of relocated structures the attention to detail in the layout means that the site is recognisable as a place with an inherent and familiar orientation. Within this layout, the streets range in width and are variously treated: main streets are cobbled whilst others in more industrial areas are dirt. As well there is a considerable amount of street furniture and the back gardens are planted, carts sit waiting outside houses and laundry hangs on the lines.

Not all of the buildings in Den Gamle By are accessible and several of the structures along the main street bordering the pond house administration offices. Externally there are few clues other than small handwritten signs. While a vivid experience, it must be acknowledged that Den Gamle By does not offer a complete illusion (of the sort that Ste Marie is trying to achieve) and visitors will find that some interior spaces are inaccessible while others will house museum spaces (including a display of
toys and an audio-visual presentation devoted to the reconstruction the Mintmasters house).

At Fort York there is not a great deal in the way of stage setting. The eight buildings making up this place sit in an empty, well-mowed space. Accessibility to the buildings is very limited. Only two interior spaces: the north end of the soldiers' barracks and the Officer’s Mess building are open to the public as recreated environments. An additional room in the barracks provides exhibition space as does one of the two blockhouses but the rest of the structures are closed to visitors. The basement of the Officer's Mess (previously interpreted as a basement kitchen) used to be a recreated space but now is made up of an observation deck from which the archaeological features from excavations in the late 1980s can be still seen.

The exterior space is explained as the “Parade Ground” and is home to demonstrations of nineteenth-century military exercises and the firing of the cannon; however, apart from this and the cannon ranged around the bastions the site is, for all intents and purposes, empty.

It may be that this empty space fits with the visitors’ idea of what a nineteenth-century fort landscape looks like and, if so, the emptiness becomes a feature and contributes to the sense of the site. Following on this idea, do then structures like the Stone Magazine (rarely open to the public) that sit in the midst of the Parade Ground space become oversized props rather than structures and, again, contribute to holding the site together?

Alcatraz Island is interesting as it appears, at first, to be a single-themed site. It is best known as the site of the infamous prison and this is the main draw for visitors. As it is made up of original, restored structures and because it is contained within such a defined area one would expect that the efforts to create cohesion might not be as complicated or as arduous at other sites. However, there are two main agents against which the site is working. First, the many of the buildings at Alcatraz are inaccessible and in poor structural shape (figure 65). As one moves
throughout the site is not uncommon to find barriers and signs in front of the buildings (figure 133). This has the effect of setting them apart so that whilst there has been an attempt to make the few modern buildings “match”, in fact what happens is that visitors move past most of the site without being able to interact with it. Second, the National Parks Service, who own and administer the site have developed a multi-themed approach to interpretation. There are four different guidebooks (and maps) available so a visitor may see Alcatraz the Civil War fort, Alcatraz the wildlife preserve, Alcatraz the “The Rock”—a general tour focussing on the prison period or finally, a tour themed around the various prison escape attempts. There was little evidence, during the site visit, that visitors were using these guidebooks. There are also tours lead by park rangers that detail the civil war history and while these were well attended, the patterns of visitation observed on the site visit appear to suggest that most visitors came to visit the prison.

Up to this point there has been little mention of the interior spaces of the various structures that make up sites. In many cases this is because these rooms work as distinct spaces in and of themselves and tend to convey a sense of the past. This is not to say that all interior spaces at the site work well rather, it is to note that the focus of the discussion and the analysis is examining the means by which visitors are moved in between these place in such a way that they are kept in the site and kept in the past. In the context of this current discussion, when there is no or little mention of these spaces it can be assumed that they “work”. When there is a dissonance or when the interiors are at odds with either other interior spaces and/or the exterior site, the interior spaces will be discussed at length.

At Alcatraz, because, for many visitors, it appears that it is the interior space of the Cell House that is “the whole” site this is an important area to consider. Throughout the island there are a variety of interpretative devices and signs used and this is no more apparent than inside the Cell House. To enter it visitors are moved through the Warden’s House where
all furnishings have been removed and replaced with large vista boards and through a hallway where visitors are fitted with the audio tour and, finally, into the cell block itself. Once inside it becomes apparent that there is a certain indecisiveness evident in the presentations offered in the cell house. In some places, the original prison signs have been preserved or reproduced to recreate the past space; the dining hall is a prime example of this. Around the hall there are some of the aforementioned “period” signs, and the kitchen is presented with menus and signs (the menu board on the wall reads March 21 1963, the day prison closed) whilst in the adjoining hall all the tables and benches have been removed and some of the windows are broken. This dissonance continues throughout the interior spaces.

In some areas there has been no attempt to recreate the environment and instead, spaces have been treated like an archaeological sites with standing remains or remnant shelving, sinks or other furnishings. One area even contains a grey wooden bench on which is painted “PARAMOUNT PRODUCTIONS/ The Bird Man of Alcatraz”; a leftover from the set of the movie. Other areas, have been fully recreated: some cells are kitted out with typical items, others contain vista boards which supplement the audio tour and some have paper signs indicating the “home” of some of the more infamous prisoners.

On the whole, most of the tour of Alcatraz is a directed, display type experience with a few interactive moments thrown in. The period signs are clearly an attempt to recreate the environment but as they are limited to small areas the visitor never really gets a chance to take hold of the experience. Interpreters inside, as outside, are National Park Service Rangers and are in modern green and brown uniforms. Granted, visitors are offered the chance to engage (ever so briefly) with the past by being locked in a pitch-dark cell in the solitary confinement wing; however, this experience has more of a feeling of a theme-park ride or tour and is quite different to the longer-term experience that other sites (such as Beamish with its Drift Mine) offer. In the Cell House, as at most of Alcatraz, there is
certain sense of dislocation and it is never absolutely clear whether visitors are in the past or present.

Black Creek Pioneer Village's brief as a museum is to portray a country village as it would have existed in the 1860s. Notably, while most of the site is made up of relocated structures, these buildings are in fact set up around an extant farmstead and cemetery. This means that there are specific problems associated with creating a viable and credible place. The result of this is that the farmhouse now sits across from shops on the main street of the town and although this stretches the imagination somewhat the fact that there are other, farm-type buildings and properties located on this same side does soften this arrangement. Designs for landscaping and planting were built into the original site plans and now, after nearly forty years, the site has mature growth trees. The amount and indeed even the presence of street furniture varies throughout the site. The town areas are packed with boardwalks and signposts which tend to draw the spaces together. Elsewhere, there are both implicitly and explicitly defined functional areas that create a town/village landscape that is recognisable to most visitors (even those not familiar with the particular history or culture being portrayed).

At Black Creek, during the 2001 site visit, there was clear evidence of ongoing infrastructure and restoration work (figure 131). Visitors were greeted in the entrance buildings with a map of current works projects and within the site it was not unusual to see small diggers and machines parked in the main streets and to encounter properties blocked off with modern orange, plastic fencing. Similarly, throughout the site there were a number of modern-style signs which ranged from notices about the restoration of the cemetery, to safety/warning signs (particularly at the time the dangers of foot and mouth disease). It appears that at Black Creek that when there is a need for such a device, there are few qualms about using even blatantly modern signs. Perhaps, this is an indication of the confidence that the museum has in the experience that they are presenting. Indeed museum staff suggested that rather than the machines
intruding on the experience of the site (as a total nineteenth-century environment) visitors would be “reassured” that the site was being taken care of (Brent 2001). In essence, she was suggesting that these modern elements would be no more than background and could be incorporated into the visit without taking away from the experience.

It is perhaps important to acknowledge that Henry Ford never intended Greenfield Village to be a public site. It was only after considerable public demand that the educational institute was opened to the public. It is no doubt equally vital to remember that it was a considered decision by Henry Ford to locate Greenfield Village amid the Ford Motor Company plants and factories. Finally, once again, it should be remembered that since the visit in 2002, the site has undergone significant changes and there are indications that the issues of cohesion, which will be discussed below, may have been altered in the intervening time. Rather than invalidating the data presented below, I suggest that these changes in fact strengthen the findings in this analysis.

Greenfield Village is similar to sites like Black Creek, Blists Hill and Den Gamle By in that it is made up of reconstructed structures relocated from other unrelated sites. Where it differs is in the layout. At most of the other similarly composed sites there is a strong attempt to create a place. If this is so at Greenfield Village it is certainly much more subtle. Moreover, there appears to be little effort made to link the interior and exterior spaces of Greenfield Village. The streets are paved, there are few street signs and the layout and the treatment is much more similar to modern environments than a place of the past. All the streets appear the same and there is little evidence of the sort of hierarchy of paths and roads seen at other sites. Indeed, the centre of the site appears to be the statue of Thomas Edison that sits at an intersection located near a complex of hot dog stands, sweet shop and carousel ride. When speaking, informally, to the museum curators, it became evident that the museum has a clear sense of the different interpretative areas that exist at Greenfield Village; however, to this visitor this is much less obvious. A look at the site map shows the site
divided into areas based upon themes such as "America's Homes", "Invention" and other intangible ideas. These are mixed in with more readily recognisable areas such as "Farm Life" (centred entirely on one property) and "Crafts and Trades". On the ground, however, there is a very strong tendency for these areas to blur together. It is quite easy, for example, to accidentally move in just a few steps from Thomas Edison's twentieth-century Fort Meyers (Florida) laboratory to the eighteenth-century Hermitage Slave Cabins from Georgia. Conversely, within museum-defined areas portrayed on the map there are areas that as the visitor moves through the site, appear as bounded and clearly separate spaces. The Menlo Park complex, the Susequehanna Plantation house and the grouping of the Daggett House and Cape Cod Windmill area are all set off as separate, defined areas and the Plantation property even has stones with a logo that mark the boundaries of this space. Yet, according to the map, both apparently belong to much larger, themed areas. So remarkable is this contrast that one child entering the Daggett House, which is fully interpreted with costumed staff performing all manner of daily tasks, was heard to remark "Look Mum, this one is real". (September 2002). It is important to recognise that because each of the buildings come with their own pedigree and distinct "personality" that there is a tendency for the individual structures to assume a sort of primacy. Not surprisingly there seems to be a constant tension between the individual properties/structures and the attempt to create a single overarching place.

Interpreters at Greenfield Village are clothed in both modern and period dress and this contributes to a strong sense of constantly moving in and out of "the past". Here the overall experience is often much more display-centred than experiential. This is an important point particularly as there are scores of interactive opportunities on offer--including making a candlestick, riding in an historic vehicle or train and experiencing the sound and smell of forges and cooking fires. Nevertheless, I would question how much visitors engage with the past at Greenfield Village.
There is evidence that Greenfield Village has attempted to create an environment that takes many different forms. In some buildings, such as the Sarah Jordan boarding house, visitors entering an upper room will trigger a recording of “typical” boarding house noises. In other places, e.g., the Robert Frost House, tapes will play recordings of some of Frost’s better-known poems and, in one startling instance, moving too close to a tollbooth will trigger a commentary.

Accessibility varies at the site. Most of the buildings are accessible and many interior spaces are open. However, even within one space, the treatment can range from modern museum displays to recreated rooms either blocked off or accessible. In the end it never makes for a lengthy or unified experience.

Colonial Williamsburg is not unlike Greenfield Village as it too portrays an urban environment. Of course, there is an enormous difference in the fact that Colonial Williamsburg (the museum) is in its original location. The street pattern is that of the eighteenth century and the street names are those that would have been known to the colonial inhabitants.

The landscaping and recreation of the natural environment (particularly the gardens) has always been an important aspect of the museum’s mandate. Today, after sixty years, there are large trees and mature boxwood hedges which, along with the gardens, stand as a trademark of Colonial Williamsburg.

Most of the streets are paved although there is a clear hierarchy with the main street being the widest and bordered by cobbles and the secondary streets narrower with dirt shoulders. Outside, there is a great deal of street furniture. Wood is piled up beside houses, the shops are identified by colonial-looking signs and weathered notices in eighteenth-century penmanship are posted outside the inns and taverns (figure 88). At any one time there is considerable activity on the streets of the town. Horse drawn wagons and carriages pass often, costumed interpreters are to be found outside buildings engaged in a variety of “colonial activities.”
and frequent interpretative events occur throughout the day on the streets and lawns of Colonial Williamsburg.

Colonial Williamsburg expends great effort disguising things and though this will be discussed further when we examine visibility, it is worth noting that elements such as water fountains and rubbish bins are disguised as wooden barrels (figure 89) whilst modern street lights are infrequently placed and are hidden in the heavy growth of leaves.

The site appears to hold together quite tightly and this is probably due to the fact that, with few (two) exceptions, the museum is able to present an unbroken streetscape of eighteenth century structures. This generally appears to “work” quite well in terms of creating a landscape of the past. In some cases, it appears to work too well and visitors can be seen trying to enter the private residences (for employees) that are interspersed along the streetscape. Like Beamish and other sites, where it was difficult to discern whether signs were old and for exhibition purposes or whether they were informational, this confusion, which sometimes arises, can be problematic for visitors.

The two breaks in the streetscape represent land that Colonial Williamsburg has not been able to acquire. The first, located near the west end of the town, is marked by a large brick house. The second was until 1995 the site of a large yellow farmhouse which has subsequently been moved outside the Historic Area. The latter location is fully interpreted as an archaeological site while the second is mentioned but not fully acknowledged. Of the two properties, the brick house is the less visible. It sits in a less vigorously interpreted end of town, is hidden by a very large tree and is somewhat obscured by the church and churchyard. The role of the archaeological site is a bit more complicated and we will return to this later.

As sites Bokrijk and Skansen are distinguished by their size. Although Bokrijk spreads over a considerably larger area than Skansen, both sites contain within their limits vast spaces that are “empty”. In both
cases these empty spaces contain woods or other areas of natural vegetation.

A dominant feature of the Skansen landscape is the outcropping of bedrock found throughout the site. Rather than set the outcrops apart they form part of the landscape that visitors to Skansen have to negotiate. Skansen is meant to portray Sweden "in miniature" and, thus, the parts of the site that make up the open-air museum are identified as different geographical areas of the country. Within each of these areas there are, once again, props that help to convey a sense of an environment. In some cases this is created by differential landscaping or mowing of grass and planting of flowers or vegetables. In other cases, simple items like the bicycles propped outside the town hall lend a sense of place (figure 63). The difficulty at Skansen is that it is not just a museum it is also a park, a place for concerts and a zoo. These very modern usages and spaces are interspersed throughout the historical areas so that once again one moves in and out of an experience—albeit on a very large scale. In between the areas the paths are paved and there is some but not a lot of street furniture. Along the way visitors may find the occasional setting of milk churns sitting at a crossroads (figure 92) or will encounter one of the many milestones (gathered from Sweden) or even rune stones (figure 94). However these are widely and intermittently spaced and it could be asked whether they carry enough "weight" to bridge the empty spaces.

Bokrijk has much more empty ground than inhabited spaces. This museum represents the province of Flanders with two country areas (east and west), one town and one village area. Two things make this a more sustained experience than Skansen. First, at Bokrijk, the open-air museum is the site and there are few, if any, modern elements to the site. Second, this site is very good at filling up their in between spaces. To bridge the considerable space between some of the sites, the fields are filled with animals and the roads throughout the site look like country lanes with ditches and weeds. In and amongst the forested areas visitors will
encounter roadside shrines or other intermediary sites that help to carry one over to the next space (figure 93).

Interestingly the road signs at Bokrijk are unashamedly modern and are made of metal painted brown. These, however, are only found at the intersections of roads and thus tend not to intrude (figure 87).

Accessibility to structures is good here. Many, if not most, of the buildings are open and similarly, most of the interior spaces are reachable. Inside lit fires and recreated rooms contribute to a full experience.

4.4 Visibility

Throughout this discussion it has become evident that many of the elements that contribute to the guiding principles, and indeed the guiding principles themselves, are closely related. In many cases, the site elements (whether signs or fence lines or any other tangible component) will stand as indicators and evidence of more than one of the principles. With visibility this is even more apparent. All the factors that work together to create a sense of cohesion have to be perceived or experienced; most often this happen visually, with our eyes. What we actually see as we move around the site helps to create a sense of a whole environment and is a significant part of the process of the visitor engaging with the site and with the experience.

Within this section visibility will be considered in two senses: first, as physical visibility and second as cultural (in)visibility. The former is relatively straightforward as it takes into consideration all the tangible clues that are seen by visitors as they move through the site. Thinking back to the exploration of cohesion and its role at the site, the role of vision becomes clear. The stage setting devices that are used to knit the site together are of little use if they are not viewed and adjudged to be “real” or to look authentic. In many ways cohesion can be considered as the end
product or sum total of all the visible and tangible elements that are seen
by visitors.

Physical visibility is so closely linked to the other two guiding
principles and the way in which both the boundaries are understood and
the site as a cohesive unit are perceived ultimately come about because of
what is seen. Likewise when we come to analyse cultural (in)visibility, this
physical sense of seeing will come under consideration perhaps only
implicitly but clearly as part of the process. For this reason, the section
dealing with physical visibility will be brief and will act more as a short
review of some of the issues encountered in earlier sections. The focus of
this section will be on the idea of cultural (in)visibility. Here we will deal with
issues such as the role and prominence of modern elements in this created
past space and we will examine how sites see themselves within their
larger surroundings. Within this context components such as view sheds
and lines of sight will be considered and assessed.

4.4.1 Visibility: The Physical Experience

It has already been acknowledged that many
aspects of the discussion of both boundaries
and cohesion may be applied here. The markers
that make up aspects only work when the visitor
visually recognises those elements. Not only that but the idea of familiarity
comes into play here. Part of the process of setting up the experience of a
place of the past and a place apart means that visitors need to feel
comfortable, or at least somewhat confident, in negotiating their way
through the landscape of the site. Given that either one or both of the
aspects of the site may be unfamiliar to visitors, it is important to create a
sense of recognition. This can be done by setting up repeated elements
that can be visually recognised and will help to guide visitors in their
journey about the site. In many ways this is akin to a brand recognition.
Within the site a set design to the signs may fulfil this requirement. At
Beamish, for example, there are a great many very large “empty” spaces
between the interpretative areas. Left without obvious clues, such as a view of the town site or any of the other areas, the signs are reassuring; suggesting that visitors are still within the site and are going in the "right" direction. This is important and can act to carry visitors over to the next area without them feeling lost in the in-between spaces. Blists Hill employs this idea outside the site. All of the museums making up the Ironbridge Gorge Trust are signed by characteristic red and black signs with the site name and the Ironbridge logo and are clearly recognised (figure 116). This not only serves obvious practical needs it also ties together distant places and thus may create a sense of a larger landscape.

A lack of standardisation can also send messages to visitors. To look at one instance, Greenfield Village does not appear to have a unified approach to signage. What this means, it that while most of the exhibition buildings are marked with a typical green sign (figure 120), nearly as many are not. The differences between signs immediately raises some questions. Are, for example, these "other" signs indicative of some difference between properties? The signs in the Henry Ford homestead are all framed in gilt (figure 119). Does this make them more significant than the other properties that have more conventional museum labels? The clues that we process visually are often the first step to building an understanding of the site—whether in terms of its boundaries, cohesion or theme. To begin with a sense of confusion does not bode well for the overall experience of the site.

Returning to signs as a form of stage-setting here, too, problems can occur because of what the visitor may see before his/her eyes. Again signs often act as the visual clues that allow visitors to move about a site easily and fluidly. The problem occurs when museums use an old or sympathetic style for signs that are meant to convey information. These signs may "fit in" with the site but because of this quality may, at the same time, be confusing. One set of signs at Beamish prohibiting entry to a structure looked old and therefore it was difficult to determine whether visitors were meant to heed the instructions (figure 123). Again the issue of
how the museum envisions the site versus the actual experience offered at the site arises. As we have seen in other examples the vision of the site that the museum holds and the experience that the visitor encounters may not be the same, and in some instances may even be in direct conflict. As we saw earlier with the Incline Plane at Blists Hill while the museum sees this as part of the site, visitors faced with a half closed gate receive a different message and therefore tend to ignore this part of the site. Likewise, at Colonial Williamsburg where visitors often need to lift latches or walk around to side doors in order to gain access it can be disconcerting to find that a number of the structures on the main street are locked. On the one hand the cohesive quality of the streetscape and the view down the main street encourages visitors to think of all the buildings in a similar fashion; whereas, on the other hand, there are clearly a number of different roles for these structures.

Granted, these may seem to be small points; however, if either in part or in whole any of these changes the visit from a looser, more experiential journey to one where directions or restrictions of movement come into the forefront, then the experience of the site changes.

4.4.2. Cultural Invisibility

At its simplest, the sort of visibility that we have just discussed deals with all of the physical components of the site that may be seen by visitors to the site. The idea of cultural (in)visibility is less straightforward. Here, depending on the way in which individuals experience the site, different elements will assume a different prominence within the physical landscape. Moreover, the idea of cultural (in)visibility also takes into account elements of the landscape which cannot be seen with the eye. In this sense, a “memory” of a particular feature, building or event may occupy a space in the cognitive site map that a visitor will hold in his or her head. Moreover, as we shall see below, there may be an attempt by the museum to reduce the role that a tangible element will have at a site. Beyond even this, a place or structure may become “visible” as
its function changes over time. As an example of this last point and moving away from the case studies for a moment, when the Gilbert Scott-designed the Battersea Power Station on the South bank of London was transformed into the Tate Modern gallery this building came into a new prominence and subsequently became a much more visible element of that landscape. Previously, unused and relatively unattractive, it had in recent times faded against structures such as the adjacent Globe Theatre and St Paul's Cathedral each of which presented a much more clearly (and visibly) defined role in the landscape.

In order to explore further this idea of cultural (in)visibility, let us look at the role of modern elements within these created landscapes of the past.

The practical requirements of creating a site that portrays the past are considerable particularly when original structures are used. Stairs constructed in centuries past will be too narrow to allow access to upper stories, machinery dangerous, objects fragile and areas out of bounds. Extending outwards, the site as a physical property needs to be secure and protected. This means that fire extinguishers, burglar alarms and exit signs must all occupy obvious spaces in the landscape of the past. Beyond this comfort must be assured and thus, amenities such as toilets, restaurants and shops will need to be incorporated into the site and the knack of making them visible in order that they can be available to visitors yet, at the same time, ensuring that they fit, or blend in with, their environment is difficult to achieve (figure 149). Different sites interpret this in different ways (figures 151, 152). In essence, to be successful, the institution needs to make modern facilities and elements both visible and invisible.

To discuss each of the facilities separately would be a lengthy task and would involve a certain amount of repetition. Rather than going through all the different forms of modern intrusion, I will spend some time on just one example: toilets. Whilst this may appear a frivolous choice, in fact they stand as exemplars of many of the other modern facilities and amenities that need to be accommodated within a site. Toilets are universally required elements and, by necessity, must be modern in
construction. An examination of the treatment that institutions develop to incorporate toilets within an historical site reflect issues and fundamentals of the principle of cultural (in)visibility.

Amongst the case studies, several sites choose to construct purpose-built structures in a sympathetic but obviously modern design. The two nineteenth-century pioneer sites: Black Creek and Upper Canada Village use similar devices and within the site rely on single story wooden structures. At Black Creek, the buildings are painted a red-brown colour similar to other, clearly identifiably, old buildings (figure 137). The structure itself is surrounded by a smaller scale version of the boardwalks found throughout town and are identified with signs apes the street signs and which "look old". The structures at Upper Canada village are made of raw lumber and have simple stencilled signs (figure 138). In both cases, these exterior structures tend to sit behind exhibition buildings or off to the side and some appear as though they are outbuildings. In this way they are both physically and visually hidden.

Greenfield Village uses this same sort of device and whilst the toilets do not match any particular structure on the site, they are constructed of red brick with white columns in a distinct (and to the American public) highly recognisable Federal style architecture (see page 148). In this way they most closely match the entrance building of Greenfield Village. Again these are located in accessible but not necessarily obvious areas of the site.

Like the above sites, Colonial Williamsburg, relies on purpose built structures. Here there are a variety of designs but again, in almost every instance they are located off to the side or behind other structures (figure 139). Depending on the location, the buildings most often are white clapboard which blends with the other elements on the streetscape. Like the other sites, signs in the Historic Area are usually discreet and match the style of the street signs. In the Visitor Centre at Colonial Williamsburg, the washrooms in that modern building are denoted by the internationally recognised symbols. Significantly these symbols have been enhanced so
that the figures are in colonial dress. Even the sign for the disabled toilets depicts a colonial person but this time seated in a wheel chair (figure 144).

Due in part to its size there are a variety of different means by which the toilet facilities are accommodated at Skansen. Most pertinent to this discussion are those located in the "Town Quarters" area. In this case, the museum has chosen to use a purpose-built structure but has added a twist. While this building is located to one side, it nonetheless is located on one of the busier streets. Not surprisingly the structure is set back from the road. More interesting still is that they are housed within a semi-subterranean building meaning that there is minimal frontage (figure 141). From the back there is a sloping roof rising no more than 2 metres in height. This is further hidden by the plants that have grown up over the roof and by the fact that it is nestled in and amongst the bedrock outcroppings.

It seems evident that in, at least one instance, Alcatraz has tried to achieve a sort of invisibility with the toilets located in the main interpretative area next to the Cell House. This is a difficult area as it contains the fully interpreted and (mostly) restored Cell House, several original structures which were intact but clearly under repair or restoration as well as the Warden's House which stands behind a fence as a shell with interpretative signs. The resulting breezeblock structure chosen to house the toilets does stand out quite dramatically and is prominent in the landscape. It is a matter of debate whether it blends into the overall structural landscape or whether it stands out. In another area the toilets appear to have been designed according to a National Parks Service template rather than as an attempt to blend with this particular site. This building, one wall of which is almost wholly taken up by a “Welcome to Alcatraz” National Park Service sign (figure 3) has an exterior of white stucco reminiscent of a Spanish-American style. Having said that, it may be that in its own way it achieves a sort of invisibility. This building sits in a multi-purpose but ill-defined area next to the docks. Old cranes, modern construction equipment and museum buildings all make up an eclectic landscape. Perhaps then, these toilets blend in as part of highly varied set of landscape features.
Fort York has made a choice that sits somewhere between these purpose-built structures and the "hidden" structures that will be discussed below. Here, the toilets are only indicated on the map and are tucked behind the officers mess and located within the fort walls.

The other very common option is to disguise modern facilities within original or reproduction structures

Den Gamle By uses an original structure located on a main street near a busy area as both an indoor picnic area (with vending machines) and as toilets. From the street frontage there are no signs on the building but around the back (on a secondary route) where there is direct access the two doors are denoted by hand painted signs, in script (figure 143).

Blists Hill also uses this approach and the toilet is located in the dense area nearest the entrance of the site is found down a passageway in a backcourt. The toilets are marked by small, metal (apparently) period signs (figure 140). Others are located in the restaurant pavilion (which has a semi-modern interior and is a dedicated food service space) and outside the entrance building.

There seems to be duality of approach at Bokrijk. Some of the toilets are located in buildings and tucked away to such an extent that they are difficult to find. In one instance, signs (figure 145) were so sparsely placed that it was necessary to seek directions from museum interpreters. Conversely in the main village green area the toilets are well signed with modern, universal symbols. Here they appeared to be located in modern purpose built structures that neither particularly matched nor presented any great dissonance with its environment.

Beamish tends to conform more to the approach of disguise and most washrooms are located inside old structures. At the Home Farm complex (on the site of the road) the washrooms and a refreshment bar are both situated in an old stone structure. In one particularly evocative instance, the modern toilets are located in the back yard of one of the pit cottages—in a shed similar to the privies. Even the signs in this case are painted over to match the rest of the structure. However, in one
spectacular departure from this method, there is also a set of toilets located in an unattractive breezeblock building (figure 142). To be fair to the museum, staff indicated that this structure remains only because of budgetary constraints; however, that it was ever constructed in this way and in a reasonably visible area of the site may say quite a bit about the way the museum views (or viewed) the site.

Some sites opt to limit the toilet facilities to the entrance buildings. Often this is a choice that is heavily influenced by the size of the site. While this may be possible at a small or medium site, at larger sites, it is simply not practical not to make provision for these facilities within the recreated site. Elsewhere, the nature of the site itself does not allow for construction of facilities. Carter's Grove is located on a vast tract of farmland and the choice of treatment of recreating at least two of the spaces; Martins Hundred and the Slave Quarters, means that including toilets would require a separate and very obvious building. Likewise, the plantation house itself has no space for the inclusion of any modern facilities. In the first case, with Martin's Hundred, this issue was solved when the subterranean Archaeology Museum was constructed in 1992. The main toilets are located in the entrance buildings or, failing that, are hidden in the stables (located between the slave quarters and the house) along with vending machines, benches and a brief introductory video.

Jamestown Settlement limits its toilets to just two areas: the entrance building and the area along the modern dock (for the seventeenth-century ship). Both the Native American village and the Fort are free of any modern elements. This device is one that is found quite often; many sites will either spread out their toilets so that they do not lie in the “centre” or in densely interpreted spaces. At Flag Fen, the only facilities lie within the visitor centre. This, I would suspect, is for similar reasons to those at Carters Grove. To construct a new purpose built structure would make that building extremely visible and would accord it a prominent space and perhaps role both on the landscape and as part of the other structures.
This also applies at **Bede’s World** where toilets are limited to the entrance building.

The last site, **Ste Marie**, as we have already discussed, has tried to eliminate all modern elements from its reconstructed site and so, here too, one will only find modern facilities/amenities in the entrance buildings. Rubbish bins are also missing from the site which, in and of itself, is unusual. With this single exception rubbish bins were found at all of the case studies. However, despite their efforts to omit signs from the site, Ste Marie ultimately included a sign in the interim space. Notably this sign does not have any words instead it has the universal symbols for toilets, restaurants and first aid (figure 146). In order to tie it into the site it also has, across the top, drawings of fleur-de-lys and the turtle, evoking the French and the First Nations groups portrayed at this site.

Finally, in most cases, the toilets (and other facilities) located outside the historical site itself tend to revert to a wholly modern appearance. Yet for some sites, even here it is important to hearken back to the themes of the site. At **Blists Hill** whilst the teashop outside is anonymous and quite modern the toilets are decorated with tiles with drawings of the Thomas Telford’s iron bridge (similar styles are available in the shops). At the Visitor Centre at Colonial Williamsburg the vending machines, rather than being fronted with the familiar Pepsi or Coke logos, have been replaced by a large-scale photo of a woman eighteenth-century garb serving food in a tavern (figure 152). While this example may seem overly simplified, the issues involved in incorporating a modern facility into a landscape which is portraying the past in fact demonstrate the complexity of decisions that is involved in this process. There is a fine balance between setting the stage and creating confusion and so there is also with making modern elements blend and yet allowing them to be noticed as well. This phenomenon is not just limited to structures. Carter’s Grove has chosen to move its visitors through Martin’s Hundred by means of a self-prompted recorded tour. In order to do this whilst at the same time attempting to maintain a sense of the past, the museum has created a
series of numbered barrels out of which, when the switch is tripped, the disembodied voice of the site archaeologist issues forth. Furthermore, lights, alarms and electrical lines are just a few of the elements that need to be worked into the background of the view. Some of these items (e.g., exit signs and fire extinguishers) cannot, for a variety of legal and/or safety reasons be hidden and must be fully visible. How prominent a position these intrusive elements will occupy is, I believe, a factor of the strength of the landscape as a whole. The answer to this will, I believe, emerge out of the consideration of the three guiding principles together.

4.4.3 Cultural Visibility and the Shape of the Landscape

Another aspect of the principle of visibility comes together in shaping the appearance of the physical landscape of the site. Of course, this will also be a contributing factor in the sense of cohesion and boundedness of the site and ultimately it will also influence the strength or resonance of the heritagescape. In this sense, visibility (in the sense of perception) is apparently deliberately shaped by mechanisms employed in the physical landscape and by the appearance of the physical elements that make up the site. Not surprisingly, the sense of a landscape, as whole, has an important role here and there is strong evidence that the exterior streetscapes and appearance of the structures are critical components in creating this environment. Further, it also appears that there is a premium put on the exterior (or immediately visible) aspects of sites (c.f. Garden 2000). Within this analysis it was observed that museums, even those with a high premium on “authenticity”, which lacked certain elements (notably structures) would copy, alter or create new structures in order that the landscape, as a whole, would be credible and (perhaps) cohesive. It would suggest that this sense of the whole (as perceived visually) has considerable weight. Whether it has more weight than the individual components is not immediately clear and will need further consideration.
Before moving on it does bear mention that, using conventional methodologies the subtlety of this phenomenon may not have been recognised. We will return to these points in the concluding chapter. For now, it is important to note that what this appears to be suggesting is that there is a clear trend towards creating a perception of an unbroken landscape. The fewer physical breaks and the fewer mental gaps, less chance of the visitor moving in and out of the experience of the past.

There appears to be no pattern to this trend; it can neither be entirely identified with sites that are wholly recreated nor those that are wholly original and in situ. Indeed, I suspect that all sites rely upon this tool to some extent. Rather than looking at all the examples, the discussion below will focus on some of the more notable examples of this form of visibility.

As we have seen Beamish is made up of original buildings and the interpretative areas (if not the site itself) offer a credible experience. In the Town area devices such as the “To Let” sign, the street furniture, changing shop windows and even the apparently derelict building all create a very strong visual environment and a vivid sense of being in a past. However, there have been some very deliberate alterations to some of the buildings. The “Beamish Garage and Cycle Works” has an original façade which has had a new building added onto the back. This is only visible if one knows to look at the side of the buildings where the join between the brick facing wall and stucco side walls becomes apparent (figure 148). This was undertaken in order to create a safer environment for visitors and to aid in visitor movement through the building. The recreated floor plan is essentially the same as that of the original structure and the shop has been recreated as a working environment. Rather than list it as a “particular” place the guidebook refers to the shop as “typical” of World War I garages. (Beamish, 2003:24) A few pages earlier the guidebook (2003:23) reveals that this same device will also be employed at the new Masonic Hall. In many ways the garage is a passive sort of alteration, which unless the visitor makes a point of asking, will probably remain unnoticed. It is
interesting that the description of the Masonic Hall makes particular note of this but again, it will be interesting to see whether that part of the description will remain once the structure is completed and, if so, whether it will be a factor that is important in the visitor's perception of the building and of the site. More obvious and more startling is the presentation of the "Dainty Dinah Tea shop". By the time the visitor has moved through the town, he or she has become familiar with the environment of the past which is on offer and most would probably expect to remain in that place. Thus, it comes as a surprise to find that the teashop, located on the first floor above the Co-op, has an entirely modern interior. This not only stands in harsh contrast to the exterior landscape of the town, it also conflicts with the presentations offered by the interior spaces. In the town there are two food service facilities and two retail outlets. With the exception of Dainty Dinah's all make an effort to create an environment of the past. Granted modern crisp packets may be seen in the Sun Inn but there is a coal fire and lamps and several other strong stage setting devices that make it appear "real". Likewise in the sweet shop and the stationers there is an effort to disguise or at least reduce the impact of modern elements in favour of an old setting. Whilst the stairs leading up to the teashop maintain the illusion with appropriate furnishings, the appearance of a very modern cafeteria at the top must be a shock for most visitors. Perhaps the banks of windows along two walls that look back out onto the site are an attempt to draw the visitor's eyes back into "the past" and away from the modern place.

We see a similar situation at Fort York in Toronto where a multi-year project has recently resulted in the reconstruction of the "Blue Barracks". This structure, long since lost, was partially reconstructed in the 1930s. Originally it was one of the larger and more important buildings at the fort and a considerable amount of effort has been expended by archaeologists, historians and architectural historians to recreate an authentic representation of this building. Despite this care the majority of this new building has been given over for modern purposes and much of
the interior is, at best, sympathetic. Whilst only some of the rooms reflect the original floor plan, in the case of the dining space (where visitors may be served a "typical" nineteenth-century meal) the location of the original walls and partitions have been marked out in a darker wood against the paler wood floor. In essence this is a nod to the past, rather than a fuller presentation of the past.

At Blists Hill there is a slight variation on the trend. One of the first buildings that visitors encounter at this site is the Lloyds Bank (figure 147). This building has a key role in setting up the site for visitors: it is here that they may exchange their modern money for reproduction currency of Victorian England. However, this building is a new structure that has been copied from an original. Significantly not only is the original buildings still standing on its site as a bank, it is also located in the nearby town of Broseley. Whilst visitors travelling from afar might not be affected by this structure, it must have some impact on those visitors who are familiar with the Broseley building. Again, while Blists Hill otherwise has almost all "real" buildings, the need for this—both interpretatively and visually—clearly outweighed any other considerations.

From the perspective of this investigation one of the most remarkable aspects of the reconstruction of the Mintmaster's Residence (see page 155) at Den Gamle By, which required the removal and subsequent replacement of two buildings on another site, was that these dramatic changes to the physical landscape seemed to be incorporated into the understanding and perception of the site itself. This is an important point and we will return to it later; however, in this context, it is important to note that, for the institution, it was the visual and spatial landscape of the "Town Square" that was valued over the specific location of the two smaller structures.

The last example comes from Ste Marie, the Jesuit Mission, and here the attempt to create a visually strong environment is found in one of the interior spaces. Unlike the Dainty Dinah example, at Ste Marie the effort has been expended towards this area looking more like the past. A
key part of the interpretative story-line at Ste Marie is the martyring of the Jesuit Fathers in 1649. In past years, the site has marked a spot in the reconstructed Native Chapel with a small metal plaque with the names of dates of one of the martyred Jesuits, Jean de Brebeuf. The plaque sat flush against the level dirt floor and no doubt was similar to the lead plaque found by archaeologists in 1954. This site was clearly visible but not necessarily obvious. More recently, Ste Marie has changed this display. Now the plaque has been replaced by a built up mound of earth (evoking a recently- dug grave) which has at its head, nailed to the wall, a wooden plaque, apparently hand hewn and with the dates and name burnt into the wood in script. Surrounding this is a low wood, rail fence. It is important to know that Brebeuf’s bones do not lie here nor have they for many, many years. It could, of course be argued, that this feature is not significant for many individuals and only is noticed by long-time or repeat visitors. However, there are two further points. First, it is acknowledged that this “grave” would not be noticed by one-time visitors; however, it is an important example of the sorts of changes and ongoing evolution that a site undergoes over time and it offers a strong argument for the necessity to consider these sites not as synchronic places “frozen” in time but as dynamic places which, over time, will undergo a series of alterations. Second on the grave mound there are votive candles and flowers—both real and plastic—left behind. This “grave” raises all sorts of questions and presents a very complicated sort of experience. On one hand, the old display with a clearly modern plaque had a much better fit with the past—at worst it did not conflict with the experience. In contrast, the current display that has much more “realistic” elements (especially the grave mound) in fact does not appear to fit and becomes, along with the plastic flowers and candles, something of the present. Having said that, the votive candles and the flowers could suggest that this grave “site” may credible. The question must be, are people buying into an experience influenced by the visit/experience of the Pope or are they buying into the experience of Jean de Brebeuf’s grave? Perhaps it is both? I would argue though that whilst
this gravesite does offer an experience—and one that might be exotic—that experience is not necessarily one of "the past". This phenomenon is akin to that at Bokrijk where it was argued that the experience was not of a place "of the past" but rather as an experience of a place "apart".

One last thought when considering the photo and the modes of presentation in this space, it should be noted, that this is the same site, which when faced with health and safety regulations requiring that windows on the upper stories have grates, endeavoured to create iron grates that were typical of seventeenth century France. One the one hand there is a clear mandate to keep the visual past clear of modern intrusions and as accurate as possible, whilst with grave and the photo, there is a clear sense of the visual past and present being mixed together.

Looking back over these examples, it is tempting to cast these devices as fakery or as artifice meant to delude or deceive. However, I would argue that this is far too simple a diagnosis of a very complicated phenomenon. In many ways it returns to that much earlier point made in Chapter 3 that it is not about whether a site is "good" or "bad", "real" or "not real". What is important is how different sites regard or use the different means available to convey the past. No doubt there are serious interpretative decisions that lie behind the placement of something like a modern photograph or the incorporation of a copy of an extent building into the landscape of a heritage site; what we are looking at in the course of this analysis is how those elements found at an individual site that are used to portray the past can tell us about that site and how it works but can also tell us about how heritage sites in general work.

4.5 Case Studies: Towards a Summary

At this point, a considerable amount of data has been put forth as the result of the investigations into twenty case studies. It is now time to review what we have learned from the sites themselves and about ways in which the heritagescape both manifests itself and operates at different
sites. The next chapter will consider the findings and will also return, briefly, to the question that was posed earlier: namely, does the methodology of the heritagescape enable us to identify any underlying processes—notably that of change-- that may accompany the heritage site over time.
Chapter 5
Case Study Analysis. Summary of Findings

The previous chapter has offered an analysis of the findings that emerged out of the application of the heritagescape to a set of twenty case study sites. In order to create a sense of organisation and also to ensure that the discussion was centred around the guiding principles, this data was offered without an overall summary of the elements at each of the sites and without a focus on the individual versions of the heritagescape. This chapter will address that situation by looking at the site through the lens of the heritagescape, in other words, it will move a step back and consider the sites in a larger context. As well, some of the outstanding issues (including the impact of the changes that occur as a site evolves over time) will be considered. We will begin this dialogue by returning to our case studies. It should be noted, in advance, that there is no structure to the order in which the sites are presented: to discuss them either in their geographical or temporal context is to run the risk of imposing a structure over the analysis.

5.1 Considering the Sites as Heritagescapes

Greenfield Village is a prime example of the sort of site (i.e., one of those made up of disparate structures brought together in an unrelated location) that previously may not have come under serious study. Most of the buildings at Greenfield Village come with a pedigree—all in one place visitors can see Thomas Edison’s workshop, the bicycle shop owned by the Wright brothers before their historic Kitty Hawk flight and a seventeenth-century Cotswold cottage. Around all of this runs a boundary, which in the area of the site closest to the entrance and most visible to visitors, is marked by a very solid red brick wall.

In terms of applying the guiding principles to this site what we see almost immediately is that cohesion has a much-reduced role. First, the spaces between the buildings are just that—spaces—there are few street
signs or other stage setting devices that create a sense of the past. The signage does nothing to improve this situation. There is a huge variety of sign and the only “standard” one is a green sign found in front of the buildings that offers the name, date, original location and sometimes a brief social history of the structure. These signs tend to feel like giant labels on display cases. Because the cohesion is so weak it is difficult to identify (visibly or otherwise) what is or is not the site. As a result, when one regularly glimpses the Ford plants situated beyond limits of the site the apparently strong, physical boundaries tend to fade and the site as a discrete entity tends to blur. The lack of cohesion may also have arisen out of the emphasis on the individual building rather than the site as a whole. While it is a hallmark of this institution it may also be that it is a strong factor standing in the way of an experience of “the past”. This also means that Greenfield Village becomes more of a “museum of buildings” and less of a place. Nonetheless, it is also quite clear that Henry Ford was cognisant of the need for and the power of cohesion and there are parts of the site that clearly do hold together.

Chief among these cohesive areas is the Menlo Park Complex that was home to Thomas Edison’s laboratories when he invented the light bulb. When Ford moved the Menlo Park labs to Greenfield Village along with the main structures, fences and outbuildings he also scooped off the topsoil around the buildings and brought it along with the structures to Dearborn where they form a complex. Anything found in the topsoil has been transformed into an artefact. Upstairs in the main lab Edison’s work area has been faithfully recreated. Visitors standing behind the barricade cannot help notice a chair pushed back from a worktable. This chair, which sits on a square of floor that is plainly different to the rest (of the boards), has been nailed into place to mark the spot where it landed when Thomas Edison stood up from the table. What is particularly remarkable about this is that the chair was preserved not from the “Eureka” moment when Edison discovered his light bulb worked; instead, the chair was set in place following the ceremony, at Greenfield Village, that marked the fiftieth
anniversary of the invention. It was in the presence of Ford and President Hoover that Edison stood up and it is that occasion and that spot that Ford has his carpenters have literally “captured”. Since then, the entire floor has been replaced save for the square on which the chair sits. The point is that what we see is Ford himself creating a history if you will: a history within a history. Yet rather than enlivening the site or making it more credible, the chair and the complex itself give a sense of being locked in place. As a result what one sees at Greenfield Village is that all three of the guiding principles are quite weak which, in turn, means that the site does not stand strongly as either a place apart or of the past and, in the end, the experience is much more display-oriented. Finally, because the site is so firmly set as a sort of a tableau it appears that it would be virtually impossible to accommodate any kind of sustained change that would not impact the overall identity of the site.

Den Gamle By, although also composed of buildings of different ages and from a variety of places, operates in a much different fashion to Greenfield Village. Den Gamle By is also located within an urban environment but within this site there is a much better sense of being “elsewhere” within a larger landscape. Because the museum considers that “the streets are rooms too” (Kjær 2001) the outside spaces become much more than the means to move from one place to another. As one moves through the site one can see and recognise the layout of town squares, city streets and even miniature neighbourhoods all of which work together to create cohesion. Critically, at Den Gamle By one tends to remain within the past. Although the boundaries at Den Gamle By are not marked in a substantial way because as a site it is so cohesive these boundaries have a greater role. Here they both separate the site from the city and also take into account its presence. Thus, because the guiding principles are all very strong at Den Gamle By one has a very strong sense of the experience of being in the past and so the site as an entity is recognised.

All of the above would seem to suggest that the landscape of Den Gamle By is very “clean” with few modern intrusions. In fact, this site has
chosen to mark each of the buildings with blue and white signs which offer, in three languages, the name of the structure and its original location and function. While these signs are not large, they are quite visible. Furthermore, some buildings have an extra plaque this time in brass and denoting a corporate sponsor. These signs are located near the ground but usually they are multi-coloured and include the company's logo. What does happen is that these elements, whilst present on the landscape, do not dominate. I suggest that this is because the site as a cohesive unit and as a place creates a strong heritagescape and this means that the experience of the past and of the place are enough to carry over and include these modern elements.

Before moving away from Den Gamle By let us return briefly to the Mintmaster's Residence, the large structure that was added into the Town Square area. This is a good example of change at a site and offers a chance to examine the impact of this process. As we have described above a very large and imposing structure was slotted into the site necessitating the removal of a significant portion of the hillside (which formed one of the boundaries of the site) as well as the relocation of two other buildings. Now this is a familiar landscape to Den Gamle By's many visitors so it would be logical to assume that an intrusion like this into the centre of the site and into one of their central interpretative areas would have quite serious ramifications. Critically, it appears that this was accomplished without taking away from the essential identity of the site: the boundaries changed but the site did not. Both visibility and the marked, physical boundaries were altered, yet the site seems to have remained as a cohesive entity and this element has been assimilated into the landscape of the past at Den Gamle By. Change has been subsumed by the strong identity of the site. One of the factors that may have contributed to this is that the perceived boundary in this area of the site seems to be very strong. Whilst the fenced and legal limits run just behind this new structure, it also appears that the heritagescape may extend beyond this point. At the top of the slope is an historic windmill which is marked on the
guide map and which is visible from most areas of the site. Rather than a sense of the site being locked into the physical limits there is a feeling that the site "naturally" flows into the visible distance. No doubt, as we saw above, the fact that the boundaries on the city-side of the site both separate and acknowledge their larger surroundings means that Den Gamle By, as a site, is able both to achieve a strong sense of place and to be fully integrated into its larger environment. Therefore, cutting away the hill and moving the boundary does not have as damaging (to the site identity) an impact as it might; rather, it becomes a "natural" process. At Den Gamle By each of the three guiding principles are very robust and each is operating at roughly equal strength and, as such, it has a very strong and vibrant heritagescape. In the end this means that the experience of the past being offered at Den Gamle By is vivid and sustained.

The Bronze Age Centre at Flag Fen has recently experienced equally significant changes to its site and thus also offers a good example of the sort of information that can be gained about long-term site processes by using the heritagescape as a means of analysis. Over the last year with the addition of a new visitor centre the entrance to the site, which, in the past was linked to the historical landscape, has moved 180 degrees to the opposite side of the site. In essence this has made the "front" of the site the "back". Yet, here again, the site seems to have subsumed change and retained its own character. Whereas at Den Gamle By this can be accounted for by the strength of the guiding principles and the heritagescape, at Flag Fen it is a bit more complicated but still this methodology based upon the guiding principles offers insight. Flag Fen is made up of a variety of different types of features and it is by no means the most cohesive of sites. As a site, Flag Fen is hard to define: on the one hand the area is broken up by the many ditches (typical of the Fens) that cross the site, whilst on the other hand the lack of a visually strong boundary tends to allow the eye to stretch out across the surrounding landscape. Because there are so many different kinds of space at Flag
Fen it is vital, if the site is to present an experience of the past, to offer tangible markers that will tie the areas together. At the time of the initial visit there were few. Flag Fen clearly had a story line of life in Bronze Age Britain but it was hard to carry for visitors to carry this theme over areas that represented different chronological periods or which, in the case of the archaeological displays, were clearly modern in purpose. Likewise, even though there was a strong entrance building, when visitors exited it they arrived at area of the site that failed to offer a readily apparent vista. In short, it was hard to determine exactly what kind of site Flag Fen was. To be fair, this site did not bill itself as an open-air site; the problem was that it also didn’t necessarily identify itself with any other mandate. On the whole, the experience at Flag Fen was thin; it was not cohesive, the boundaries played little, if any, role and visibly it was hard to discern any markers in this landscape. The experience was almost entirely display-centred and somewhat intermittent. In short, overall, Flag Fen had little to offer as either a place apart or as a place of the past.

The two site visits to Flag Fen took place in November 2001 and again a year later in November 2002. With the opening of the new Heritage Centre at the opposite (formerly “back”) side of the site, the site has pulled together and is a much stronger place. Much of this has to do with this new form of entrance and particularly with the architecture of the building with its bank of windows facing onto the site. Not only is it possible to locate hedgerows and fences that appear to mark boundaries, the view has been turned back into the site and into a denser part of the site so that buildings and other features can be seen. Along the way, the boundaries and, to some extent, cohesion seems to be gaining a new prominence. It may be still debatable whether Flag Fen offers an experience of the past but now the site is beginning to offer a sense of place. At the time of writing Flag Fen is still a work in progress so it is interesting to note that staff identify as one of their mandates the placement of new and more signs to create “a more cohesive site”. In sum, Flag Fen is a site where the heritagescape is (now) relatively
apparent but where because the principles are not operating entirely in parity and none is particularly strong, it is a heritagescape that lacks vigour.

When thinking about the guiding principles and how they operate relative to each other within the context of a specific heritagescape, it should be remembered that it is not necessarily a negative factor when one or more principles operate at different levels. Often, it might be that the way a specific principle operates that will account for the distinct character of a site. **Fort York**, like our other urban site, Den Gamle By, is located in the heart of a city yet the visibility and boundaries are manifested in a very different manner. At Fort York, despite an imposing boundary of stone walls surrounding this fort, the visibility (in this case the view) is directed outwards from the site and links are made to the original eighteenth-century town site. Within the interpretative materials and the presentations the role of the town of York from which the fort drew its name and with which it was economically, socially and, since, historically linked, has a strong role and is readily evoked as an active component of the site. This is notable for a couple of reasons. First, it draws the view **away from** the tangible fort site to a now-hidden town site, visible only in the themed street signs that presently mark the area. Second, by adopting this tactic, the line of sight is deliberately directed towards the twenty-first century vista of the skyscrapers of downtown Toronto. In essence the invisible town of York plays at least as important a role as the much closer and very much more visible Garrison Commons and cemetery. Yet, somehow in terms of visibility at this site the skyscrapers are either invisible or incorporated.

In contrast, an almost identical site with a discrete space and a prominent physical boundary has a very different sense of visibility. **Ste Marie Among the Hurons** sits within a natural landscape that has remained almost unchanged since the seventeenth century and has few, if any, visible modern intrusions. Like Fort York, this Jesuit mission is surrounded by a wall and has a clear historical link to its surroundings; however, in this case the visibility is almost entirely centred on the site with the view drawn inwards to the site itself. Obviously, there are more factors
at work here and a look at the other two guiding principles reveals that even this quick look at visibility offers a good example of how sites that are apparently similar may, in fact, operate in quite different ways. Moreover, by using the methodology offered by the heritagescape and the guiding principles, not only is it possible to recognise this, it is also possible to begin to account for these differences. With the heritagescape we can see not only how they operate individually but also relative to each other. With previous approaches this would have been impossible.

It might have been expected, given that Ste Marie sits in a virtually unaltered landscape, that the heritagescape would extend well beyond the walls and that the relationship between the site and the larger environment would be well integrated. This is blatantly not so. Only one of the museum staff identified any of the areas outside of the “interim space” and the administration buildings as part of the site. For visitors there are few, if any, opportunities to ascend to the viewing platforms in order to see over the palisade towards the outside. It is almost immediately apparent that the boundaries and visibility are operating strongly at Ste Marie and likewise cohesion is a strong force. There are a couple of further points that bear further consideration. The indication from one of the museum staff was that a large number of visitors to the fort never made it beyond the first court (Vyvyan 2001). This was borne out by visitor movement patterns observed during the site visit. What this would appear to suggest is that the boundaries in this instance are overwhelming the other two principles, Cohesion and visibility, whilst strong, are not able to carry over into the other areas which are easily accessible but nonetheless difficult to see (physically). Again, at Ste Marie we have a case where the heritagescape experienced by visitors does not quite match that identified by the museum (staff). In terms of the interim space, it is difficult to know how visitors perceive this area as it was empty during most of the site visit. In addition, the archaeological features—the two fireplace footings and the extant foundations of the bastions—seem to be understood differently. The museum does not seem to take into account that both by their presence
and by the signs posted around them that they each represent a break in the whole illusion on offer.

Finally, for a number of visitors Ste Marie, the historic site, comes as a package with the Martyr’s Shrine located across the motorway. From certain points throughout the fort this building can be clearly seen. There is an historic connection as it is the repository for the bones of the Jesuit priests that were killed by the Iroquois who attacked Ste Marie and, as noted in Chapter 4, when Pope John Paul II toured Canada in 1984 he visited both the Martyr’s Shrine and Ste Marie and a large photograph of the Pope at the site reinforces the link between the two sites. Museum staff indicated that they considered the Shrine outside the site limits and “quite distant” (Vyvyan 2001) but the photo would appear to belie this. Furthermore, under legal agreement with the Society of Jesus, site of Brébeuf’s grave must remain accessible and free of charge to all visitors. This part of the site in effect “belongs” not to the museum but to the Martyr’s Shrine (Vyvyan 2004). Is this perhaps an indication of a heritagescape that is not overtly acknowledged by the museum? In the minds of visitors, there appears to be more than one heritagescape, including one where the shrine prominently features.

Turning to one of the larger sites, let us look at Skansen. As the oldest open-air museum Skansen is used both as the template and as the exemplar and, over time, it has become a sort of a shorthand for all open-air museums. It might, therefore, reasonably be expected that Skansen would have a strong heritagescape wherein the guiding principles came close to operating as equally as possible. Skansen incorporates the immediate topography and vegetation into the site and has a natural-looking environment. Extending to a wider vista there appears to be no attempt to block the modern skyline of Stockholm or indeed to conceal the houses that sit mere metres away from the iron boundary fence. Given that the site sits on a height of land it would be next to impossible to ignore the surrounding city; however, beyond this there are deliberate points—in the
building at the top of the escalator for example—where windows have been placed to offer a view back towards the city.

Inside Skansen there are very "strong areas" where an encounter with the past is particularly vivid. Yet partly because of the size of the site and partly because of the variety of different roles that Skansen, as a place, performs the site does not hold together very well. The spaces between the interpretative areas are not always well thought out and often visitors will lose track of "the past", despite the fact that in the farmsteads and around some of the interpretative areas there is considerable stage setting. Because of its great size the visual clues need to be strong and in many cases not only are they weak, they are absent. Furthermore, several of the areas at Skansen have been given over to modern functions so that as a visitor one is constantly moving in and out of the past. One minute the site appears like a public park, the next like a fair and the next like something of the past. All in one place visitors will encounter alongside the historic areas, a zoo, "Little Skansen" a play area for children, a large plaza with a modern restaurant, a stage and a car park. Simply put, Skansen fulfils too many different roles to be a cohesive and defined place of the past. Indeed, because Skansen is not only a museum and zoo but also a place for picnics and outdoor concerts, it doesn't really even exist as a place apart. The boundaries blend not from the obvious vantage of the top of the site but also along the street front. Here the striped awning and illuminated signs call to mind the Tivoli located around the corner. It is telling that there is considerable confusion amongst visitors between the two street level entrances and this suggests that they may not readily recognise the site limits. So, although Skansen occupies a strong role in the hearts and minds of Swedes and acts a cultural and folk icon (Wikander 2003), in fact, on the ground it melts into its surroundings and takes on the appearance of just one more among the many attractions on the Djurgården.

Bokrijk, the Belgian site, is as large, if not larger than Skansen, yet there is a very different "feel" to it. What is curious is that from the main
entrance (near the car park) there is very little of the site to be seen. One does however, have a very clear sense of entering into the country: the lanes are dirt, cows graze in the fields and ditches are weed filled. What is notable at Bokrijk is that it is quite uncommon to be able to see large parts of any of the other areas. The Oude Stade area is completely hidden from view and requires a significant journey in order to find it. On weekends Bokrijk can be very crowded but during the week it is possible for visitors to find themselves alone which cannot be ignored as a contributing factor towards the experience offered at Bokrijk. Most of the buildings at Bokrijk are accessible and those that are open tend to be persuasive spaces of the past. Some of the interiors contain museum displays and exhibition cases but these are well in the minority.

Bokrijk is a terribly convincing landscape and when in it there is little doubt that one is somewhere else. Arriving at the site brings one through small settlements and towns and has a suburban feel to it; however once inside Bokrijk one is clearly deep in the country and just as clearly somewhere else. There is a very strong sense of place here: the treatment of roads and paths varies according to the environment being portrayed, the "manicured" feeling that comes with many museums is absent or minimised and natural stands of trees and other vegetation appears to have been knit into the landscape of the site. The site is very tightly held together which is remarkable given the vast empty spaces between interpretative areas. The directional signs, which are all brutally modern in appearance, are found only at crossroads (thus aping "real" road signs) so that there are long spaces without overt directions. Remarkably, there seems to be an underlying sense of understanding of how to move through this landscape by relying on sense other than vision. This intuitive sense of moving through the site employs more than just the eyes. In more than one instance the route ahead as seen by the eyes was visually very difficult to discern. Faced with dense tree cover and more than one route, the messages sent via the eyes were confused and unsure; however, because the site had managed to create a familiarity within its treatment of paths the
sensory experience of the familiar ground underfoot leant an assurance of the route forward.

The boundaries at Bokrijk are subtle and, as noted above, are not encountered very often. In many instances the eye travels beyond the physical boundaries to tree lines or wooded areas beyond. This suggests that Bokrijk fits well with its larger environment. Although it does not actively encourage a view outward (like Fort York) there are nonetheless many instances in which Bokrijk’s heritagescape appears to slip over the physical boundaries. The site seems to be almost seamlessly knit into its larger surroundings. This means that moving through the site requires work: routes are not always clear-cut and confusion can sometime arise when open gates are encountered. Notably, in one area near the Oude Stad, where visitors are faced with a large green gate and it is not immediately clear that this is not a thoroughfare (indeed it appears so on the map). More than one visitor ended up in a works area briefly before choosing the second, woodland path. Whether this is a negative quality is not clear. I believe it may be an indicator that the three guiding principles are working together in a balanced and close relationship so that there is a strong heritagescape. As such, it may be an instance where most of the heritagescape is working in an almost ideal way—i.e., that it is both defined place but also a place that is firmly located with the larger landscape.

There are modern elements at Bokrijk. In addition to the modern directional signs each building has a metal sign, located about knee height with a number that corresponds with the site map. Other types of sign include a more elaborate and in-depth version of the house sign; large billboard type signs found in fields that are part of an ongoing exhibition; and a memorial to one of the museum’s founders. Like the signs at Den Gamle By, by and large these signs tend to assume a lesser role in the visual landscape. What does stand out, however, is one of the interpretative areas: the Oude Stade. Visitors coming out of the wooded route cannot help but be struck by the towering seventeenth century buildings making up this “town”. Yet unlike the rest of the site, there is a
film set quality to the Oude Stad and it does not appear "real". The reasons for this are not immediately clear. The museum does acknowledge that they ran out of funds and this area is only partly restored. Only a few of the buildings are "open" and apart from the theatre and a beer cellar visitors cannot actually enter into the shops and houses and must remain behind barriers, viewing the interiors from a distance. Not surprisingly, it was observed that most visitors spent considerably less time here. Obviously this is a much less interactive experience which, coupled with a paved plaza and streets and a events tent located on the mowed lawn, lends a flatness to this area of the site. Whereas in many of the areas at Bokrijk one has a full, *sustained* experience with a past time, here it is more of a quick visit.

One final note before leaving Bokrijk; there is little doubt that Bokrijk operates as a very strong place and the stage setting elements found in the different areas of the site manage to carry over between the empty spaces. However, it must be asked whether this experience is one of place or of "the past" or if indeed it offers both, which is foremost?

This issue and discriminating between a place "apart" and a place "of the past" has now been raised several times: we first encountered it in Chapter 3 when introducing the concept of the heritagescape and since, it has arisen more than once during the analysis of the case studies. It is a key question and begs further discussion. This issue will be addressed in the final chapter as we assess the heritagescape and explore what impact phenomenon such as the above may have upon both the methodology and the concept of the heritagescape. For now, let us look to another of the case studies.

Among the sites that we have examined *Beamish* has, over time, come under considerable scrutiny. Figuring in both Hewison’s *Heritage Industry* (1987) and later in Shank’s and Tilley’s treatment of various means of portraying the past in their 1992 book *Reconstructing Archaeology* this site has come under criticism for soft focus nostalgia and for removing this past from the larger historical context.
A big question at Beamish is whether it operates as one large cohesive site or as four individual (but related) areas. Within most of the interpretative areas there is quite a strong sense of being in the past. The colliery village is particularly strong and offers a vivid experience. Here, the stage-setting devices are strong: the gardens with their ramshackle sheds, the dusty road and the pithead building all contribute to the experience of this area. Once again, this is not to say that the village is free of modern intrusions. Several of the pit cottages are barricaded, at least from one side and the drift mine must provide all of its visitors with red plastic hardhats. As well, there is ample evidence of security systems and other modern devices. However, the view out from here is either into the central field or into wooded areas and both of these elements contribute to the illusion and help to define this area as a distinct space. Likewise, the town with only a very few exceptions is, overall, able to sustain an illusion of the past which is remarkably intense in the outside spaces along the High Street. The two remaining areas, Pockerley Manor and Home Farm, are also, in varying degrees, quite resonant spaces. However in both instances the farmyards tended to be empty and, in the case of Pockerley Manor, weed-filled. This sense of abandonment or inactivity stood in high contrast to the actively interpreted interiors.

Of the two, Home Farm suffers particularly due to its separation from the rest of the site by a road and by being located on the side of the site that has a weaker interpretative focus. Home Farm itself is made up of a combination of modern barns and pens and historic structures—some of which house the tearoom and toilets. On the whole the area has a very "mixed" feel to it.

A problem at Beamish, as at so many very large sites, is that the space between the areas is vast and it is hard to maintain the experience and the sense of the site. It is clear that efforts have been made to reduce this sensation. For example, the new Museum Collections building has been designed to look like a carriage works on the outside (figure 150). Not only does this help to make the building fit in with the late nineteenth/early
twentieth-century setting it is also important in that it provides a substantial marker on the horizon so that when one is at the opposite side of the site (i.e., nearest the colliery village and the site entrance) and looking across the vast expanse of the site, this building draws the opposite side in and offers a point of reference from which a set of limits or an edge to the site may be inferred. In another example, the side of the site that runs between the Town and Pockerly Manor is empty and the wide pavement, manicured grass and benches all look more like a contemporary park than the site visitors may have come to recognise. This setting stands in contrast to the fields and woods that make up the rural landscape visible on the other side of the rail fence. Whereas in many areas of the site the sense—which begins when the visitor leaves the roadway and is presented with the vista of Beamish filling the visible valley landscape—that the site is part of the larger surroundings is diminished along this more modern side of the site. It is a rare example there is a clear demarcation between the inside and the outside (of the site). It is also on this side that the institution seems to have made a departure from their regular mode of signs. Signs at this site tended to either be sympathetic, appearing to be of the period, or to be blatantly modern maps. Near the “Waggon Way” and next to stage setting signs that warn “Poachers will be Shot” is a map and several road signs. For some reason, it was felt necessary not only to locate the visitors in space but also in time. Thus amongst the variety of signs is one notable example that reads “1913 Town/1990’s Car Park”.

The museum identifies the limits of the site as stretching from the line of trees visible beyond the occupied areas to the steam hammer at the entrance. No doubt for the institution this also describes the extent of the heritagescape. The map that is offered to visitors seems to reinforce this sense of a bounded site by trying to draw the site together. As noted above, the unseen river is depicted as running around the site, thus forming a limit. Furthermore, trees and other background features have been drawn in, presumably as an attempt to make the site appear less empty and/or spread out. In terms of the guiding principles, we find that at
Beamish each of the three principles to be quite strong and together the three operate at roughly the same sort of level or strength. Beamish tends, on the whole, to be both a distinct space and, at the same time, well integrated into its larger surroundings. The problem is that there are areas (the Town and the Colliery Village) within the larger site which seem almost to be sites within a site and it is little wonder that museum staff identify these two places as the most visited of all the areas at Beamish. It could be argued that these areas seem to have their own individual heritagescapes that often threaten to overwhelm that of Beamish as a whole. This is particularly significant as there is such a strong place of coming into a place even before one passes through the entrance building.

**Carter’s Grove** is similar to Beamish in that it, too, is made up of a series of separate interpretative areas. In this case the site is smaller but the links between the areas are weaker. The entrance at Carter’s Grove does much to set up the experience of the site; however, when one applies the guiding principles it appears that at least one of the principles—cohesion—operates in a punctuated way meaning that, overall, the site does not hold together well. The most dynamic experience at Carter’s Grove is the Slave Quarters area, which does exist as a clearly defined space with a considerable amount of “furniture” that helps to create a vivid setting. Despite this, the experience in this area is not sustained. The problem, I suspect, is that the Slave Quarters as a place is simply too small to offer a comprehensive experience of the past. Once again we see a situation where, rather than an experience of a past place, we are left with a glimpse.

The other two spaces at Carter’s Grove also fail to create a vivid experience of the past. In particular, Martin’s Hundred remains as a display space: the semi-reconstructed wooden buildings and palisades are striking but their skeleton state means that visitors will always be kept back from the past as presented here. Even the voice of the archaeologist (to whom we have been “introduced” in the museum) is not enough to make this a “living experience”. The visibility—as a means of perceiving the
past—could be seen to work against the other two principles. However, it is much reduced.

The problem with the house is that it is a highly managed visit and, again, it is display-focused with visitors kept behind velvet ropes and in the care of docents. In the house the boundaries overwhelm and like some enclosed museum spaces, it separates itself from its surroundings. Overall this site, whilst it offers areas that individually may be quite tight and cohesive, as a whole place it does not hold together.

**Blists Hill** prides itself on conveying the “whole” environment to its visitors. The site is very strongly cohesive: from the street furniture to the stage setting devices found inside and outside the buildings. Here, there appears to be a robust heritagescape that is readily apparent. The part of the site nearest the entrance is perhaps the most cohesive and visibly is the strongest. The sense of being in the past is quite strong here and the experience seems very “real”. In some ways because the visible limits of the site are so clearly defined by the striking topography there is a strong visual recognition of many of the boundaries. However, there are also areas which operate somewhat differently. Among these are the aforementioned archaeological remains. The “Tile Works” area sits in contrast to the rest of the area because the extent structures and machines are blocked off. On many of the walls there are large, modern vista boards. Although it is clearly not the same as the heavily interpreted town area and it is located across the canal from the main site area, this site somehow retains a connection with the town. I suspect this may be because the view from the Tile Works is back onto the town where the activity from the various buildings and the smoke from the chimneys is visible. A curator later identified this line of site as the only “remaining” nineteenth-century vista (Dix-Wilson 2001). During the site visit the canal was bridged by a wooden part scale model of the Thomas Telford’s Iron Bridge which had been reconstructed by the Royal Engineers as part of a *Time Watch* programme so it was notable that the link between the Tile Works and the rest of the site seemed to hold even with this contemporary
and alien element added to the landscape. In contrast, the Blast Furnaces situated further along the canal have an air of isolation and distance. No doubt much of this lies with the fact that they are fenced off and inaccessible; however, it also probably has much to do with their location within Blists Hill. The main, densest area of Blists Hill sits on roughly level ground. At the edge of the town area the hill slopes down to the large green and buildings and here it is much more sparsely populated particularly in winter, when the activities of the site seem to be focussed in the town area of the site. What happens is that the wide open space of the green, the hill and location further from the gate and the reduction of the activities and structures all give this area a feeling that it is the "back" of the site. This factor influences the way visitors view and, indeed, move around the site. The staff at the entrance gate who drew a line across the site map also reinforced this feeling. Finally, apart from the very obvious topographical features which suggested or indicated some of the site limits, it was evident that the boundaries and to a great extent the heritagescape as envisioned by the museum did not match with the site as experienced by the visitors. The most obvious example is the Hay Incline Plane which lay beyond the half-open white gate. Not only was the gate a deterrence but also to get there meant that visitors had to cross over several "empty" areas—in other words, any visits to the Incline Plane required some foreknowledge and a significant commitment on the part of the visitor. Most might have been put off by the gate and apparently empty woodlands beyond thereby missing not only the plane but also a number of other buildings and interpretative features. Interestingly at least one member of staff did not see this as an empty area and cited the "bears" (large upthrusts of iron slag) which are dotted along the path to the Plane as significant components of the landscape (Dix-Wilson 2001). What is empty to the visitor is clearly full to some members of the museum staff. Despite this, the visitors appear to engage with the site. Somehow, the site is able to convey enough weight that visitors could co-exist in two times; as one example of this, in the mine building visitors were observed to be fully
involved in the interpretative process (i.e., by asking "appropriate" questions) yet also were able to move back to talk about their own personal experience with a particular building now located at that site.

**Alcatraz Island** as we have seen is also a site that is heavily defined by its boundaries. In this case the interface between the island and the water of San Francisco Bay marks what seems to be an indisputable boundary. While this point does mark a significant and recognised edge to the site there is some indication that the heritagescape transcends the marked boundaries. There was evidence that suggested that the museum includes the area beyond the water's edge as part of the(ir) heritagescape. Not only is the city (of San Francisco) evoked in the interpretation but attention is drawn in the audio tours, signage and other interpretative material towards the Golden Gate Bridge. Similarly, the fact that the museum has restored and maintained the warning sign (figure 2) that sits offshore suggests that the approach to the island may also be part of the site. On the other hand, the boat company clearly sees that the entrance begins at Pier 41 and makes great ceremony out of the boarding process—taking pictures of all passengers and later providing commentary about Alcatraz on the way over.

The problem, at Alcatraz, is that there seems to be no coherent theme or even appearance. When the penitentiary closed in 1963 many of the structures and their interiors were in good shape; however, since then natural decay and a lengthy occupation by Native American groups has meant that considerable damage has occurred since then. The condition of the buildings is very mixed: throughout the site the shells of the buildings and piles of debris vie with reconstructed spaces. It doesn't help that the Parks Service seems to be undecided about the story that they are portraying and, as such, the interpretation seems to get "split" between wildlife sanctuary, military fort and prison. The last is the most compelling them for visitors and is obviously the main draw. Inside, the cellblock the conservation (and conditions) is varied and the story disjointed. In most cases any restoration of the interior spaces is limited to the bottom level of
cells so that should a visitor look up the sight that greets him/her is of wrecked cells. Visually the images are confused. In the end, at Alcatraz—both inside and out—there is never enough of a chance to engage with any one of the stories.

As a site, Alcatraz is poorly defined as an experience of the past. It does not bill itself as an open-air museum yet it does stress the experiential quality of a visit. Interestingly, the visibility is drawn outwards but because the site is not well-established as a distinct place of the past, this outward view seems to diminish rather than enhance the place of the site.

**Jamestown Settlement** does not appear to have a strong heritagescape. No doubt this is due in no small part to the way that visitor traffic moves through the site and to the very modern entrance plaza. Visually, the three interpretative areas (Fort, Ships and Powhatan Indian Village) sit along a cement path that runs through a very manicured grass landscape. Modern elements including the chain link fences and the contemporary architecture of the docks are almost constantly in sight. The ships themselves are recreated and present a seventeenth-century interior; yet, they appear more like period rooms in enclosed museums and do not offer a sustained or lengthy enough experience of a past to make it convincing. No doubt, for this reason, the modern elements (health and safety signs, the Perspex donation box and interpretation signs) all dominate the visual space of the ships. For those visitors who are familiar with the area, the ships are the one area where one can glimpse the shoreline of Jamestown Island where the actual James Fort is located. Whether this has an impact on the visitor or not is not known but it raises the question of whether being able to see the “real” settlement sets up a conflict and/or contrast between “real” and “recreated” for the visitor.

The Powhatan Village should work as a strongly cohesive and distinct area however it fails and this, I believe, is due to the fact that it is simply too small an area and too close to the cement pathway to allow visitors to “escape” the present. In many ways this area is like the Slave Quarters at Carter's Grove which in and of itself has compelling qualities
and is strong both visually and cohesively. What is missing is the length or sustained period of the experience and, so, visitors have a limited time with which to engage with this encounter with the past.

The final area of Jamestown, the Fort site, is similar to the above but offers a stronger sense of the past. The Fort has two advantages: first, it is walled by a high wooden palisade and second, it is located near one edge of the site which means that the outlook from the fort is onto a wooded area. The palisade not only serves to clearly and physically demarcate this area as a distinct space, it also provides a strong entrance. Like the main (or exterior) entrances this smaller entrance has a strong role in moving visitors from the much more modern and park-like setting of the site into the fort area. Inside, the fort offers a visually and physically cohesive site. There are few, if any, signs or other modern intrusions and the exterior and interior spaces seem to be weighted equally. Even spaces that could be seen as "behind the scenes" or as the "back of the site are full. Of course, it helps that nearly all areas of the Fort are accessible and not only can visitors enter into all of the rooms, they can also sit on the beds and touch many of the objects. This form of sensory experience is important in setting up an encounter with the past; however, without the rest it would remain a more distant and less experiential visit.

Overall, the heritagescape at Jamestown Settlement is, at the level of the site, rather weak. Instead of the interpretative areas being linked strongly together they merely sit around the path as independent entities. At Beamish there was evidence of a similar sort of situation but at that site there was much clearer evidence that the site had tried to overcome this phenomenon and, as such, whilst the heritagescape at Beamish was by no means the strongest we have seen it was nonetheless very recognisable and operated quite strongly. At Jamestown the heritagescape at the site level is much more subdued. By comparison the Fort and even the Powhatan Village are stronger and more vivid as individual spaces than they are as part of a site as a whole.
The following three sites are all small and to some extent are similar to the areas in Jamestown in that because of their size it is difficult to create a lasting illusion or experience of "the past". Yet despite these similarities we will see that even an important influence (i.e., the size of the site) does not mean that they operate in quite the same way or even that they have a similar heritagescape.

Both the Scarborough Historical Museum and the Viking Houses have made an attempt, despite their small size, to create a full landscape and both have made concerted efforts to fill the outside spaces. Each has a definable heritagescape but each works in a slightly different fashion. The Scarborough Museum has several buildings with variety of accessible interior spaces, several of which are compellingly interpreted. Inside, the theme and the interpretation are vivid and seem to overcome the few modern signs found inside the fenced-in space. Outside, this continues with the boardwalks and the plantings. The site, because it is small and fenced off, appears physically as a separated space; however, it also tends to get lost against the very strong and modern city park in which it sits. In terms of the guiding principles the boundaries are physically strong and the cohesion has strong elements. The problem is that the view is never free of the surroundings. This, as we have seen with other urban spaces, does not have to be a strong influence and can be integrated into the sense of the site, Here, because there simply is not enough of this site what otherwise may be a strong heritagescape does not have a chance to fully develop and as a result is a bit obscured by the strength of the surroundings. At Scarborough is that there simply is not enough separation from the present and this means that the heritagescape appears weaker. Even with the encroaching surroundings a strong entrance way—and hence stronger boundaries—would have gone a considerable way towards separating this space out as a distinct place.

There is an initial sense that the Viking Houses offer a stronger heritagescape but I suspect this has much to do with the more rural and less visually discordant surroundings. Like Scarborough, the Viking site
has incorporated a series of stage setting devices into the area that is fenced off; however, unlike Scarborough the Viking Houses are much less dynamic. Of the three structures only one of them is regularly open. The buildings, therefore, must be viewed from a distance, making the interaction with the site and “the past” limited. Although this is a site that exhibits quite strong cohesion in the exterior spaces it tends to be interrupted by the inaccessible interior spaces. The boundaries and the entrance are similar to that at Scarborough and, very likely, in less sympathetic surroundings the site and the heritagescape could lose some of its force. The stage-setting devices between the buildings are critical elements and turn the site from a more display-oriented space to a more experiential place. The heritagescape reflects this.

Both of these sites are quite different from Todmorden Mills. Throughout this analysis Todmorden has failed to emerge as a “strong” site. A look at the factors that contribute to this once again offers considerable insight into the way that sites, which have similar components and may even be of a similar size, may—because of the way that the guiding principles operate—end up having quite different heritagescapes.

Todmorden, like the two sites above, has also expended efforts towards creating an environment rather than simply presenting a “display” of structures. Whilst neither the truncated railway tracks or the small heritage garden and site plantings may seem like important features both are key influences in creating a distinct space and, in this case, a nineteenth-century space. It is aided in this sense of being “in the past” by its location in a wooded valley with unimpeded view sheds. Nonetheless, the experience at Todmorden never seems to be sustained and, even on special event days, movement is limited to certain areas of the site (e.g., it is rare to see many visitors including the original (in-situ) mill complex in their visit). Judging from visitor movements it appears that people either visit arts centre in the mill or the interpreted site but not always both. Although there are tangible elements which are visible and which contribute to a sense of cohesion the site does not seem to hold together
as a distinct space; any definition of "place" appears to be more an accident of the location and the surrounding valley topography rather than something that has arisen out of deliberate or perceived establishment of boundaries. I suggest that this fuzzy sense of the site is a result of naturally imposed (but otherwise ill-defined) set of limits, an ambiguous entrance and a thin interpretive storyline. The physical layout of the site means that any entrance to the restored site is more of a drifting movement that a deliberate journey. Because the site does not seem to have settled on an interpretative theme (or themes) the purpose becomes diffuse and ends up being split between an historic area, a theatre and a wildflower area.

**Bede's World** is located in an environment that is at least as discordant as that seen at Scarborough. Here, although the museum has constructed berms to block the views to the port, there is strong evidence that they also appear to co-exist along with this modern environment. The presence of trails and features (such as the Celtic cross and the reconstructed barrows) on top of the berm directs visitors to an area where not only will they see these features, they will also be exposed to a view of the port. What appears to have happened is that the site has acknowledged the space that lies beyond the site and, in doing so, has managed to locate the site both in its larger surroundings and to set it up as a place—despite the adjacent Shell Oil plant and the port. Moreover, by placing interpretative features along the boundaries the institution has made the boundaries a much more active and dynamic feature.

Within the main area of the site the landscape features of the pond and creek, animals ranging throughout and a lack of manicured "tidiness" makes the landscape appear as a distinct place "apart". Inside, as at some of the other sites, few of these spaces are open but those that are, are full of props that help make them vibrant spaces.

Not all of the site at Bede's World is made up of a reconstructed environment. The farm, although patterned on an Anglo-Saxon farm and containing rare breeds, has modern buildings and looks more like a contemporary farm than anything else. This area is located closest to the
entrance building so that there is a sense that one can “walk away” from this more modern area to a space that appears to be “of the past”. Here, the pavement pathways running through most of the site seem to be subsumed by the cluster of Anglo Saxon buildings sitting in an appropriate landscape. In this respect it helps that most of the Anglo Saxon area is tucked up against and under the berm contributing to a sense of space. The cross (atop the berm) enhances the sense of place as it offers both a view into the distance and into the foreground.

Overall, and quite remarkably, Bede's World does seem to have quite a distinct sense of place. Like Beamish, it has also come under considerable criticism for the view and the past that is presented. However, the site, despite its physical situation, has managed to create a heritagescape with strong, active boundaries that sets it apart but does not isolate it from its larger surroundings. Here, the sense of a view is important in contributing to the principle of visibility. It could be argued that the sense of cohesion is not as strong as some places we have seen, Bede's World nonetheless operates as a site that has a sense of itself as a place.

The first part of the journey into Black Creek Pioneer Village did not bode well for setting up a sense of the past. Faced with the “Pioneer Patio” and the mile marker sign being presented in a “glass case” museum-type display suggested that the site might not offer a strong sense of either a “place apart” or a “place of the past”. However, the illusion of the past is very strong here and the site, overall, is cohesive and offers a strong and engaging experience of the past. The layout of the site with its streets and lanes and paths and back gardens that are full and actively used spaces conveys a sense of place. Street signs are placed at crossroads and period signs all help maintain the illusion. Dirt streets are left with ruts in them and weeds grow at the side—all contributing to a sense that this is a place that has grown up over time. Whilst both the physical and/or legal boundaries are not often encountered or seen at Black Creek (save for the area near the Church, c.f. Chapter 4), the layout of the houses, shops and trade
buildings along the roadways is a familiar town layout and, as such, the spaces beyond the buildings which in many cases face onto wooded vistas act to set up a passive boundary. Rather than being deliberately directed away from the “edge” of the site there is, instead, no need to enter into this “back” space. Without actually physically marking out limits, the edge of the site is understood as the space which lies beyond the built up areas.

It appears, judging from visitor traffic patterns, that while most people are able to negotiate the site easily and remain within the built up areas, there is also some evidence that many people also tend to wander off down the road marked on the map (c.f., Chapter 4 and map 2) which leads into the valley and the conservation area. The implication that the boundaries are weak is a valid point; however, I suggest the impact on the site as a place is relatively small. What seems to have happened is that because the museum (as an institution) envisions this area as part of the site (or at least considers it as part of the backdrop), it presents no great problem (to the sense of the site as a place) if people wander off on this path. Indeed, it could be countered that this represents a successful integration of the site into its larger landscape. Further, whilst this may seem like a situation similar to that at Blists Hill and the Hay Incline Plane, it is rather different. The key difference is that because this more of background than a specific interpretive area (as at Blists Hill) and missing this area does not mean that the visitor has missed part of the site.

Finally, having suggested that Black Creek is a strong heritagescape it might be assumed that the physical visibility was unimpeded by modern intrusions. In fact, there is considerable evidence of “the present” and even from the main entrance a tower block is visible. Yet, the sense of place and of the past seems to be strong enough to assimilate this modern feature into the site. As at Den Gamle By, the structure is acknowledged as apart of the surrounding landscape but, in the face of a robust heritagescape, it does not dominate or overwhelm the site.

Turning to the other nineteenth-century pioneer site Upper Canada Village we see another place that offers a strong heritagescape and which
offers a dynamic encounter with "the past". This site benefits from its rural setting and as at Black Creek there have been notable attempts to create both a place "of the past" and a place "apart". So stringent are these efforts that, with the exception of the Harvest Barn restaurant, there are no retail elements within the historic site. Modern retailing is viewed as a distraction at Upper Canada Village (Cazaly 2002).

There tends to be equal attention devoted to the interior and exterior spaces and some of the work areas in the barn even have a dusty or dishevelled interior as one might expect to see in a "real" (i.e., non museum) work area. The stage setting here extends to the point where the museum has recreated a cemetery (no doubt as part of the attempt to create a whole environment). Upper Canada Village is not the only site to do this (Bokrijk and Skansen are two other examples) but, given that many other sites have "real" graveyards, it does raise questions about the way in which the past is being portrayed at such sites.

Like many other sites Upper Canada Village has to deal with traffic; in this instance it is maritime traffic. This does not seem to diminish from the site. Three factors most likely contribute to this. First, the St Lawrence River and its flooding is a strong theme in the interpretative story presented at this site so the river naturally assumes a role within the site. Second, there are buildings thematically-linked to the river (including a lockkeeper’s house). Finally, the opportunity for visitors to take a ride on a dory along the rivers edge helps to extend the site beyond the shoreline and no doubt further incorporates the river into the landscape of the site.

On the whole there is a strong, recognisable heritagescape at Upper Canada Village. Here, too, boundaries may not necessarily be prominently marked out and/or encountered. What often happens is that there are devices (fields, woodlands, rivers) that suggest a natural edge to the site. At this site, the view tends to be directed back into the centre so that even the edges of the site that are marked by the berms are not overt boundaries. Albeit, there are areas where the limits are more apparent (notably in the area of the Harvest Barn restaurant) but overall the visible
limits are not a prominent feature on the landscape of Upper Canada Village.

In terms of fitting into its environment Upper Canada Village could be considered both a success and a failure. The map that is offered to visitors presents the site as a part of the larger “Heritage Park” (made up of the Pioneer Memorial, a National Historic Site, the train ride and the manicured gardens and parklands along the long drive in). In this role, as part of this environment it is less successful and appears to be just one of a set of disparate but loosely linked sites. On the other hand, considering its relationship to the surroundings (beyond the heritage park) Upper Canada Village does manage to define itself as a separate space and also to acknowledge the (natural) landscape in which it sits. In this sense, the site is very cohesive and presents a sustained and viable experience of “the past”.

Our final site is a large one: Colonial Williamsburg. The site clearly has a strong sense of place despite having both a distant and an ambiguous set of entrances. No doubt the sense of place is, in part, inherited and emerges out of the fact that the structures and the properties making up this museum are situated on the original site. Perhaps, in that respect, the site does not need an entrance as it capitalises on this feature. What emerges out of this is a passive sort of entrance (from any number of directions) that apes the sense of coming into the centre of a city. It is interesting that there is such effort expended towards the Visitor Centre (including the recent linking of the site to the centre via the bridge). Clearly, although most of the staff interviewed do not envision the site extending to include the Visitor Centre, it has been identified as important element to help set up that moment of entering “into” the site. Perhaps this reflects the attempt to create a place of the past. It would seem that the pedigree of a “real” place has done much to create a sense of the Historic Area as a place apart (i.e., a distinct space).

There is some difference between the site as the institution views it and as visitors perceive and use the site. As such there are areas where
the boundaries are more changeable (or at least permeable). For example, there are clear indications that for some visitors, the retail area of Merchant's Square or the Hotel areas become part of this space. For others, the site ends before or at the moment the visitor crosses the city streets that surround the Historic Area.

The surrounding streets at this site do not seem to be as strong a line between inside and outside of the site. Again, as at other sites we have seen, this may be due to the layout and history of the site or perhaps it is due to the fact that, for many, the entrance from the visitor centre is effected by means of shuttle buses that run along these roads. Thus, whilst not actually part of the site these streets and routes have an unusual role in delineating it as a space.

As we have seen from earlier discussions there has been considerable work undertaken to maintain the illusion of the past at Colonial Williamsburg. The site appears fluid and the construction of new structures (undertaken by costumed staff apparently becomes seamlessly incorporated into the overall interpretation of the site. Thus, whilst not wholly “of the past” this nonetheless offers a strong, interactive experience. This phenomenon of seeing a site evolve or change or be added to is important as it hearkens back to those natural qualities that some observers have cited as the criteria for a “real place” (Hodder 1999:134; Walsh 1992:103)

As a heritagescape Colonial Williamsburg is strong and the qualities of visibility and cohesion working together create a vibrant encounter with “the past”. Edward Chappell, Director of Architectural Research at Colonial Williamsburg that although they “try” to give equal weight to the interior and exterior spaces sometimes the exterior appearance wins (November, 2002). The inaccessible staff houses, the foundations of the coffeehouse on the High Street and the nineteenth-century private home all lend testimony to this. Yet somehow, the site, like others we have seen in the course of this analysis, is able to transcend these and creates a site that is experiential and dynamic.
5.2 A Final Look at the Case Studies: A Summary

At this point, before moving on to the concluding chapter, it is a good opportunity to consider what we have gained from this analysis of the heritagescape applied to individual sites. As we have seen throughout Chapter 4, the insights gained at the site-level are invaluable and enriching and have allowed us to look at very specific components and aspects of each site in a way that previously was not possible. This means for a specific place, particular issues may be highlighted, identified and subsequently investigated. It also reveals in a replicable manner that each site is a multi-component, complicated and changing space. This information offers much in determining how and why different parts of the site may appear or function in different ways. Often, it is also able to identify why some areas of a site may seem less vivid and/or less attractive to visitors.

Once again, it is critical to remember that whilst a considerable amount of time has been spent thinking about open-air museums, these were simply devices—test cases—used to test the methodology of the heritagescape in an efficient manner. The focus of both the methodology and of this dissertation is on heritage sites as a cultural construct. It is an inclusive and coherent means of analysis.

Of the many important points that have arisen out of this analysis four in particular may considered as key findings about heritage sites (in general) and which, at the same time, support the concept and methodology of the heritagescape:

a) Apparently similar or identical sites may have quite different heritagescapes

b) Change is an ongoing universal process that accompanies all heritage sites. Often, it will have a prominent role.

c) Differences observed between individual sites are as important as similarities. Often differences are an indicator of the
individual "personality" of a site; differences do not need to divide.

d) Heritage sites are not necessarily removed from their environment. Some sites exploit their landscapes as a fully integrated aspect of the site. Many more will at least acknowledge their surroundings.

In the end, what the heritagescape does is demonstrate the futility of using sweeping and often ambiguous terms to "define" heritage sites. It is only by applying a method which looks at those individual components of a site that the complexity of these unique places will surface. The heritagescape as a methodology is able to do this because it is, at its heart, a classic archaeological analysis, using material culture to address larger concerns. It is this approach that now enables us to discuss and to begin to understand heritage sites in an overarching and coherent manner.
Chapter 6
Interpretations, Summary and Conclusions

6.0 Introduction

Over the course of this analysis a considerable amount of time has been spent looking at the case studies that have formed the basis of this research and, as such, a significant amount of effort has been spent exploring open-air museums and similar types of living history sites. However, it must be remembered that this dissertation is not just about one sort of place; it is about lots of different places. It is also about the qualities that characterise these places; it is a consideration of how they work and it is about the very many different ways and devices that these places use to portray "the past". More than just a review of a specific type of site, this is a dissertation about heritage sites and about heritage sites both as a group and as a cultural construct. It is this latter aspect and the decision to move the focus of analysis away from the site level to a broader based context that is so critical. Locating the analysis at this higher overarching level means that we are able to consider the heritage site not just as a specific place but also that we are now able to explore the phenomenon of the heritage site. This represents a significant departure from the way that investigations, to date, have been conducted. Despite its importance this is still just a critical first step. In order to further explore heritage sites and to gain a more comprehensive understanding of these unique social spaces, it is necessary to have a coherent, replicable and transparent means of analysis. The development of a new methodology, the heritagescape, which enables us to explore heritage sites both at the site level and as a group of places that have a complex way of operating, lies at the heart of this dissertation. Drawing upon ideas inherent in the study of cultural and natural landscapes the heritagescape offers a radical new approach for analysing heritage sites. The ability of this new
methodology to create an inclusive framework in which to locate a dialogue about heritage sites is one of the heritagescape's most important contributions. Ultimately, the heritagescape offers us the opportunity to move research forward and to gain a greater and more comprehensive understanding of both heritage sites and also of heritage as a cultural construct.

6.1 A Review

Heritage sites are complex social spaces and beginning the process of taking them apart to view their inner components in order to start to understand how they "work" is an intricate endeavour. Assessing the inherent qualities of heritage sites is further complicated by a number of trends that have emerged out of the approaches that researchers have espoused in the past. A number of these issues have created particular problems and, in some cases, have been responsible for stalling the movement towards a more comprehensive understanding of heritage sites. Some of these problems were outlined in the early, introductory chapters while others have emerged over the course of the analysis. In both cases it is useful to spend a few minutes reviewing these issues.

In general, these problems have arisen out of two areas: (1) the lack of a coherent and a consistent means of analysis and (2) the tendency to locate any investigations outside of the site and at a distance. The lack of methodology has meant that in an attempt to deal with the diversity of places known as heritage sites many investigators have resorted to embarking on a quest to find the quintessential site, which is then used as a sort of template against which all other sites might be compared. Researchers adopting this approach often find themselves in a situation where they struggle to make sites "fit" and to make them match what often can be a very different structure. Further, because almost every analysis is based on a different "key" site (with others brought in to stand against it) the criteria for assessing the individual features of a site (or sites) and for identifying the underlying processes are constantly changing. Thus, the methodology ends up being written over and over again. This stands in the
way of any consistent means of analysis and it also means that the language used to describe heritage sites not only can change from one analysis to another but it can also shift within the same investigation. Without a common language it has been difficult to engage in a broad-based discourse on heritage sites.

The second problem associated with a lack of methodology arises out of what is, no doubt, an effort to compensate for this trend and the attempt to deal with the diversity and quantity of sites. Traditionally, there has been a strong movement to try to make sites, which either have the same (or similar) name or which appear to fulfil a similar function, fit into an imposed category. Often heritage sites (and notably open-air type sites) have been analysed in such a way that the category has determined the nature of the site. Thus, there is an implicit sense that all sites falling under one category (for example, all open-air museums) will operate in a very similar manner. As we have seen in the course of this dissertation this is both a broad and a misleading assumption that often results in the process of analysis becoming awkward. No doubt, this accounts for the inclination of most researchers either to adopt broad, all-inclusive lists or to rely upon sets of rigid, "defining" criteria (c.f. Chapter 2). In particular, the trend towards defining sites has limited our understanding of heritage sites as particular experiential and social spaces.

This penchant for imposing narrow structures and drawing up tight definitions has also arisen out of a tendency to view heritage sites from afar. In this sense heritage sites are a bit like fingerprints. From a distance both heritage sites and fingerprints appear similar to their counterparts: it is only when one gets up close and starts examining the individual elements that create the whole that it then becomes possible to realise the full complexity and nature of each of these entities. Considering heritage sites from without the site means that it is much more difficult to identify any underlying processes that might accompany a heritage site over time. This distance also ensures that the level of analysis remains at the level of the site. As such, the individual and unique features of a heritage site are
obscured and this, in turn, has had serious repercussions particularly as it has been demonstrated (over the course of this analysis) that it is these elements that offer insight into the way that heritage sites “work”.

In the end, the solution lies in recognising the importance and need to consider and investigate each heritage site as unique place while at the same time also locating these places within the larger context of heritage sites. The problems with a narrow-focus approach have been outlined elsewhere. Equally, relying solely on a long-distance view results in problems. Not the least of which is a smoothing out of the anomalies found between sites, giving a veneer of sameness to what are, more often than not, very different sites with very different ways of portraying the past. Likewise, lacking a good sense of the components of a heritage site means that it not only becomes difficult to identify universal processes, it also makes it impossible to account for and assess changes which may occur over time. In short, without being able to identify the qualities that characterise a heritage site and without knowing how an individual heritage site “works” it is virtually impossible to begin to assess or understand how heritage sites, as a group, operate. Once again we can see that our ability to gain a fuller understanding of the heritage site is closely related to our overall comprehension of heritage. Ultimately any gaps in our knowledge of heritage sites will have a serious impact on our grasp of the processes of the creation and maintenance of heritage.

The heritagescape, was developed specifically to address these and other issues that have long plagued researchers investigating heritage sites and is defined by its (1) ability to offer a flexible yet consistent means of analysis and (2) role as a constant, offering a common language which will enable researchers to engage in a coherent analysis and dialogue. It is important to remember that the heritagescape is both a concept and a method. As the former, it describes a particular form of landscape: a landscape of heritage. Like other landscapes, the heritagescapes are located within their larger surroundings; they are unique spaces yet, at the same time, fully integrated into the larger environment.
Heritagescapes—like other forms of landscape—are dynamic spaces and over time they will grow and change. As a method the heritagescape offers an overarching constant against which individual sites can be assessed and it provides a common language that we can use to discuss heritage sites and other places that portray the past.

The heritagescape enables the different elements and the individual qualities of a site to emerge and be accounted for and, yet, at the same time provides a baseline by which any number of different sites can be assessed. The heritagescape is able to do this by using the three guiding principles: boundaries, cohesion and visibility as a means of highlighting the individual elements found at a particular site. In some ways, thinking of the heritagescape as a tool made up of three levels: site criteria, guiding principles and the heritagescape itself makes the idea easier to grasp.

(i) **Site criteria** sit at the first level and consists of the whole of the set of data that emerges out of a survey of all of the physical elements of the landscape of a site

(ii) **Guiding principles.** It is here that we can see how the individual elements begin to work together to create the site as a physical and experiential place.

(iii) **Heritagescape.** Considering the role that each of the three principles have and how they work together will provide a sense of the shape and the strength of the heritagescape at a particular place at a particular time.

Of the many advantages offered by the methodology of the heritagescape is this ability not only to identify the nature of the heritagescape but also to know what it is that has contributed to its particular “shape” that is perhaps the most important.

**6.2 Underlying Processes**

A fundamental part of the central hypothesis was the application of the heritagescape (as a method) to sites and the subsequent taking apart of each site to look at its components. In turn, it was this that would allow us to examine any underlying processes that might accompany heritage
sites over time. At the outset, change was named as one of the processes. Others have since emerged and, no doubt, as further research is undertaken and we get a better grasp on heritage sites, more of these underlying structures will come to light. For the present we will look briefly at some of the more prominent.

Obviously, among these, the portrayal of “the past” and the creation of an experience are fundamental processes. In the course of examining the data we have already gained solid evidence of their importance and the role they both play in creating place and a sense of the past. Without these two elements shaping and informing the mandate of the site, it would, in fact, be a very different entity. Alone, neither these nor any of the other processes that we will discuss are unique to heritage sites; it is the combination of these aspects working together that result in a heritage site and in the heritagescape.

6.2.1 Authenticity

An important element that has emerged out of this analysis is role of authenticity. While this has long been recognised as part and parcel of heritage sites I would suggest that it has been misidentified and it has been thought of as more a criteria that defines the site rather than as an underlying and universal structure. I would argue that were authenticity a defining trait then it would offer a means to distinguish between sites such as theme parks and open-air museums. In point of fact many attractions (including notably (but not limited to) the Walt Disney parks) put a very high premium on authenticity when (re)creating their tangible landscapes (Bryman 1995; Leon and Rosenzweig 1989:164). This, among other factors, makes it unlikely that authenticity is a viable, defining characteristic of heritage sites. Instead, I suggest that it has assumed a role as a fundamental and shaping influence on those places that portray the past. At present the full breadth and nature of this role is not wholly clear; however, what is clear is that within the context of heritage sites authenticity is an issue that is even more complicated than previously anticipated and it is an idea which remains under-explored. Once again,
this is where the heritagescape and particularly the guiding principles are so useful: they enable these underlying structures to be identified and their influence (in shaping the individual site elements) to be accounted for as part of the process of analysing a site.

Authenticity has long been a consuming issue with regard to heritage sites and it has been discussed comprehensively for many years (e.g., Bruner 1994; UNESCO 1994; Handler and Gable 1996; Gable and Handler 1996). From UNESCO convention (The Nara Document on Authenticity, 1994) to scholarly articles, the phenomenon of authenticity continues to be investigated. The methodology of the heritagescape has offered a clearer picture of how it operates within the context of the heritage site and this, I suspect, will contribute to a more comprehensive and clearer dialogue of some of the qualities of the very large and very complicated concept of authenticity.

6.2.2 Change

Returning to the issue of change, the key element here is that the heritagescape is predicated on the idea that all sites are landscapes. For many there is a built in acceptance of change as a significant and determining influence within landscapes and most would agree that “[t]he landscape is never inert, people engage with it, rework it, appropriate and contest it” (Bender 1993:3). Accepting the heritage site as a landscape locates these places in their rightful place as fluid, changing spaces with which people regularly interact. Like landscapes, heritage sites are “not so much artefact as in process of construction and reconstruction” (ibid).

Further, as the focus of an analysis based upon the heritagescape begins at the most fundamental level; i.e., at the individual elements of a heritage landscape, it is easy to spot change and to identify those factors that have contributed to the alterations. For example, at Flag Fen it was possible to identify changes that were in progress by looking to specific components. Of course it was obvious even at a site level to recognise that the entrance had moved; however, it was only by looking closely at the alterations that had gone along with those changes that it was possible to
begin to assess their impact. The individual tangible elements (i.e., the site criteria) held the clues and the guiding principles offered the means by which to interpret them.

6.3 A Place of the Past and A Place Apart

In the course of the summary of findings and, indeed, throughout this dissertation there have been references to both a place of "the past" and to a place "apart". Whilst the differences and meanings have been implied this is an important enough concept to spend time briefly reviewing these ideas and considering their relevance to this analysis.

It has been established in the early chapters that in order to create a site and to create an experience, one must create a sense of place (c.f. Chapter 3). Visitors must be able to move from the present to the past—to "step back"—in a recognisable and, ideally, vivid way. In this fashion expectations of the site are set up and visitors are prepared for the experience of "the past" that lies inside the entrance. In the examples we looked at nearly all the places were able to achieve this in some sense. Albeit some of the smaller sites (e.g., the Scarborough Historical Museum and the Viking Houses) had a particularly difficult brief given their size whilst other sites needed to carve out a separate place in a very dominant, modern landscape (Bede's World is a notable example). However, as we have seen, many were able to give the sense of a distinct space apart from their surroundings.

Achieving a place of the past is another thing which, whilst it is closely related to a place apart, is also wholly distinct. This comes about when a site manages to create a vivid enough sense of a past place—an illusion—that the environment of the site appears not only as a vibrant encounter but also as a credible experience. Expressed best by a curator at Den Gamle By, this comes about when the "streets are rooms too". In other words, when a total environment is recreated. This is not to say that a "total environment" will either contain all of the furniture of the past or that it will be free of modern intrusions; rather, it is when all of the elements of the
landscape of the site work together to create a cohesive space and a convincing experience. Among our case studies Bokrijk stood out as an example of a site that managed to achieve a very strong sense of place. It was very clear that one was somewhere very different to the parkland and woods and towns that surrounded the site, yet it did not seem to have the same sort of resonance as a place of the past and so it felt more like a country walk in an unknown village rather than an experience of a long ago time.

A heritagescape will have most resonance and will be most apparent when a site manages to gain at least a rough balance between a place of the past and a place apart. Some of the sites that carried the most weight as a strong experience (e.g., Den Gamle By) managed to achieve this balance. In some ways this is where theme parks stand out from heritage sites; they may be very good at achieving a place apart (especially in the case, again, of the Disney parks) but they lack force as a place of the past. Likewise, one could argue that city centres are often quite good at creating some sense of the past but fail to be a distinct space apart. In any event, even if these two dimensions do manage to work together at a preserved district it appears that neither operate very strongly and might be present in a much more reduced fashion which, in part, accounts for a much weaker heritagescape than one might see in a living history site.

6.4. Future Directions.

As this dissertation draws towards its final conclusions, it is time to reflect on the heritagescape and to consider how and where it might be applied in the future as this project is expanded out to include other contexts. Likewise, there are a number of issues that have emerged out of the investigation that will need to be addressed at length.

Two topics: authenticity and change came forward as important and complicated processes that, each, play vital roles in heritage sites and in the manifestation of the heritagescape. While both have been discussed in the course of this dissertation the full scope of these processes remain
elusive and their role and impact on heritage sites is, as yet, not fully comprehended.

Although it was not a central theme of this analysis, along the way some intriguing and important insights were gained into the idea of authenticity. As discussed above, authenticity has long been considered as a distinguishing factor of heritage sites: i.e., heritage sites are authentic, theme parks and attractions are not. Obviously this is an oversimplification but it is one that has tended to direct previous research. More recently, work on theme parks by Leon and Rosenzweig (1989) has shown many of these places are, in fact, “hyper-authentic”. Likewise, even a cursory examination proves that many heritage sites employ the same devices of copying or “facading” that are seen at theme parks and historical attractions. Expanding upon this theme, Corbin illustrates the variation that may occur within a site and notes a tendency for many heritage sites to knit “inauthentic” bits into a larger “authentic” whole (2002: 243). The case studies, that formed the backbone of this dissertation, provide even more evidence that authenticity cannot be used to identify heritage sites. This new data can be added to the large body of work that has developed out of investigations into the relationship between authenticity and heritage sites. The issue of authenticity must be kept at the forefront of any future investigations of heritage sites and considerable effort should be directed towards examining this idea within this context.

A related but unique issue is the trend towards defining heritage sites (and notably open-air museums) as “good” or “bad”, “real” or “not real”. The latter two are particularly problematic. Although “real” is in common usage, very few researchers have managed to define this attribute in a way that is either completely satisfying or overarching. “Real” in the context of heritage sites tends to be applied in a manner that suggests it defines whether a site is credible and/or whether it presents a factual actual account of the past.

In some ways this predicament has come about because the role of authenticity has not been fully comprehended and in an effort to
understand these places, many have resorted to the quality of “real” as a benchmark for heritage sites. However, reducing a complicated entity like a heritage site to one extreme or another is unsatisfactory and usually fails to provide new data. It is almost certainly guaranteed to stall any investigations. Heritage sites are not black and white and many—if not most—will fall into the middle, grey area. As such, any methods used to investigate these places must take into account their complex and protean nature. The heritagescape is able to accommodate these qualities.

The way forward with heritage sites lies in moving away from oppositional definitions like “good” or “bad” and concentrating instead on looking at “how” and “why”. Rather than locating an analysis in questions of whether a site is “good” or “bad” or whether it offers a “real” version of the past, it is much more useful and rewarding to consider how a site uses the components of its tangible landscape to create a distinct, place of the past.

Likewise, investigators will need to examine the meanings of terms such as “real” and “credible” and to reflect on the impact they each have upon our understandings and interpretation of heritage sites. As with authenticity these terms are complicated and laden and each needs to be highlighted in future research.

Among the many complicated issues that have been discussed, the full role of change and its association with the heritage site over time has only been but touched upon in the course of this analysis. Using the heritagescape to analyse sites has highlighted the need to put to rest once and for all the erroneous and superficial notion of heritagescapes as static or frozen spaces. Heritage sites are dynamic, evolving spaces and the introduction of a flexible yet coherent methodology not only makes this apparent (at the site level) it also offers the means to account for changes that may occur over time and helps to clarify the relationship between change—as a process—and heritage sites. Further work needs to continue in this area and change—like the notions of authenticity, credibility and the quality of “real”—needs to assume a prominent role in that research.
A significant amount of this dissertation has been concerned with the application of the heritagescape to one particular case study site: open-air museums. Out of this focus, several key issues have been brought to light. Two of these: a place of “the past” and a place “apart” are particularly important and relate not only to open-air museums but also to heritage sites as a group. Both of these are related to a sense of place—a widely recognised notion that has been discussed earlier (Chapter 3) and which is an important component of the unique experiential space of a heritage site. While neither of these ideas is new, what is novel and unusual is that within this dissertation both have been considered explicitly and individually. Furthermore, by doing so this has allowed us to recognise the relationship between them while, at the same time, noting their unique qualities. A place of the past and a place apart are fundamentally related, yet it should not be assumed they are necessarily the same thing or that they will always exist in concert. This analysis has thrown up the need to direct considerable effort towards a fuller comprehension of the notions of a place “of the past” and a place “apart”. Once again, this is a critical aspect of further investigations.

So far, this discussion of “future directions” has been limited to the theoretical issues that should underlie any future investigations of heritage sites. However, as well there are practical issues that will also direct future investigations and it is important to consider how this methodology might be expanded to include other types of heritage and related sites. This research has concentrated on only one kind of heritage site; however, because the analysis is located in the tangible and unique landscape of a particular site whilst at the same time offering a constant against which to measure this data, I would suggest that the heritagescape could be applied to a wide variety of sites and that it could be used to investigate both heritage sites and related spaces.

One of the consuming issues of research into heritage sites is how to distinguish between the many different types of place that portray the past. Returning to an earlier discussion (Chapter 1) there is usually a clear,
intuitive sense of how such sites differ but there has been little sense of how to approach this in a consistent and coherent manner. References to historic city centres and similar conservation districts have come up throughout this dissertation and there are clues within the case studies that the heritagescape could be applied to these places with the same measure of success demonstrated at open-air museums. Likewise, it is of great importance to test the heritagescape at historical attractions or theme parks. The diversity of sites (found within the case studies) strongly suggests that the heritagescape as a method is widely applicable. However, the argument for adopting the heritagescape as a means of analysis would be considerably strengthened by applying it to a further study that incorporated related sites (including city centres and theme parks). There also may be potential for applying the heritagescape to designated, natural heritage sites. At time of writing, natural landscapes and, notably, the elements that comprise them, are pressing concerns for a number of agencies and bodies (including but not limited to Scottish National Heritage (2003, 2004)). Likewise, similar issues—this time in the built environment—are currently being investigated (e.g., English Heritage 2000, 2003).

6.5. Final Summary

At the end of Chapter 5, a summary of four key insights that had emerged out of the analysis was offered. In the same vein we can now consider what insights have been offered by this new method and what the heritagescape can tell us about heritage sites within the larger context of heritage.

We now know that heritage sites are not the frozen, "synchronic" (Young 2002:158n) places they were once thought to be and in answer to those critics who saw heritage sites removed from the landscape we can now offer evidence that they are integrated into the larger surroundings. Further, we have also seen that many of these sites have been successful in creating a sense of place and of distinctiveness. Heritagescapes are
landscapes; they are about the visible, physical place and also about the experiences that people have with that place (c.f., Thomas 2001:181; Canter 1977). Like all places, heritage sites grow up and change over time. Like all landscapes this will not necessarily take place at the same speed or at the same rate at every site (Darvill 1999).

This dissertation has been a first step. Within it the heritagescape as both a method and a concept were introduced and were subsequently applied successfully to a small number of case studies. Whilst this was a limited sample and it focussed, overall, on sites that were both highly experiential and which physically resemble more conventional forms of built and natural landscapes, importantly, it also provided a considerable amount of data that would not have been accessible without the methodology of the heritagescape. As well, contained in the body of this analysis were a few sites which may not have appeared as a landscape and/or which operated as something other than an open-air museum and which, using more traditional approaches, might never have come under serious investigation. The success with the sample sites overall coupled with the preliminary data that emerged out of these “related” sites indicates that this is a viable and coherent methodology. It also offers a language that we can use to describe, discuss and disseminate the very many different types of place known as heritage sites.

I believe the application of the heritagescape is not limited to built sites and that in the future in may be adapted and applied to sites which may not have standing remains. It must be cautioned, however, that it will only apply to places that can be recognised as a marked out space; i.e., a site. Thus, whilst the location of a grandparent’s house may be prominent on an individual’s own map of the past, this is not what we are considering with the heritagescape. Not only are they different sorts of space; we already have words we can use to describe these places.

The heritagescape recognises, accounts for and can offer explanations for change. Heritage sites are dynamic, changing places and recognising heritage sites as evolving places cannot help but prove useful
to heritage managers and museum curators as they make daily decisions. Whether operational or interpretative issues, knowing the impact that various components of the landscape have on visitors is vital. It helps in the planning of changes to the physical plant and it will shed light on the way that visitors will interact and perceive the past that is on offer.

A strength of the heritagescape is its ability to offer a means to bridge the gap between the academy and heritage practitioners and provides a method of analysis that is replicable, flexible and transparent and, in doing so, it gives us the words with which to discuss these places. In the end, we still may not all have the same mental list of what is included under the heading of “heritage site” but, critically, we now have a common language with which to engage in a dialogue. Heritage studies and our understanding of heritage as a cultural construct can only benefit from this.
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Figure 121. Diversity in Signage. Exterior Example (Bokrijk)
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Figure 127. Giving the Site A Past. An Unused Building As part of Streetscape (Beamish)

Figure 128. Giving the Site a Past: 'Wear' as an Indicators of Long Terms Passage of Time (Blistis Hill)

Figure 129. Annual Events/Lifetime Events as Indicators of Time Passage (Upper Canada Village)
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Figure 131. Giving the Site A Future. Construction of New Structures as Part of Interpretation (Colonial Williamsburg)

Figure 132. Giving the Site A Future. Notice of Future Developments (Beamish)
Figure 133. Ongoing Repairs (Alcatraz)

Figure 134. Repairs to Exhibition Buildings (Skansen)

Figure 135. New Visitor Centre (Jamestown)
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Figure 137. Purpose-built 'Blending' (Black Creek)

Figure 138. Purpose-built 'Blending' Structures (Upper Canada Village)

Figure 139. Purpose-built 'Blending' Structures (Colonial Williamsburg)

Figure 140. Adaptation of Old Structures (Blists Hill)
Figure 141. Purpose-built Structures. Non-blending (Skansen)

Figure 142. Purpose-built Structures. Non-blending (Beamish)

Figure 143. Adaptation of Old Structures (Den Gamle By)

Figure 144. Toilets: Signage (Colonial Williamsburg)

Figure 145. Toilets: Signage (Bokrijk)

Figure 146. Toilets: Signage (Ste Marie)
Figure 147. Lloyd's Bank, Brosely Recreated (Blists Hill)

Figure 148. Facading (Beamish)

Figure 149. Modern Telephone Box within Old Structure (Skansen)
Figure 150. Blending. Museums Collections Building with Sympathetic/Period Exterior (Beamish)

Figure 151. Blending. An Attempt to Reduce Impact of Modern Elements By Association with Sympathetic Structure (Upper Canada Village)

Figure 152. Blending. An Attempt to Reduce Impact of Modern Element (Colonial Williamsburg)
Maps

Map 2. Black Creek Pioneer Village. (Black Creek Pioneer Village 2001)
NEW in 2002
This Regional Museums Store
houses large items from the
collections of Beamish and
Tyne & Wear Museums.
These can be seen from a
viewing room.

Key to Symbols
- Tramway and stops
- Footpath
- Footpath
- Toilets
- Facilities for the disabled
- Baby changing facilities
- Refreshments
- Public telephone


you enjoy your visit, please talk to them.

For the safety and enjoyment of all visitors please
keep to the main paths and walkways and ensure
children are well supervised.

Where staff are working with machinery and
serials please ask if you wish to use flash
photography.

There is livestock within the museum including
pigs, chickens, goats and donkeys, do not feed any
of the animals and keep your dog on a lead at all
times.

If you need advice or assistance ask any of the staff
at the Museum - they will be happy to help.

---

Map 5. Blists Hill Victorian Town (Ironbridge Gorge Trust Museums 2001)

Map 6. Bokrijk (Het Domein Bokrijk v.z.w. 2003)

Map 8. Historic Area Colonial Williamsburg (Colonial Williamsburg Foundation 2001)
Map 9. Den Gamle By (Den Gamle By, Arhus 2001)

Map 10. Flag Fen (Flag Fen Bronze Age Centre 2001)

Map over Skansen

Skansen is big - 300,000 sqm. We have marked some places to make it easier for you to find your way round.

1 Main entrance. Open daily
2 The Skansen shop. Open daily
3 The Skansen-Aquarium. Open daily
5 Haelsemuseum and mountain train. Open daily summertime. Weekends during winter.
6 The Town Quarters
7 Sofiero
8 Herb Garden
9 Växelstation. Information. Open daily
10 Ätnnam Farmstead. Open daily
11 Bellevue Square and the Market Street
12 Skogaholm Manor. Open summertime
13 The Farm Labourer's Cottages. Open daily
14 The Seglora church
15 Tingvallen, stage with folklore performances during summer.
16 Lil-Skansen, children's area. Open from middle of May to middle of September.
17 Horsetable
18 Brown Bear. Open from middle of April to end of October
19 Wolf
20 Skoter Farmstead. Open daily.

Map 15. Ste Marie Among the Hurons (excerpt) (Huronia Historical Parks n.d.)

Map 16. Upper Canada Village
(St Lawrence Parks Commission 2002)
Map 17. Viking Houses (Moesgård Museum 1998)

**N.B.** Maps were not available for the following sites: *Benares Historic House Museum, Scarborough Historic Museum and Todmorden Mills Heritage and Arts Centre*
Appendix I
**ALCATRAZ ISLAND, NPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>San Francisco, California USA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MANDATE/STORY LINE</strong></td>
<td>Portrays Alcatraz Island Prison. Attempts to incorporate history of natural environment and Civil War into interpretative programme. Films and books attempt to link to prehistoric past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TIME PERIOD/SPAN PORTRAYED</strong></td>
<td>Primarily 1930s-1963 (prison period) but 19th Century Civil War military period acknowledged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SITE (INSTITUTION) HISTORY</strong></td>
<td>Was to become National Park in 1969 (following threat of commercialisation but was delayed by Native American occupation until 1972 when Golden Gate National Recreation Area established. Open to tours in 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NATURE OF SITE</strong></td>
<td>In situ prison buildings and extant Civil War period military structures. Some structures restored, many others standing as ruins. Part of site is wildlife preserve. Access to buildings limited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SELF DEFINITION</strong></td>
<td>Website defines as &quot;destination&quot; and a &quot;unit of the GGNRA&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVAILABILITY OF GUIDE BOOKS, VIDEO AND MAPS</strong></td>
<td>Standard NPS pamphlet available (not given out though). Four guide books (themed) available for $1/book. Other publications, including NPS guides at $4.95. Orientation video. Tour of cell house is audio tour with few vista boards. Ranger tours (on specific themes) offered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOUNDARIES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External Boundaries</strong></td>
<td>Site wholly contained on Alcatraz Island in the midst of San Francisco Bay. Must board ferry boat in order to access site. Photos taken as board boat and audio tour throughout journey to island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defined/Distinct Areas</strong></td>
<td>Three areas defined as much by topography as by theme: (1) bottom of island (near dock) with shops, video and museum (2) cellhouse and top of island with prison buildings (3) front bottom (with debris piles) now bird sanctuary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal Boundaries</strong></td>
<td>Bird sanctuary fenced off when nesting. Several areas inaccessible due to safety. Roadway to cellhouse is a sort of boundary between top and bottom areas and entrance and prison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visitor Centre</strong></td>
<td>No visitor centre. Funnelled through orientation video. Museum is adjacent but off main traffic route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entrance</strong></td>
<td>Entrance not well defined. Entrance may be at moment when leave boat. Dock area is crowded with modern machinery, building materials etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to Site after hours</strong></td>
<td>No public access. Evening tours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sight Lines</strong></td>
<td>View to San Francisco very prominent. Angel Island, Golden Gate Bridge also form part of viewshed. Maritime traffic apparent and visible but not intrusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Landscape</strong></td>
<td>All structures are in situ. No additional structures save for toilets. Many areas of ruins and or debris. Site is unevenly maintained/presented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COHESION

Attempt to create 'whole' environment

Site theme of prison is very strong. Little attempt to set stage. Exception is in cellhouse where there is an inconsistent attempt to set scenes. A small number of cells are furnished (including one created by 'Unsolved Mysteries' TV show). Vista boards within cellhouse give sense of museum-type display. Tour through cellhouse is via audio tour which affects cohesion. Some stage setting: signs are a mix of 'real' and display type. Kitchen has menu for last day prison was open. Aspect of cellhouse as ruin. Some cells clearly used as storage for unused signs and mattresses. Second story of cells has not been restored.

signage

Mixed approach to signs, varies widely across the site. Some NPS standard outside (esp. near dock and entrance). Safety signs and external signs (on structures) tend to be NPS standard. Also newer signs which reflect 4 themes presented in guide books. Internally signs in cellhouse are modern vista boards (which work with audio tour); sympathetic styled or are temporary signs which have a casual appearance (eg Al Capone's cell).

Access to structures

Most structures inaccessible and stand as ruins

Outdoor Activities/movement

Limited number of routes through site. Two options: main route to cellhouse or paths around perimeter. Route up the hill is the main path. Movement directed. No outdoor activities (save guided tours)

VISIBILITY

Inside/Outside

View outwards is key component of view and of interpretative scheme

Amenities

Shop located at entrance. Bottled water available. No food or drink permitted on island. Picnic area near dock. Main shop and bookshop at entrance and small shop at end of cell house tour

Toilets/Bins/Health and Safety

Two sets of toilets. Upper one near cellhouse is of breezeblock manufacture, doesn't match other structures. Does evoke modern prison and/or institutional look. Lower at dock in adobe style with NPS welcome sign on one wall. Matches Spanish American context of California but not sympathetic with site.

Construction/Renovation/Restoration

No attempt to disguise ongoing work and is a prominent feature of dock area. Several of ruins appear to be under restoration or maintenance

OTHER NOTES

The attempt to interpret island with multiple themes tends to distract from overall 'prison' theme and weakens site. Some elements appear to be stage setting (eg worn off paint on bars) but in fact is result of visitors being told to grasp bars as part of audio tours--i.e. modern visitors have created this 'old' effect. Spaces between buildings are just that. Perhaps attempt to portray as wildlife preserve have some hand in this (i.e. inside=prison, outside=nature)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>BEAMISH NORTH OF ENGLAND OPEN-AIR MUSEUM</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCATION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MANDATE/STORY LINE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TIME PERIOD/SPAN PORTRAYED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SITE (INSTITUTION) HISTORY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NATURE OF SITE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SELF DEFINITION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVAILABILITY OF GUIDE BOOKS, VIDEO AND MAPS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOUNDARIES:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External Boundaries</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defined/Distinct Areas</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal Boundaries</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visitor Centre</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>small cafeteria. Exit door and glass wall of shop is visible from here. On other side of brown door faced with long hall hung either side with old(?) repro? enamel signs. Far wall is giant version of hand-out map. Shop to immediate left (immediately adjacent to brown door). Toilets here (signed in 'olde' style). Until now all signage modern, change here</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entrance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to Site after hours</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sight Lines</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Landscape</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COHESION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attempt to create 'whole' environment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to structures</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outdoor Activities/movement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VISIBILITY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inside/Outside</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amenities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Toilets/Bins/Health and Safety</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction/Renovation/Restoration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER NOTES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER NOTES cont’d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Bede's World**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>Jarrow, Northumbria, UK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MANDATE/STORY LINE</td>
<td>life and times of Venerable Bede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME PERIOD/SPAN PORTRAYED</td>
<td>673-735 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE (INSTITUTION) HISTORY</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATURE OF SITE</td>
<td>three recreated Anglo-Saxon buildings, experimental farm, and visitor centre. Tied to Jarrow Hall and adjacent Monastic site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF DEFINITION</td>
<td>bede's world, where history was made' (<a href="http://www.bedesworld.co.uk">www.bedesworld.co.uk</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVAILABILITY OF GUIDE BOOKS, VIDEO AND MAPS</td>
<td>map given to visitor, pamphlet available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BOUNDARIES:**

| External Boundaries | outside centre of Jarrow, between river Tyne and port and Shell Oil tank farm Site surrounded by high constructed berms and within that space sympathetic fences (wood) ring main area of site |
| Defined/Distinct Areas | most prominent are AS houses and experimental farm. Area atop berm also linked. Monastic site removed from site but strongly linked |
| Internal Boundaries | few fences, separated by space/distance |
| Visitor Centre | new building c. 2000. Very Mediterranean (Greek) in style. Shop main area given over to the Age of Bede exhibition. Can skip exhibition but main traffic through museum. Glass windows and doors. Notable as some of these only offer (or main part of) view of tank farm |
| Entrance | via car park off motorway. Can also be accessed via gate at Jarrow Hall and path to visitor centre |

**Access to Site after hours**

| none |

**Sight Lines**

| view to top of berm (to Celtic cross and recreated barrows. View within site though seems to acknowledge the tank farm and the port |

**Location**

| in rural area of county, near small towns along motorway, 8 miles away from CWF |

**Physical Landscape**

| all buildings recreated. Site heavily landscaped to build up berm along river side in order to 'block' view |

**COHESION**

**Attempt to create 'whole' environment**

| inside of AS houses (those that are open) are fully furnished with repros so completely accessible. Grass not cut but appears to be maintained by goats. Messiness (i.e. slopped daub around buildings) creates 'realness'. Pond recreated. Paths are tarmac |

**signage**

| none in SQ, standard CWF signs in MH plus barrels, labels in house |

**Access to structures**

| only one AS building open. At Monastic site, buildings exist as ruins and footprints |

**Outdoor Activities/movement**

| special events |

**VISIBILITY**

**Inside/Outside**

| mostly inside but cross, barrows and path atop berms suggest there's some view to the outside |

**Amenities**

| shop in reception centre |

**Toilets/Bins/Health and Safety**

| toilets in museum and reception centre |

**Construction/Renovation/Restoration**

| n/a |

**OTHER NOTES**

<p>| at time of visit petition to have 'twin' sites included on WHS list. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Benares Historic House Museum</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCATION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MANDATE/STORY LINE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TIME PERIOD/SPAN PORTRAYED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SITE (INSTITUTION) HISTORY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NATURE OF SITE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SELF DEFINITION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVAILABILITY OF GUIDE MATERIAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVAILABILITY OF GUIDE MATERIAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOUNDARIES:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External Boundaries</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defined/Distinct Areas</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal Boundaries</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visitor Centre</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entrance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to Site after hours</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sight Lines</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Landscape</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COHESION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>signage</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to structures</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outdoor Activities/movement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VISIBILITY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inside/Outside</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amenities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Toilets/Bins/Health and Safety</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction/Renovation/Restoration</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Black Creek Pioneer Village</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCATION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MANDATE/STORYLINE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TIME SPAN/PERIOD PORTRAYED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SITE (INSTITUTION) HISTORY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NATURE OF SITE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SELF DEFINITION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GUIDE BOOKS/MAPS/VIDEO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOUNDARIES:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>defined/distinct areas?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>internal boundaries?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>visitor centre</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>entrance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>access to site after hours</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>sight lines</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>location</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Landscape</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COHESION</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Outdoor activities/movement</strong></th>
<th>pony rides, school children in streets and in school, interpreters v. visible in houses and outside. Children/family programmes on green definite hierarchy of paths. Roads tend to be dirt and main street bordered by boardwalk. Main secondary streets are wide but no boardwalk. Series of small paths cut across property--some lead nowhere, one leads to back (staff) door of one of carriage works/cabinet makers. Likewise some secondary roads (which are depicted on map) lead either nowhere or off site into conservation area. Edges not clear here</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>VISIBILITY</strong></td>
<td>town laid out along the High St. Can't see out (save for exceptions noted above) and impression is a wooded rural setting. Some visibility to road below and occasionally can hear traffic. Site appears as cluster around village, open space near green and ruins, and Tiles works. Hay plane area invisible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>inside/outside</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amenities</strong></td>
<td>some shops related to trades: baker. Other items can be purchased in the factory or workshop: eg, chandler, foundry, plasterer Main restaurant in period Hotel. Also stalls (wooden and sympathetic) selling ice cream, hotdogs etc. Located at side of buildings with picnic areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>toilets/ bins/health and safety</strong></td>
<td>Toilets located in visitor centre or in sympathetic purpose built buildings. Located in back areas (as if outbuildings). Also toilets in Hotel. Bins tend to be visible, made of green oil drums. Health and safety signs v. visible (esp. foot and mouth warnings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>construction/renovation/restoration</strong></td>
<td>Considerable. JCBs and machines present, orange construction fences and map at entrance shows ongoing work. Also can buy roof shingles in shop to support work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER NOTES</strong></td>
<td>on map no 'natural' areas named (i.e. green is not on map) and such spaces appear only as background green. Cemetery us is only marked 'green area' Buildings relocated from nearby (usually) buildings slated for demolition and/or under threat. Built around the Strong farmhouse which is in situ. Some modern buildings (horse barns, toilets) but look of period some buildings come with a pedigree and some, like halfway house, were moved in recent memory. Hence there is a 'memory' of this building in its other life, when it was in situ. does not seem to be critical that inside and outside match two buildings: Masonic Lodge and Mennonite Meeting House still in use by those two groups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Blists Hill Victorian Town

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>LOCATION</strong></th>
<th>Telford, Shropshire, UK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MANDATE/STORY LINE</strong></td>
<td>Industrial Britain in the nineteenth century. Home of the Industrial Revolution, Valley of Invention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TIME PERIOD/SPAN PORTRAYED</strong></td>
<td>Late 19th century. Victorian England (though not stated in interpretative material). Trend to drop a century from current date and portray that period. Recent trend and had to stop in 2001 as 1901 marked Victoria's death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SITE (INSTITUTION) HISTORY</strong></td>
<td>1960s local initiative by councils and Telford new town. Extant parts of the site were maintained by visitors. Now part of WHS (along with rest of IBG museums)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NATURE OF SITE</strong></td>
<td>Original insitu factories, furnaces, Hay Incline plane, canal, gateway bridge and part of the railway siding. Added to this are relocated buildings. All local. Some copied buildings (e.g. Lloyd's bank is from Broseley).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SELF DEFINITION</strong></td>
<td>18th and 19th century working towns. &quot;Discover the sites and smells of Britain’s Victorian Heyday&quot;. Strongly themed around the Industrial Revolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVAILABILITY OF GUIDE BOOKS, VIDEO AND MAPS</strong></td>
<td>Standard NPS pamphlet available (not given out though). Four guide books (themed) available for $1/book. Other publications, including NPS guides at $4.95. Orientation video. Tour of cell house is audio tour with few vista boards. Ranger tours (on specific themes) offered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOUNDARIES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External Boundaries</strong></td>
<td>Sits on top of hill (well above roadway access) and is confined by site morphology. Parts of the site are prone to slippage. Primarily canal (though must cross to access original tile works) and fence along hill/roadway), entrance building act as boundaries. Impl. to note that several buildings and Hay incline plane sit well beyond a white gate at far end of site. These areas located out of site in heavily wooded area. Otherwise most fences are mostly unobtrusive grey or chain link. Along Tile Works area fences hard to see or missing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defined/Distinct Areas</strong></td>
<td>Site laid out as a village so clustered around the High St--site most dense in this area. Starts to thin out near crest of hill towards blast furnaces (here buildings not nec. Staffed in low season. Admission desk staff draw line across map showing which area to visit. Tile Works across the canal form another cluster, Sampson and David engines yet another whilst photographer and refreshment area tends to have an off to the side feel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal Boundaries</strong></td>
<td>Individual properties are fenced as are commercial yards (e.g. ironmongers). Small park is fenced off as distinct area and is squatters cottage. Also nb white gate from above. Main shops and businesses aligned along the High St. The Canal is a sort of secondary boundary but small and can see over to the tile works etc so not certain of 'strength' of this boundary. Ruins (blast furnaces and tile works) fenced off and inaccessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visitor Centre</strong></td>
<td>No visitor centre. Entrance building is substantial and is only (or at least primary) access. Outside building (in plaza) are vista boards of events and daily openings, amenities. Entrance is via shop and, in low season, where tickets are purchased.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Entrance
From entrance building is a long pathway (slightly visible from car park and vice versa), bordered by picket fence. Widens out by railway siding with 'Blists Hill' sign. Lloyds bank (where change money) is immediately to the left.

Access to Site after hours
used to be but now closed for security reasons

Sight Lines
Area around is heavily wooded and most sight lines look to this natural area. Some sense of car park near front of sight and can glimpse outwards to roadway from some areas of site.

Location
Sites within the Ironbridge Gorge World Heritage Site. Located 5 miles from train station, limited pedestrian access.

Physical Landscape
Most structures have been relocated here and centred around the tile works, blast furnaces, canal and other in-situ features. BF and TW exist as ruins.

COHESION
Attempt to create 'whole' environment
Considerable use of stage setting devices. Sense of weathering (old notices, shabby fences etc). Backyards are filled with rubbish, piles of wood, period headlines in the print shop. Windows and shops reflect the 'death of Victoria' theme well. Smells play a very important role. In winter, foundry, coal fires and engines contribute to this. Site is a mix of ruins and relocated buildings. Ruins tend to to off by themselves and a bit out of the way of the main site areas.

signage
Very little signage—mostly in terms of street signs or stage setting props. Lots of sympathetic (ie period-style) posters and many are weathered. Safety signs tend to be of the period with modern signs (symbols) used in areas like David and Sampson engines. EU signs in tile works and explanatory vista boards. Items for sale in village are listed in signs noting prices in old and new money.

Access to structures
some buildings inaccessible and not all open on the same day. All are exhibition buildings (save for pub and refreshment building). No exhibition space or museums within village.

Outdoor Activities/movement
Along High Street outwards to far end of site. In part because of the hill more visitors tend to remain in town area when there aren't activities in the lower area. Even though visit took place in low season, there was notable street traffic and activities.

VISIBILITY
Inside/Outside
Town laid out along High St. With few exceptions can't see out and impression is of a wooded rural setting. Some glimpses to road below and occasional traffic noises. Some areas (e.g. Hay plane) invisible.

Amenities
some shops (trades such as baker, chandler). Other items may be purchased in the foundry or workshop. Pub is located on High St and has period interior, refreshment pavilion old, but newish interior. Food may be bought in several shops.

Toilets/Bins/Health and Safety
Toilets tend to be located in back of buildings and in some cases appear to be tacked on to historic structures. Invisible from outside. Signage for toilets tends to be of the period. Health and safety signs mix (see above) and the fencing off the tile works and the ruins areas.

Construction/Renovation/Restoration
No evidence. Experimental construction of scale model of Iron Bridge but temporary for Time Watch programme.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appear to be at least two different sites: (1) village (2) tile works area. Structures outside gate are likely third. Had sense that outside buildings were less removed than TW. No museum on site but can purchase 'passport' for other museums at IBG Trust. All sites linked by 'brand' signs. Areas outside white gate is wild. Building those mostly relocated tend to be used for original purposes (w/in museum). Some have been restored, only one recreated building--the Lloyd's bank from Brosely. Mine shaft is 'real' but has been filled into depth of about 50'. Cage appears to descend as apart of the interpretation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOKRIJK</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCATION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MANDATE:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TIME SPAN/PERIOD PORTRAYED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NATURE OF SITE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SELF DEFINITION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVAILABILITY OF GUIDE BOOKS/MAPS /VIDEO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOUNDARIES:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defined/Distinct Areas</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal Boundaries</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visitor Centre</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entrance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access To Site After Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sight Lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COHESION:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempt To Create 'Whole' Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access To Structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Activities And movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISIBILITY:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside/Outside</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Amenities | One primary shop located at first main crossroad. Considerable distance from the entrance. Can purchase guidebooks here (as well as at entrance if in stock). Few shops located throughout the site: a bakery, sweet shop. Restaurants located throughout the site (at least half a dozen). Each place matches, broadly, with the theme of area in which it is found. Most are period inside (all are period outside). |

| Toilets/Bins/Health and Safety | toilets are in buildings that appear to be purpose built |

| Construction/ Renovation/ Action | Some apparent work with blue tarp on roof but low key |

<p>| OTHER NOTES | note re: signs. Even though very modern in appearance they tend to blend, or at very least, be inobtrusive. Is this b/c they are are located at crossroads and appear to function in a way that is similar/identical (?) to 'real' road signs. Would argue that there is very little doubt that it is a site--one has a very strong sense of place--but the important question is whether it's a place in the past |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Carter's Grove</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCATION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MANDATE/STORY LINE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TIME PERIOD/SPAN PORTRAYED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SITE (INSTITUTION) HISTORY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NATURE OF SITE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SELF DEFINITION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVAILABLE OF GUIDE BOOKS, VIDEO AND MAPS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOUNDARIES:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defined/Distinct Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Site after hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sight Lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COHESION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempt to create 'whole' environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Activities/movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VISIBILITY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside/Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets/Bins/Health and Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction/Renovation/Restoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER NOTES</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COLONIAL WILLIAMSBURG FOUNDATION

LOCATION
Williamsburg, Virginia USA

MANDATE/STORY LINE
Eve of the American Revolution. Life in the colonial capital

TIME PERIOD/SPAN PORTRAYED
Eighteenth century America, beyond that not explicitly stated on site or in interpretative material. Visitors Companion for Sept 2002 (time of visit) states that its autumn of 1774

SITE (INSTITUTION) HISTORY
1926 beginning, opened 1929 after idea conceived of by W.A.R. Goodwin and financed and embraced by John D. Rockefeller Jr. 75 years in 2001

NATURE OF SITE
original in situ buildings plus extensive reconstruction from archaeology. Some movement of buildings in and/or out of Historic Area district massive 1930s cross-trenching followed by 60 years of archaeological investigations

SELF DEFINITION
"America's Birthplace". "That the future may learn from the past" "Birthplace of the Revolution" An outdoor museum. Website intro: "America Chapter I. Welcome to the Revolution". Website is www.history.org, phone is 1-800-HISTORY

GUIDE BOOKS/MAPS/VIDEO
broadsheet guide (12 pp) consisting of intro, events guide, map and "resort" information. Colonial Williamsburg guidebook available for purchase for $6.95 (2002). In all CWF hotel rooms and is given out free with some hotel/vacation packages. Is readily available Story of a Patriot shown at VC. Much touted and longest-running movie in world. Has added cachet that Jack Lord (of Hawaii Five-O fame) is in film. Gives background to historical period. Other slide shows focus on visit to CWF and what to do/see/etc. Also videos shown in locations in HA: eg Bassett Hall, Abby Aldrich, DeWitt Wallace

BOUNDARIES:
External boundaries
site sits at one end of city of Williamsburg between commercial and residential neighbourhoods. Adjacent to College of William and Mary. HA is bounded by LaFayette St and Franklin CWF Admin (back site buildings)—in essence Nicholson St. Ends at Merchant Sq/W&M, Francis St/Williamsburg Inn, Capitol and Waller St. Visitor centre off site but connected by buses and, in 2003, by bridge from VC to Gateway building hotels sit on south boundary but also some main shops and Abby Aldrich so may be inside boundaries

Defined/Distinct areas
Not on ground. There are areas associated with Palace Green and Governors Palace or Capitol and these buildings (esp. Palace) do have enclosed areas or sense. Site laid out like 'real' town with concentrations of business and residential areas etc. Visitors companion and guidebook define areas centred on 8 areas (one VC is outside HA district). Each area (as listed in Visitors' Companion) includes (in order): Exhibit Sites, Food and Dining, Shopping, Amenities, Shuttle Service Brutton Heights facility offers programming but is off site. DoG St is 'America's Most Historic Avenue' and most of exhibition buildings and taverns along this area.

Internal boundaries
individual residential properties fenced off with low white picket fences; Governors Palace and Capitol but these all relate to individual property layouts concentration of business, trade, residential etc but no physical divisions

Visitor Centre
Visitor centre located off site. Previously was separated from site itself by highway and long walk. In 2003 bridge was constructed to lead to gateway entrance. Series of plaques imbedded in cement to 'lead into' site. VC also underwent major expansion. Contains shop, bookshop, theatre (for Story of Patriot), Info, coffee shop and major vista board and slide show displays. VC is site of major car park for CWF; shuttles run from VC to site. Entrance into VC v. dramatic and leads from above with row of State flags to waterfall which depicits map of local region in bronze. In b't here and door is table map in bronze of city of Wburg. Once under canopy of entrance can hear CW fife and drum music. Inside, music and sound effects play strong role. Also can make hotel and dinner and event reservations here

Entrance
Entrance hard to define. Prior to 2003 the main entrance was probably from east of DoG St near Merchant Sq with secondary entrances from Williamsburg Inn and Lodge (i.e. S England St). Gateway entrance newest (established c. 1998) but may b/c more important with bridge opening

Access to site after hours
part of city; buildings shut but complete access to site 24 hours a day. Cars restricted during day but allowed on street at night and first thing in the AM
### Sight lines

North and East edges of site are strongest with little sense outside. Even though road crosses—and is a major vehicle (car) route—there are exhibition buildings on opposite side road. N. side has trees to block admin buildings. West edge most permeable and faces out to Merchants Sq shopping district. Colonial in style but clearly a 20th century construction.

### Location

Within city of Williamsburg but in conservation district. Houses surrounding date to 19th century. Little modern development (save for that CWF bldgs.) around. From Governor's Palace look out to empty grasslands/field. In S. England area can see Williamsburg Inn etc but is set back and behind plantings located within area known as Historic Triangle and adjacent to Colonial Parkway (NPS administered property) which runs b/t historic towns of Jamestown and Yorktown.

### Physical Landscape

Extant and insitu buildings, where missing in most cases have been reconstructed via extensive archaeological work. Visitor centre located offsite but linked by bridge.

### COHESION

**Attempt to create "whole" environment**

- Lots of signage. Street signs—all standardised and in dark green or more often brown—often attached to street lamps. Stage setting signs for taverns etc. Brown pillow signs are very common and act as giant labels for buildings. Some old white on white labels (eg Robert Carter House) leftover. Some attempt at themes in terms of street furniture: stones delineating Susquehanna Plantation property.
- No cars on DoG St and main E-W during day and until 10 PM. However emergency vehicles, CW security cars and delivery trucks (eg UPS) are often seen on minor streets.
- All interpreters in costume and many are 1st person. All buildings are staffed.
- Street furniture consists of horses on street, piles of wood beside houses, interpreters actively or passively engaged in old activities.
- Within HA there are some 'intrusions' that break flow of 18th century streetscape. Notably big brick Armistead House, Bruton Parish parish hall, and hoarding around Armistead (Coffeehouse) site. All 19th or 20th C structures.
- Coffeehouse site only eg of upstanding foundations/ruins. Everything else restored or not present.
- Gardens are key part of total environment. Gardens are elaborate and well kept whether in front or behind structures.

### Signage

Above signs as noted on and in front of buildings. Toilets etc noted in brown on brown standardised signs (with recognisable CW font). The pillow signs tend to be on a few major buildings: court house, palace, capitol, church, public hospital and some big buildings (eg Peyton Randolph). More often not labeled. Thank you' signs located at ends of DoG street and S. England. Also barriers and 'No Motor Vehicles' signs at ends of streets (on edges of site).

**Red and black old info signs near LaFayette side. Also see these on outside of site along LaFayette St. Also Colonial Parkway green on green signs open building indicated by Union Flags (in day) and braziers at night.**

- Many buildings inaccessible and have small 'private residence' signs on them. Closed.

### Access to structures

Buildings are (a) leased to CWF employees (b) hotel accommodation (c) donor services. Save for signs, often v. hard to distinguish b/t buildings (except Tucker House which is signed as Donor Centre).

### Outdoor activities/movement

Considerable animal and people traffic on street. End of day events and file and drum corps march daily. Tours offered by historic interpreters (in costume) or 'modern' interpreters in CWF polo shirt and chinos or plain clothes. Outside heavily used.

### VISIBILITY

**Inside/Outside**

- Town is laid out in grid pattern therefore appears as a fairly discrete and somewhat bounded unit. No fences or distinct boundaries—save for aforementioned barriers, signs etc. Waller, Francis and Henry streets. North side has wooded areas bounding it (or at least street is not visible).

### Amenities

In historic area shops are in historic buildings and are 18th century in appearance. Cash registers are hidden and buildings lit by candle. Some modern items sold but bags are brown paper and items are wrapped in repro broadsheets.
<p>| Amenities cont'd | outside historic area themed upper-end shops (Craft House) sell repros. Other shops around HA and in VC are modern and see repro items + modern souvenirs (postcards, t-shirts etc) restaurants are taverns: all period with period food and props |
| Toilets/Bins/Health and Safety signs | toilets signed by brown signs. In historic area tend to be located behind buildings, out of site and are in sympathetic structures. Rubbish bins are hidden in barrels and hydrants are miniature, green and low to the ground. |
| Construction/Renovation/Restoration | major construction tends to be carried out by costumed interpreters: Peyton Randolph construction best eg. However maintenance work is carried out by uniformed (khaki) CW staff. May be visible during open hours |
| OTHER NOTES | Not certain where boundaries really are especially in case of eg Capitol not sure whether street or buildings are edge. Map shows both Buildings have been created based upon extensive architectural and archaeological investigations. Architects originally responsible for archaeology. Buildings recreated to high standard of architectural (and archaeological) authenticity. Building exteriors and interiors often updated (eg Peyton Randolph exterior and 'urban plantation' complex, Wythe and Brush Everard interiors and even Governor's Palace even shop is real and has label over the door but is, in essence, outside of site does not seem to be critical that inside and outside match |</p>
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**BOUNDARIES:**

**External boundaries**
- Site is entered off side road and sits adjacent to major intersection. Backs onto grounds owned by Botanic Garden. A city park provides spatial (but not visual) buffer b/t site and city.
- On street side, site is bounded by wooden fence with name written on in big letters. Restaurant (associated with site) located at street level and round piller-type information and advert posts indicating site. Enter site down slight hill. Two stage sort of entrance: first past the restaurant and the Elsinore theatre and is actually a sort of passageway b/t these front buildings and the backside of those in main site.
- No entrance building, simply a booth structure. Visitors channeled by means of low wooden fence. However road has simple barrier--one bar--which is lifted at night.
- Exits (to park/street side) and full-height turnstiles set in gates marked with exit signs.
- The back of the site is bonded by a fairly steep hill to the botanic garden. Windmill sits at top.

**Defined/Distinct areas**
- Town is set up in 'neighbourhoods'. Named on map and also on ground. Sometime there are gates/fences at end of neighbourhood.
- Pond in centre of site (created or at least enhanced) is focus for oldest bit of site and is a passive boundary of sorts.

**Internal Boundaries**
- Pond, gates or period fences mark areas. In part laid out around town square. Movement around site is via town streets.

**visitor centre**
- No visitor centre. Shops on site (in period buildings) restaurant/lunch areas located through site.
- Museum can be omitted from visit--located to one side of the plays but is prominently signed.

**entrance**
- One entrance, channelled past restaurant building into the admission booth. Entrance is unobtrusive.

**sight lines**
- From OUTSIDE and front of site, can only see rooflines of nearest buildings. Hints of site from outside in Botanic Garden and in park and look down on it from hill but wooded area and again, rooftops only visible. Inside, because it is in hollow (esp. to BG side and back) outside not immediately visible. From side adjoining park, outside is quite visible.
- CERES brewery office building towers over site and is visible from most parts of site (even central part).

**location**
- City of Arhus, slightly outside of main downtown area, but well in city proper. Adjoins Botanic Garden and large park.
- All on unrelated site; location amongst Ford Plants deliberate. Buildings original and recreated cobbled together from various locations. Many come with strong pedigree (eg Menlo Complex or Wright House) others are recreated out of strong memory/family associations (eg Martha Mary Chapel).

**Physical Landscape**
- Most buildings are "real" (admissions booth is copy) culled from all over Denmark. Buildings saved from demolition (eg mintmasters house) brought into site.

**COHESION**
- Attempt to create "whole" environment. Lots of stage setting: laundry on line, carts in streets etc. Booths on street selling fish and others serving crafts. Fountains, hitching posts all contribute to feeling.
- Some attempt at themes in terms of street furniture: stones delineating Susquehanna Plantation property.
- Gardens important--behind the house settings are mostly full and propped.
signage
Many period signs, admin buildings are signed in period manner. Houses are labelled with modern blue signs, which gives name, date and original location of property. In multiple languages. Some houses are 'sponsored' and have brass plaques with company logo (eg CERES beer) guide maps way through site. Some maps at front.

access to structures
not all buildings open. Admin buildings along central road. Other offices in upper stories of exhibition buildings. many buildings contain museum displays (toys, watches etc) so exterior is just shell to house museum

Outdoor activities/movement
activities: gardening, tours, stall (booths) on streets

VISIBILITY
inside/outside
inside are period fences but fences toward BG are low and can see through them. Some plantings around edges. Likewise while outside not hugely apparent it is nonetheless possible to see outside quite often (even towards city) can see from upper street and must look from BG (forms a sort of passive background) but not terribly obvious except for white fence at front. All helped by fact site sits in hollow interim area and visitor centre modern; nb the garage door on theatre. No big attempt to blend interim area: modern park benches. Is a patch of corn growing outside. Grass cut away from gate but is a strip right along the wall of cut grass

Amenities
shops are found in trade or crafts buildings throughout site. Maybe big, modern shop in barn but 4/01 was being refurbished

toilets/rubbish bins/health and safety signs
toilets in back of historic building (also houses lunch room with vending machine) From outside building 'fits'. Rubbish bins in barrels with 'trash' handwritten in gold letters

construction/renovation/restoration
Mintmaster house under construction at time of visit. Most of exterior finished but that which taking place was with modern workmen (trucks etc visible). Photos indicate that at no time were modern bits hidden from public view. At one point building was swathed in plastic sheeting

OTHER NOTES
Mintmasters house completes the town square but in order to fit it substantial portion of the site (back side) had to be dug away and portion of adjoining building needed to be removed. In 2001 building was absent but video in nearby building explained building of house modern museum shop is in barn (yellow) even shop is real and has label over the door but is, in essence, outside of site does not seem to be critical that inside and outside match
<p>| <strong>signage</strong> | Many period signs, admin buildings are signed in period manner. Houses are labelled with modern blue signs, which gives name, date and original location of property. In multiple languages. Some houses are 'sponsored' and have brass plaques with company logo (eg CERES beer) guide maps way through site. Some maps at front. |
| <strong>access to structures</strong> | Not all buildings open. Admin buildings along central road. Other offices in upper stories of exhibition buildings. Many buildings contain museum displays (toys, watches etc) so exterior is just shell to house museum. |
| <strong>Outdoor activities/movement</strong> | Activities: gardening, tours, stall (booths) on streets. |
| <strong>VISIBILITY</strong> | Inside are period fences but fences toward BG are low and can see through them. Some plantings around edges. Likewise while outside not hugely apparent it is nonetheless possible to see outside quite often (even towards city). Can see from upper street and must look from BG (forms a sort of passive background) but not terribly obvious except for white fence at front. All helped by fact site sits in hollow interim area and visitor centre modern; nb the garage door on theatre. No big attempt to blend interim area: modern park benches. Is a patch of corn growing outside. Grass cut away from gate but is a strip right along the wall of cut grass. |
| <strong>Amenities</strong> | Shops are found in trade or crafts buildings throughout site. Maybe big, modern shop in barn but 4/01 was being refurbished. |
| <strong>Toilets/rubbish bins/health and safety signs</strong> | Toilets in back of historic building (also houses lunch room with vending machine). From outside building 'fits'. Rubbish bins in barrels with 'trash' handwritten in gold letters. |
| <strong>Construction/renovation/restoration</strong> | Mintmaster house under construction at time of visit. Most of exterior finished but that which taking place was with modern workmen (trucks etc visible). Photos indicate that at no time were modern bits hidden from public view. At one point building was swathed in plastic sheeting. |
| <strong>OTHER NOTES</strong> | Mintmaster house completes the town square but in order to fit it substantial portion of the site (back side) had to be dug away and portion of adjoining building needed to be removed. In 2001 building was absent but video in nearby building explained building of house modern museum shop is in barn (yellow) even shop is real and has label over the door but is, in essence, outside of site. Does not seem to be critical that inside and outside match. |</p>
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## Historic Fort York

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>Toronto, downtown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MANDATE/STORYLINE</td>
<td>War of 1812, Battle of York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME PERIOD/SPAN PORTRAYED</td>
<td>centred on War of 1812 but includes 18th C. beginning and later history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE (INSTITUTION) HISTORY</td>
<td>opened to public 1934. Purchased 1909, used by army through 1930s. Operated by City of Toronto agency but is a designated National Historic Site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATURE OF SITE</td>
<td>original 1812 structures plus Blue Barracks (reconstructed in 1930s, added and rebuilt 2002) surrounded by 1930s stone walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF DEFINITION</td>
<td>&quot;Birthplace of Toronto&quot;. An historic site museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUIDE BOOKS/MAPS/VIDEO</td>
<td>double sided one page photo-copied 'visitor's guide'. Vista boards (about waist height) outside on main path nearest exit (from canteen/reception area) and where tours start slide show, intro exhibits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BOUNDARIES:

<p>| External boundaries | primary and most obvious boundary is stone wall but beyond that moat and site entrance sign is surrounded by high iron gate/fence (can see through). However commons and cemetery also part of site. MAP just shows the area surrounded by stone walls |
| Defined/Distinct areas | main site itself is one area; however, if larger area, then commons and cemetery may be seen as separate. These areas don't seem to figure much in interpretation |
| Internal boundaries | no internal boundaries--series of buildings. Parade ground area identified but not distinct except in absence of buildings |
| Visitor Centre | No visitor centre. Visitors enter site (usually) via canteen/shop. No interpretative devices. Tours guided and interpretative material lies within site |
| Entrance | main entrance off street, via driveway under elevated highway. Drive has metal sign over but b/c adjacent to Fort York Barracks DND, some confusion arises. Pass by commons (unsigned), tree nursery to parking lot. Must divert through canteen for admission. Main entrance (drive) blocked by low wooden gate. back entrance (must buzz through) off Bathurst St, near public transit stop. Must walk through whole site--in essence view it backwards--to get to canteen |
| Access to site after hours | main site locked at iron gate. Can access commons and cemetery but dodgy area |
| Sight lines | dominated by elevated highway, electronic billboards, by brewery and site itself by skyline of downtown Toronto and CN Tower Interpretation (all aspects: vista boards, interpreters etc) evoke original Town of York (18th/19th C) which does not exist and lies to other side of downtowm INTERNAL SIGHT LINE. Nb the main street of the town quarter: if look up hill very solid illusion of past but if turn round can see staff cars parked by modern building adjacent to an exit. To some extent Lake (and original shoreline) also evoked |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>in downtown area, heavily industrial. Until a decade ago was surrounded by an abattoir, a multi-story brewery, a battery reclaiming factory. Now most gone but still dominated by elevated highway, main railway line and billboards. NB the noise and odour pollution was significant til quite recently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Landscape</td>
<td>All buildings in situ. Recreated blue barracks based on archaeological data. Commons located without site and includes burial grounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COHESION</td>
<td>Attempt to create &quot;whole&quot; environment grounds are groomed, grass cut and central cinder pathway. Tend to move from building to building with littl some but very little--almost none--street furniture throughout site. Cannon form main props. No gardens etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>signage</td>
<td>very little signage through site (except for initial vista boards and exhibit signs) outside green signs, themed with Toronto Historical Board. Sign at street entrance and same type of sign at main entrance by iron gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to structures</td>
<td>most buildings open. South barracks admin buildings, stone magazine closed (storage) and part of blue barracks and east blockhouse closed for (catering) functions. Upstairs east blockhouse offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor activities/movement</td>
<td>main central path, logical movement via central path. Drills and other recreated events take place on parade ground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISIBILITY</td>
<td>Inside/Outside site hard to see from outside. Glimpse of buildings from east side (esp. when travelling on public transit) and also quickly from elevated highway. Very poor street frontage; hidden behind Molson's brewery and Fort York DND barracks. cannot see cemetery from road--almost hidden at opposite end of commons--and commons just appears as empty grassed space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenities</td>
<td>Canteen area only retail area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets/Bins/Health and Safety</td>
<td>toilets located in wall, hidden behind Officer's Mess. Bins apparent but sparse. No obvious health and safety signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction/renovation/restoration</td>
<td>N/A. The presence of lumber on ground seems to indicate future building but no other evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER NOTES</td>
<td>Uneven (costumed) interpretation of buildings. Some empty, some exhibition space and some full environments. Basement of officers mess (most heavily interpreted space) is made up of an archaeological display and viewing platform</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Henry Ford Museum and Greenfield Village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>Dearborn, Michigan, USA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MANDATE/STORY LINE</td>
<td>American Invention backed up by America's Homes etc. Refer to now current set of districts (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME PERIOD/SPAN PORTRAYED</td>
<td>Largely 19th century into early 20th. Some earlier 'antecedent' sites eg. Susquehanna plantation and notably the 1620s Cotswold Cottage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE (INSTITUTION) HISTORY</td>
<td>established 1929 by HF as 'The Edison Institute'; never intended to be public, was school/learning centre. Opened to public under growing pressure now an independent, nonprofit educational institute (not assoc. w/ Ford Motor Company or Ford Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATURE OF SITE</td>
<td>combination of relocated buildings--most with pedigree--and recreated buildings that evoke HF's memories; eg Martha Mary Chapel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF DEFINITION</td>
<td>A &quot;complex&quot; which is &quot;America's Greatest History Attraction&quot; and &quot;the place where authentic American people, places and things captivate and inspire visitors of all ages* (<a href="http://www.henryford.org">www.henryford.org</a>) 7/8/03 Also defines itself as &quot;the campus&quot; and &quot;the largest indoor/outdoor museum in the United States (<a href="http://www.henryford.org">www.henryford.org</a>) 7/8/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of Guide books/maps/video</td>
<td>Fold up pamphlet with map of village and list of buildings on one side. Info re: rides w/in village, instructions about safety etc. Other side, lists general HFMGV info, including IMAX films and upcoming event. No video Other books about history of site available but not guide book per se.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOUNDARIES:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External boundaries</td>
<td>Main part of site is encircled by train tracks. Firestone House, Entrance buildings remain outside Front of site (and front sides) are defined by red brick wall. On sides wall circa 6' high. Front entrance has iron gate to left so can see Benson Ford Research Centre. Site also defined on sides (and internally) by train tracks. Back of site tends to by defined by trees and buffer zone of Rouge River conservation area. Here the boundary tends to visually blend into trees so edge uncertain. Fences less definite here. Village 'ends' at activity field and Suwanee 'River' Can easily see an exit/staff car entrance/car park from access to train ride at Smith's Creek Depot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defined/distinct areas?</td>
<td>On map, village is split into colour-coded 'themed' areas. Split entirely on theme, no date/time criteria. On ground there is visually almost no evidence, no internal boundaries, no apparent signage relating to the areas on map. Little (any?) sense of where you are and easy to 'trespass' into one without being aware. Train conductor said that covered bridge was &quot;entrance to colonial homes district&quot; Is this part of ENVISIONED SITE?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internal boundaries?</td>
<td>train tracks (see above). Some internal sites are defined as distinct areas by fencing: Menlo Park Compound, Susquehanna Plantation. Also Firestone Farm/House but is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>internal boundaries? cont’d</strong></td>
<td>more complicated as physically removed and has long farm driveway. Sits at 'side' of site, o/s Farm tracks. FENCES: also around yards of more 'rural' sites. In this case tends to be 'period' fencing but nb boundary of Susquehanna Plantation. Is the use of fencing limited?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>visitor centre</strong></td>
<td>ENTRANCE GATE. Clearly subordinate and a walk from HFMGV main ticket entrance. Main area consists of IMAX tickets, main shop, museum entrance and further on museum entrance. Can skip this but it is most accessible and obvious entrance from parking lot Site not easily visible through gate; big red brick structure. Not v. large. Contains toilets, ticket booths, pamphlets and vista boards. Shop is located outside to left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>entrance</strong></td>
<td>Entrance is through gate-like structure as detailed above. Area immediately inside gate like an interim area (liminal zone?) with service buildings: shop, staff building (library/archives), info board. The garden in this area is coloured coded to match with the ENTRANCE buildings (village, museum, IMAX theatre). Need to cross train tracks before see and/or enter village proper Outside village entrance (on grassy area b/t main entrance and village) is Spirit of 76 car thing and also History channel van (temp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>access to site after hours</strong></td>
<td>gates closed no access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>sight lines</strong></td>
<td>Surrounded by Ford Engine Works and Plants which are clearly visible over the one side of site (bordering covered bridge, windmill etc). Back and other side face unto treed area, though side is bordered by train (passenger and freight) line. Plants particularly visible from village train ride, ditto service roads and areas fenced by orange Vexar. Train ride goes through 'back' of site, where see 'Do Not Enter' signs and the Henry Ford Academy. Train blows out boiler here so sense of unused, private, service area. May also see service vehicles here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>location</strong></td>
<td>Suburban Detroit (Dearborn) amid Ford Plants. Entrance off wide 4 laned road into car park with large illuminated sign. Industrial area bordered by residential areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Landscape</strong></td>
<td>all on unrelated site; location amongst Ford Plants deliberate. Buildings original and recreated cobbled together from various locations. Many come with strong pedigree (eg Menlo Complex or Wright House) others are recreated out of strong memory/family associations (eg Martha Mary Chapel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COHESION</strong></td>
<td>attempt to create &quot;whole&quot; environment few attempts at site furniture. Tarmac roads, but no street signs or street names. Mains N-S street leading from entrance runs to statue of Edison (town centre idea) then jogs over to Village Green. Some interiors either all exhibition, some mix of both (eg Webster House) and some 'period'...no standard form of interior presentation. Crafts buildings have v. modern health/safety interiors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>attempt to create &quot;whole&quot; environment</strong></td>
<td>Some attempt at themes in terms of street furnitute: stones delineating Susquehanna Plantation property. Interpreters dressed in mix of HFMGV/IMAX t-shirts and in period costume; wandering sense of being in past. Not all buildings are staffed. Child's comment of 'real house' **important to look at web site as site has u'gone considerable change over 2002/2003 attempt to use sound as means of creating environment, atmosphere. Much of this sound is trigger by movement: eg toll booth speaks as approach. Also Sarah Jordan House where 'boarders' and 'everyday' noises (conversations, background sounds) are heard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>signage</strong></td>
<td>Neither interior or exterior signs are standardised. Green 'label' signs outside most buildings. Interior signage and labels hodge podge--partly due to different periods when buildings were opened/created etc. Some houses have bronze 'names' on outside near door. No street signs (or names) a 'period' bus stop near the Cotswold Cottage. 'NO FOOD AND DRINK' signs modern (symbols+words).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>access to structures</strong></td>
<td>Most buildings open, accessible. Very little storage w/in village. Closed buildings tended to be those in reconstruction: signed on ground and noted on map. Storage and auxiliary buildings etc appear to be located off site or in entrance area. Impnt not all buildings are exhibition; random selection of display techniques. Webster House includes 'glass case' rooms and video presentations, ditto Geo Washington Carver memorial. Plympton House has glass, letroset labels on glassdummies, and audio loop w/ combo recreated dinner conversation and narration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VISIBILITY</strong></td>
<td>Outside very visible, not sure any attempt to hide: in essence Ford Plants part of experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>inside/outside</strong></td>
<td>Located in entrance, in village and in museum building. In clapboard purpose built in entrance, in original structure in village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>shops</strong></td>
<td>Toilets in entrance buildings and restaurants. Toilets look like brick Federal style buildings--at very leas are unobtrusive. Food building on 'edge' of site 'A Taste of History' in modern building 'hidden' behind Eagle Tavern. Hydrants visible and no attempt to disguise. Rubbish bins are standard cylindrical wooden 'park type' bin (modern style) on metal leg. No attempt to hide. See signage above for safety signs. Merry-go-round in middle of site, likewise clearly modern food counters and picnic benches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>toilets/rubbish bins/health and safety signs</strong></td>
<td>Large part of central site surrounded by hoarding and u'going infrastructure works. Visible signs (eg JCBs etc) of modern construction activities and associated signage etc. Cotswold Cottages has plyboard on windows and signs on map and ground indicating under restoration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER NOTES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site was undergoing significant changes as part of infrastructure overhaul. According to website (and conversation Sept 2002) thematic areas of site redefined. Site may be +cohesive now, bears a revisit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The museum complex and site are now known as THE HENRY FORD. A tour of the Rouge Plant is now offered on website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also important to note that 2003 is centenary of Ford Motor Company.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>varying efforts to make clear 'real' and 'not real'. Link with real events important: nb Menlo Park where chair from rebroadcast nailed to section of old (read real) floor. Likewise the transportation of topsoil from Menlo Park NJ to Menlo Park MI. Similarly visit by GWC to memorial and fact he slept there (in GFV) is critical structures: part of or an idea of a structure seems to be just as good as a WHOLE structure. EG. wholly created Martha Mary Chapel and reduced version (w/ middle floors gone) John Bennet Shop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jamestown Settlement</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCATION</strong></td>
<td>Jamestown, Virginia, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mandate/Storyline</strong></td>
<td>no information in public material, life in 17th century America. First permanent English settlement in America. 17th century America (Virginia), tied to 1607 James Fort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Period/Spn Portrayed</strong></td>
<td>Entirely created site. Buildings, ships and other structures all reconstructions based upon historical/archaeological data (from throughout state). 'Real' James Fort located in NPS site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature of Site</strong></td>
<td>A Living History Museum of 17th Century Virginia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self Definition</strong></td>
<td>Orientation video in museum. All (most) visitors funnelled through museum before entering site. All visitors receive map and info pamphlet. Other guidebooks available for purchase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boundaries:</strong></td>
<td>from site entrance (exhibition galleries) back to river. Site backs onto wooded area and parking lot. Exhibition Building and car park provide--at least--visible limits to the site. Map shows similar area but based on footpaths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defined/Distinct Areas?</strong></td>
<td>Four distinct areas: exhibition galleries, Powhatan Village, James Fort and Ships. Fort is enclosed by palisades. Powhatan Village does not have boundaries or fences but is bounded by concrete foot paths (it sits within a circle where main path splits). PV is dirt with some plantings. Ships distinct area in that are on dock/pier by itself at 'end' of site. Also modern construction and towers near beginning of site. Functional areas within fort. Area immediately outside the exhibition v. modern and have display of state flags creates a distinct area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal Boundaries?</strong></td>
<td>Palisades around Fort. Bounds of ship, form boundaries b/t on board and not. Paths define PV space. Entrance plaza (between site and entrance building) appears as a distinct and modern space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visitor Centre</strong></td>
<td>Entrance building is empty (shop, ticket desks and toilets) but funnels traffic into museum which provides orientation, background history and video. Visitor centre under construction for 2007? Anniversary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entrance</strong></td>
<td>Entrance off car park, well defined with internal corridor through large, empty-ish building. Site hidden from car park (outside) . Large banners with '17th c' drawings on front of building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to Site After Hours</strong></td>
<td>none.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sight Lines</strong></td>
<td>Can often see outside site (to either side) and glimpse chain link fence marking boundaries. Edges of site bounded by wooded areas. James River forms one boundary. Mostly unchanged surroundings. Can see modern ferries crossing river.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Off main highway south from Williamsburg. Also accessed via Colonial Parkway and National Historic Park. Quite rural environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Landscape</strong></td>
<td>All structures are 'new' or reproductions. Location is unrelated to sites portrayed. Big, empty spaces between interpretative areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COHESION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attempt to create &quot;whole&quot; environment</td>
<td>within fort and within PV some attempt at 'furniture'. Chickens etc run through fort, fires inside out and interpreters in and out. Lots of activity in outside areas. Likewise PV which has garden, outside activities and 'street furniture'. Ships entities unto themselves and interiors etc recreated (nb signs and donation box) PV is bounded only by cement walkways and is quite small. Too small for cohesion? standard signs brown lettering on light brown--most signs from standing maps to toilets are same/similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>signage</td>
<td>Signage restricted to areas outside themed areas; i.e. no signs in PV or JF but are found along pathway. Several signs on dock around ships. Signs on ships safety (mind heads) variety but not limited to this type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>access to structures</td>
<td>all buildings and structures open. Not all staffed but as furnished with repros very few, if any, areas are off limits or roped off in interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor activities/movement</td>
<td>via cement pathways within PV and JF movement is less directed and more random: can wander in and out of buildings and structures at will.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISIBILITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inside/outside</td>
<td>outside, wooded. Other than aforementioned view to entrance buildings/area most of the view is into wooded areas. Can see ferry dock (to Surrey) from ships site is not visible from outside. Entrance building can only be seen from car park main, and only, shop in entrance building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toilets/ bins/health and safety</td>
<td>no rubbish bins in themed areas. Safety signs in ships and on dock. Toilets are located in the entrance building and in modern purpose-built structures on dock. Drinking fountain outside 'back' entrance (bt PV and Fort) of Fort rubbish bins standard park type, though barrels immediately outside fort and around site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>construction/renovation/restoration</td>
<td>big area of construction adjacent to exhibition building. Hoarding with &quot;Building towards 2007&quot; (400th anniversary of JT settlement. construction of new structure in Fort. Roped off with ropes and barrels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER NOTES</td>
<td>based upon historical research and archaeological research (general not specific). Fort shape (triangle) is based on historical documents of 'real' James fort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sainte Marie Among the Hurons</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCATION</strong></td>
<td>Midland, Ontario Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MANDATE/STORYLINE</strong></td>
<td>French mission in New France. First Nations history Culture contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TIME PERIOD/SPAN PORTRAYED</strong></td>
<td>1639-1649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SITE (INSTITUTION) HISTORY</strong></td>
<td>Huronia Historical Parks (Province of Ontario agency). Land leased on 99-year lease from Society of Jesus of Upper Canada. (Jesuits promoted site and archaeological excavations as early as 1940s). Centennial project (e.g. c. 1967)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NATURE OF SITE</strong></td>
<td>reconstructed via archaeology on original site. Some extant stone work (above ground), including bastion walls and fireplace foundations. Emphasis on end of fort and burning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SELF DEFINITION</strong></td>
<td>&quot;Nationally significant historic site&quot;. Define &quot;historic site&quot; as distinct from restaurant. Does not refer to itself (in promo material) as any particular type of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVAILIBILITY OF GUIDE BOOKS/MAPS/VIDEO</strong></td>
<td>pamphlet with map handed out at admission. List of buildings. Intro video (two theatres) is compulsory and is part of 'entrance' into the site itself. Reports of archaeological work available but no further in-depth guide book</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BOUNDARIES:

- **External boundaries**

  Site is entered from highway and is accessed by long and winding driveway. Entrance road also access for Wye River Wildlife Sanctuary. Landscaped up to and including entrance with local pine trees and rocks typical of the Shield. Not visible from highway entrance building, modern, low building blocks site from car park. Impossible to see site. No sign on building but large logo of Jesuit and 'Huron'. Admin buildings to left of entrance and further block view of site reconstructed area is entered through significant gateway cut into stonewall. Gate topped with wooden cross.

- **defined/distinct areas**

  As fort site is discrete unit and all buildings are tightly dated therefore. However there are separate areas based upon function: not named but defined by internal palisades. Only named area comes via list for 'Non Christian Longhouse' where they talk about it being located in a "place apart" only low fence is that for animal enclosure; sits between main high exterior wall palisade and interior high palisade. Area between visitor centre/entrance and external is left 'empty'. Restaurant located here. No 'centre' of site but first section (first palisaded off bit) nearest main gate is most dense area and has many of 'best' buildings--most impressive/evocative buildings.

- **internal boundaries**

  Palisades--often very high (not possible to see over) separate. Visitor moved through openings. The opening bit palisades into different areas of site is same (appearance, size, etc) as the opening which is back exit (to area of restaurant) of site. Whilst Non-Christian area is near back of site, it, physically, does not appear to be any more separate than many areas.

- **visitor centre**

  Significant that two areas of stonework (bastion and fireplace) which were recovered archaeologically are fenced off and signed. Visitor centre is important component of site. Includes museum, compulsory video, shop, admissions and toilets.
museum can be omitted from visit--located to one side of theatres but is prominently signed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>entrance</th>
<th>3 sets of entrances: (a) into visitor centre (b) into theatre and interim area and (c) into reconstructed itself</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>access to site after hours</td>
<td>site closed, no access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sight lines</td>
<td>Little change to visible surrounding environment since 17th century. Adjacent to wildlife preserve and little development around site. From main site, no visible pollution and very little noise pollution (train does pass by). From 'look out' point on palisade on back of site, can see a gravel road but not apparent from site itself. From centre of site can see steeple of Martyr's Shrine on hill across the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>location</td>
<td>North central Ontario, in area of wildlife and beauty. 'Cottage country' home to vacationers, outdoors (fishing) and cottagers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Landscape</td>
<td>All rebuilt structures located within rebuilt palisades. Original stonework visible in first court.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COHESION</td>
<td>Attempt to create &quot;whole&quot; environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attempt to create &quot;whole&quot; environment</td>
<td>Almost no signage (see below). Areas of plantings, animal house, and building 'under construction'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No toilets etc in reconstructed area, almost all areas of buildings accessible no interior barrier (ropes or glass panels)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In terms of stage setting outside of site tends to be clean or empty. Nearly all of it grassed and few internal pathways. Most significant example of stage setting is Jean de Brebeuf 'grave'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpreters are all in costume. All (or at least most) buildings staffed. Much of interpretation is 3rd person. Three distinct group of interpreters: Hurons, Jesuits, and French lay workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>signage</td>
<td>With one notable exception (see below) no signage whatsoever in reconstructed area. One single sign in interim area which has symbols indicating toilets, first aide and restaurant. Further has fleur-de-lys and turtle representing French and Huron culture portrayed at site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The fireplace and the bastion foundations are fenced off (with 'rustic/old' looking fences) and each contains sign explaining remains in words and diagrammes. Both topped with same logo (as seen on entrance) of Jesuit and Huron. NB other areas of original stonework neither labelled or fenced-off no 'labels' on buildings must rely on guide map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>access to structures</td>
<td>Access to all buildings. One second floor inaccessible as it used as the education centre for children's programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor activities/movement</td>
<td>Interpreters move outside and esp. 'Hurons'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISIBILITY</td>
<td>Site distinct unit b/c it is encircled by very high (perhaps &gt;15') palisades. Actually impossible to see outside which creates very strong sense of being inside, being enclosed. Important to note that whilst can't see VC from site, can see site from VC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inside/outside</td>
<td>Interim area and visitor centre modern; nb the garage door on theatre. No big attempt to blend interim area: modern park benches. Is a patch of corn growing outside. Grass cut away from gate but is a strip right along the wall of cut grass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Amenities | Shop in visitor centre. Nothing in historic area.
<p>| toilets/bins/health and safety | no toilets in village: in visitor centre buildings and restaurant. No health and safety signs and rubbish bins are absent from the reconstructed part of site |
| construction/renovation/restoration | no indication of ongoing construction. In past when longhouse was built, it was done by costumed interpreters (donnes) building and is undertaken with 'traditional' techniques |
| OTHER NOTES | change of Jean de Brebeuf 'grave' from bronze plaque in dirt floor to wooden areas with heaped up dirt (to simulate grave) and wood burnt rustic sign. This apparently occurred in association with visit of Pope in late 1980s. Important to note that Jean de Brebeuf is no longer [was he ever?] buried there but bones are at Martyr's Shrine Church is consecrated and is in use Movie, with burning of fort integral experience and does as much, if not more, to set up experience Buildings have been created based upon extensive archaeological investigations but interpreters on gate and in Boisvin house both pointed out that reconstructions weren't quite accurate and that the &quot;wrong&quot; mortar was used in reconstruction of fireplace Buildings were moved slightly by Jury in order to enhance visitor flow through site |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Scarborough Historical Museum</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCATION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MANDATE/STORY LINE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TIME PERIOD/SPAN PORTRAYED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SITE (INSTITUTION) HISTORY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NATURE OF SITE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SELF DEFINITION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVAILABILITY OF GUIDE BOOKS, VIDEO AND MAPS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOUNDARIES:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External Boundaries</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defined/Distinct Areas</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal Boundaries</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visitor Centre</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entrance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to Site after hours</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sight Lines</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Landscape</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COHESION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attempt to create 'whole' environment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>signage</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to structures</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outdoor Activities/movement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VISIBILITY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inside/Outside</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amenities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Toilets/Bins/Health and Safety</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction/Renovation/Restoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER NOTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skansen Open-Air Museum</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCATION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MANDATE/STORY LINE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TIME PERIOD/SPAN PORTRAYED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NATURE OF SITE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SELF DEFINITION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVAILABILITY OF GUIDEBOOKS/MAPS/VIDEO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOUNDARIES:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External Boundaries</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defined/Distinct Areas</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal Boundaries</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visitor Centre</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skansen Open-Air Museum</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCATION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MANDATE/STORY LINE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TIME PERIOD/SPAN PORTRAYED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NATURE OF SITE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SELF DEFINITION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVAILIBILITY OF GUIDE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVAILIBILITY OF BOOKS/MAPS/VIDEO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOUNDARIES</strong>:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External Boundaries</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defined/Distinct Areas</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal Boundaries</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visitor Centre</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Entrance

Main entrance on street. Very modern and looks not unlike Tivoli sort of entrance down street. Enter via set of booths and turnstiles. Once in side find oneself in a plaza with toilets, 3D map, stroller rental, and small set of stairs which run the width of the plaza. Most visible feature is very, very high outcropping of rock face. A plaza sits below this b/t escalator to left and path to aquarium to right. Once up stairs and to left of escalator is tobacco museum and restaurant. Escalator provides a dramatic and very physical separation into the site. Bottom has sort of trompe l'oiel paintings of town. Some painting continues up very steep escalators but mostly covered with thematic posters.

When access site from ferry (i.e. from central part of city) approach site through amusement park, pedestrianised street. V. like Niagara Falls or perhaps other similar places (Blackpool perhaps?). This street 'T's' at street fronting Skansen. However there is a grand 19th C (?) hotel that is most apparent and has appearance of being site. Hard, initially to, discern where site is

Side entrance (where buses stop) is much more dramatic than front entrance. Although set at base of outcropping can see a sight building at top. Architecturally very dramatic with arches, actual admission booth built into structure. Niche with AH's bust in it.

Inside side entrance faced with funicular ride or less obvious side path (beside animal pen) to top. Funicular is period and costs 100 SEK each way. Children free.

Access To Site After Hours

access to site after hours for concerts, dances etc. Is escalator structure at top closed?

Sight Lines

from front half of site can easily see Stockholm skyline and the harbour. Esp. prominent from Solliden. Even near museum and back can see city. Sami camp is perhaps highest point (apart from tower) and can see city.

What don't see--except from tower--is Tivoli (amusement park). Because of height and slope the area immediately surrounding the site is, in essence, invisible. Have a sense of site as filling all of the island.

Because site is on highest point of Djurgarden not much can be seen from rest of island or even from the harbour. From the ferry can see tower and some roof lines but trees and height prevent clear site INTERNAL SIGHT LINE. Nb the main street of the town quarter: if look up hill very solid illusion of past but if turn round can see staff cars parked by modern building adjacent to an exit.

Location

on island in Stockholm harbour. Wooded area. Site sits atop rocky hill and outcroppings of rock highly visible/ apparent throughout site. Elevation changes often and sometimes quite dramatically., Site is heavily wooded. Island (and notably site was the location of a country house. AH's ethnographic museum adjacent. Now Tivoli, Vassamuseet and parks

COHESION

Attempt To Create "Whole" Environment

in town quarter definite effort with stage setting devices (carts left by doors etc) and cash registers not apparent in shops. Have volunteers playing music and people at allotment cottages. cohesion strongest in town quarter; other sites may be cohesive unto themselves but not standard nor overarching some properties--town hall and temperance hall--outside of the site have stage setting and in these two cases they have bicycles propped on fences and wall of buildings. This is notable b/c it is reasonably unusual. Church yard has grave stones but no graves
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attempt To Create &quot;Whole&quot; Environment</th>
<th>Some street furniture b/t sites. IE the milk churn on the stand 'waiting' by the roadside to be picked up. Also the 'display' of rune stones and mile markers interspersed throughout site. Site is too mixed. Easy to wander 'off site' into zoo--transition almost invisible. Modern buildings are visible and/or adjacent to 'old' areas and have rune stones and AH's grave to confuse.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>Some of the signage 'period' but more is standard sort of brown directional sign with handwritten style of print in white. Other signs are modern informational with same font but in green-grey in houses some of the 'do not touch signs' are in an old font and on yellowed, old looking paper/card. Some info posts which are on stand-alone wooden signs or sometimes round 'old looking' signs. Lots of modern sandwich board sign, event signs and posters almost through site. Including brown 'do not picnic' and 'do not walk on the grass' signs. Zoo signs are modern vista boards. Also donor wall and bear statue for children to play on. Little Skansen sign is same font/style as Skansen gate sign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access To Structures</td>
<td>Most buildings are accessible--at least on ground floor. Some admin buildings on top floor of building and others in period houses which sit to edge of town quarter; i.e., removed from main traffic area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Activities/Movement</td>
<td>Movement through site is by foot primarily. 'Train' ride and pony rides available. Lots of visitors seem to cluster in zoo and front of site. Animals in fields, ducks and geese on streets and inside sites, fiddlers in back garden and allotment huts are staffed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISIBILITY</td>
<td>***VERY IMPORTANT. Around front side (near animal pens) but more significantly adjacent to the Skane Garden, modern houses butt right up against the site. Literally a few feet from Skansen iron fence. Houses VERY visible from inside can easily see far distance (topography makes seeing immediate area almost impossible) and Stockholm city and harbour (see above). Site very difficult to see from outside (again b/c of location on rocky hill). Even once inside gates faced with big rock wall and don't see site till actually in it see notes above about work areas. Immediately opposite AH's gravesite, is fence separating work area. Whilst fence is wooden, high and painted brown-red there are portakabins on other side with are well high enough to see above fence. Also satellite dish on these buildings often encounter car parks (esp. enroute from Solliden across front to belfry and skane garden area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside/Outside</td>
<td>One souvenir shop (with film, postcards etc) in village, set up just off town quarter. In town quarter there is bakery and pottery both which are of period. Also glassworks shop--this is modern and on edge of site. Glassworks adapted for safety stalls along the centre area (marknadsgatan) with food and goods stalls. Modern upscale restaurant in Solliden area. Period-type restaurant in the Krogen Stora Gugen. Interior adapted for modern usage but evokes past. Finally coffee shop adjacent to apothecary. Outside area there is restaurant in the tower--this is modern. Main museum shop in located next to entrance--have to exit in order to get to it. Trade mark bags and logos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets/ Bins/Health And Safety</td>
<td>toilets near shop (off town quarter) are in modern building but building is semi subterranean with only low-sloped roof visible. Very unobtrusive from behind and partially concealed by plantings. Others located behind barn structures near zoo outside these toilets there are big recycling bins and rubbish bins. Modern, green fairly large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction/Renovation/Restoration</td>
<td>modern scaffolding on structures (e.g. in rosegarden and bergsman garden) and no attempt to hide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER NOTES</td>
<td>not sure if geographic theme is strong enough to carry over long distances of wooded site visibility--in the being able to see all of the site old idea--may be something to think about here. funny spaces at Skansen. For example, the space b/t the tower and the Hogloftet is modern and empty and has piles of manure, skips and access to modern toilets. In all space has definite appearance of being a private or 'behind the scenes' area of the site. Yet fairly big traffic area thing is that Skansen NOT JUST an open-air museum. Is a family picnic area and park and zoo and performance place. Multi focused and perhaps thematically diffuse?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Todmorden Mills and Heritage Centre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>Toronto, Ontario Canada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MANDATE/STORY LINE</td>
<td>Industry in city of York (Toronto) in 18th/19th century, links to brickworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME PERIOD/SPAN PORTRAYED</td>
<td>1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE (INSTITUTION) HISTORY</td>
<td>was 'baby' of Etobicoke councillor currently run by City of Toronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATURE OF SITE</td>
<td>centred on farmhouse with outbuildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF DEFINITION</td>
<td>heritage and arts centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVAILABILITY OF GUIDE BOOKS, VIDEO AND MAPS</td>
<td>limited--some pamphlets available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BOUNDARIES:**

| External Boundaries | area is bounded by motorway on two sides, steep valley walls on another and final side 'blurs' into wildlife preserve and conservation area |
| Defined/Distinct Areas | houses grouped but not 'distinct area' so to speak |
| Internal Boundaries | grouping of buildings separated from the extant mill complex by entrance road and medium slope |
| Visitor Centre | none, one building designated for display and admin (i.e. admission), |
| Entrance | along driveway, very ambiguous entrance |
| Access to Site after hours | none |
| Slight Lines | view out to wooded valleys |
| Location | within city of Toronto |
| Physical Landscape | houses and mill extant, railway station moved to site |

**COHESION**

| Attempt to create 'whole' environment signage | gardens located near house, stoops and paths 'match', a length of railway track sits beside rr station limited--mostly in form of 'please don't pick the flowers/veg' |
| Access to structures | houses locked except on special occasion/event days |
| Outdoor Activities/movement | on special occasions |

**VISIBILITY**

| Inside/Outside | good matches between in and out. Gardens evoked in kitchens, valley in terms of industry noted |
| Amenities | limited bookshop and shop in admissions buildings |
| Toilets/Bins/Health and Safety | available toilets but not clear. Normal 'park' bins |
| Construction/Renovation/Restoration | n/a |

**OTHER NOTES**

| | site is anxious to link to theme of industry and time to LT Gov Simcoe's settlement etc of the valley. Acknowledges brickworks mill is home to theatre groups and has exhibition space for museums and art gallery |
## Upper Canada Village Heritage Park

**LOCATION**  
Morrisburg, Ontario, Canada

**MANDATE/STORYLINE**  
19th century Ontario village themed around trade, agriculture and domestic activities (from pamphlet)

**TIME PERIOD/SPAN PORTRAYED**  
1860s (pamphlet), all events in village have 1860s date attached to them

**SITE (INSTITUTION) HISTORY**  
Opened in 1961. Incentive was flooding for St Lawrence Seaway in mid 1950s. Site originated with Pioneer Memorial (recovered gravestones from flooded area). Crrysler’s Farm monument (with relocated soil) was second, followed by the drafting of the village site in late 1950s part of St Lawrence Parks Commission an agency of the Province of Ontario government

**NATURE OF SITE**  
All original buildings recovered from Lost Villages and relocated on Government of Ontario land (unrelated site)

**SELF DEFINITION**  
Heritage Park which includes the Pioneer Memorial (with graves stones from local cemeteries), Crrysler’s Farm Memorial and Upper Canada Village  

**AVAILABILITY OF GUIDE BOOKS/MAPS/VIDEO**  
Map handed out at entrance. One double sided sheet with map, suggested route, building history and use. General historical overview video in Crrysler Hall. NB well into site and easy to bypass  

**BOUNDARIES:**

**External boundaries**  
Site is entered from highway and is accessed by long and winding driveway. Not visible from highway and must pass through the circa 1970s (?) Queen Elizabeth Gardens (very typical of provincial site/parkway gardens). Also pass Chrysler’s Farm entrance. Front of site consists of entrance and shop. West side (i.e. left front) has berms and trees to block view to car park. Side (NW) has considerable planting to block admin and security buildings. Back and right front (SE) of site face onto empty fields/parks/trees. East side of site fronts onto St Lawrence Seaway. Once inside, very difficult to see outside

**defined/distinct areas**  
No distinct areas: all of site represents late 19th century village centred on a ‘green’. Areas furthest from entrance gate represent more rural areas and/or farms. Area immediately adjacent to entrance (also away from centre) consists of sawmills and other trade sites. Layout based on ‘real’ villages so site is ‘whole’ unit with clustering reflecting a ‘real’ village structure in some cases layout ‘fails’ i.e. Ross Farm apparently in the middle of the village  

Other two components of Heritage Park are outside of village. Clearly separate /distinct. A miniature train connects CP and PM but not part of UCV

**internal boundaries**  
Only boundaries are period appropriate property boundaries (fences). There is, within the layout a tighter clustering in middle of site which thins out near the back, rural areas.
| **Loucks Farm appears to be physically set off from site--** bound by fencing and somewhat distant to centre of site. Also children's activity area and signal tower set out on 'peninsula'
| **visitor centre** | no visitor centre. Site is entered through turnstiles and admission booths. Vista boards near entrance with time line of site history (a 40th anniversary project). only museum is in Crysler Hall. Modern interior of one of the site's most impressive building. Ground floor is history of flooding for Seaway and video of life in 19th C Ontario. Upstairs changing exhibitions
| **entrance** | Entrance through turnstiles and red painted clapboard booth ("Admissions Building"). To get to main part of site must cross concrete bridge (gravelled over). Option to turn left to Flour and Saw Mills.
| **access to site after hours** | village closed, pioneer memorial and cryslers farm memorial open
| **sight lines** | Site lines on three sides are trees/fields and dramatically to the St Lawrence River. NB. In this area the river is flooded, so in fact is part of Seaway and site located between two sets of major locks, but called St Lawrence River on maps and site. View to river includes ocean going tankers, lakers and other large ships
| **location** | Rural Eastern Ontario. Heavy Franco-Ontarien population. Adjacent to the St Lawrence Seaway and on major shipping route. Historically old part of province. Between major settlements of Cornwall and Brockville and in catchment for Ottawa tourism
| **Physical Location.** | All structures removed to this site from Lost Villages (villages flooded for St Lawrence Seaway. Site has rural appearance with outlook to river
| **COHESION** | Deliberate attempt to create a place 'away'. Grass and weeds maintained differentially. Major routes (roads) have names with street signs and are gravel or dirt (back road near farm is dirt) and main street has board walk Stage setting is very important. Much of the signage is 'old' style. There are props like barrels with names of (fictitious) flourmills, notices of upcoming ceremonies (e.g. funeral) have proper day/date but appropriate 19th century year. Also note the interpretation of the funeral extends to digging a 'grave'. Headstones in church yard are from lost villages (but bear small metal id tags) stage setting: e.g. piles of wood left about (in appropriate places), grass not cut along the fence line no retail (save Harvest Barn Restaurant) within village. VISA sign on door of HB restaurant only modern sign. Willard's Inn is 'period' inn serving meals Interpreters are all in costume. All (or at least most) buildings staffed. Much of interpretation is 3rd person though some 1st person.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>signage</th>
<th>Signage is important although it is kept to minimum. Signs consist of street signs and other appropriate old style. Is a mix of old exhibition signs and old looking signs for upcoming events Only in Crysler Hall does signage differ and b/c modern no 'labels' on buildings must rely on guide map warning' signs in 'old' style. CHECK. First Aid sign is painted free-style handwriting and has red cross but appears like a farm sign. Not of period but doesn't jar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>access to structures</td>
<td>almost all buildings are open to public, all except Crysler Hall are exhibition sites and have period interiors. Union Cheese Factory is working factory and attempt made to 'disguise' or make unobtrusive the modern health/safety furniture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor activities/movement</td>
<td>some activities on street. Pony rides. Funeral ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISIBILITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inside/outside</td>
<td>outside is distant, except for ships on seaway no sense of 'modern' period. No outside noise/sounds from highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenities</td>
<td>none in village save for harvest barn restaurant. Willards Inn period restaurant. Shop on outside--exit via shop. Can enter shop w/out visiting village pop machines are found outside of site. Again toilets 'match' surrounding buildings and this time are red paint of shop and Admissions Building. Main picnic area and benches outside but smaller area on side of HB. Note that this is at side of site and also has access to road to Admin buildings. Exit here visible but not apparent and buildings hidden by trees. Water fountains are on side of HB restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toilets/ bins/health and safety</td>
<td>toilets in village are in purpose built raw lumber buildings with symbols and font evocative of 'old' style. Toilets blend with other buildings. Rubbish bins are rectangular standard wooden 'park style' sitting directly on ground. Event signs often posted on rubbish bins. hydrants not apparent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>construction/renovation/restoration</td>
<td>no indication of ongoing construction. No information available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER NOTES</td>
<td>site and signage needs to be bilingual. All signs (esp. health and safety) need to be in both languages Because houses are from Lost Villages there are people from area familiar with houses and indeed may have lived in building. Presents specific interpretative issues Important to remember that whilst Pioneer Memorial and Cryslers farm are definitely distinct from village, they are nonetheless sold (in pamphlet etc) as part of the package. Key thing about Cryslers Farm is that the soil was scooped up from (now submerged) land and redeposited as a very large hill with obelisque/ monument all buildings are 'real' and are from lost villages or nearby. Likewise artefacts. Sometimes id's are changed (or one chosen from long line) of names/functions. Sometimes names (e.g. Bellamy's Mill) are made up but all else is 'real' even shop is real and has label over the door but is, in essence, outside of site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Viking Houses at Moesgard Museum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>Moesgard, Denmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MANDATE/STORY LINE</td>
<td>Display of 3 Viking Houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME PERIOD/SPAN PORTRAYED</td>
<td>Viking Period (870 AD and 900 AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE (INSTITUTION) HISTORY</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATURE OF SITE</td>
<td>three recreated buildings plus some landscape features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF DEFINITION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVAILABILITY OF GUIDE</td>
<td>pamphlet available at museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOOKS, VIDEO AND MAPS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BOUNDARIES:**
- External Boundaries: marked by a wood, rail fence
- Defined/Distinct Areas: N/A although there are recreated (in miniature) field systems at one side of site
- Internal Boundaries: see above
- Visitor Centre: No visitor centre
- Entrance: via opening in fence, part of museum grounds
- Access to Site after hours: unknown
- Sight Lines: view to surrounding countryside and to the museum grounds (park, play ground etc)
- Location: rural Denmark near a suburb of Arhus
- Physical Landscape: 3 'new' buildings, landscape features (including miniature field systems

**COHESION**
- Attempt to create 'whole' environment: archery target, firepit, plantings and fields all add to sense of fullness
- Signage: none
- Access to structures: limited, only church is open
- Outdoor Activities/movement: none at time of site visit

**VISIBILITY**
- Inside/Outside: church limited interior interpretation
- Amenities: in museum
- Toilets/Bins/Health and Safety: in museum, no bins
- Construction/Renovation/Restoration: n/a

**OTHER NOTES**: What does museum see site as? Site or display??
APPENDIX 2
Interviews: Citations and Summaries

Introduction

This appendix will consist of two sections: a bibliographic listing of the interviews that were conducted as part of the background research for this dissertation, followed by a summary of those interviews. The latter section will also include an example of one of the questionnaires used as a basis for the interviews. Due to the nature of the sites (i.e., some sites were reconstructed, others relocated and still others were recreated) not all the questions were appropriate for all sites. In most cases, additional questions arose during the course of the interview. These were noted down and remain on file with the author.

When reading the interviews it must be understood that this summary in no way represents the whole interview nor does it reflect the many subjects and opinions contained therein. Further, as a summary, it is very much a product of the author and it is critical to remember this fact. The summaries are presented simply as a very brief glimpse at some of the major themes or points that emerged out of the interview.

The interviews were conducted as a means of establishing a “background” to the visitor experience at the site. Along with the published materials (guidebooks, maps and other forms of media) they were used by the author to help develop a context and to begin to gain an understanding of how people who worked in the museum perceived that site. The inclusion of these interviews in this appendix does not mean that this source of information has primacy over any of the other material produced by the site.

All interviews, unless otherwise noted, took place in offices or boardrooms. In some instances, the more formal sessions were followed by informal conversations that took place as we toured the site museum(s), resource buildings or other areas of the site. None of the interviews was taped; notes were kept and later transcribed by the author.

Interviews

Benn, Carl. Chief Curator, Heritage Toronto, Toronto, Ontario. 21 September 2001

Blent, Karin. Curator, Social History Department, Skansen, Stockholm. 16 July 2003

Brent, M. (Manager) and L. O'Byrne. (Curator), Black Creek Pioneer Village, Toronto, Ontario. 14 August 2001
Brown III, Marley R. Director of Archaeological Research, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia. 16 September 2003

Carson, Cary. Vice-President, Research, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia. 16 September 2002

Carter, Genevieve. Curator, Ste Marie Among the Hurons Midland, Ontario. 22 August 2002

Cazaly, Peter. Interpretive Training and Research Officer, Upper Canada Village, Morrisburg, Ontario. 28 August 2002

Chappell, E.A. Director of Architectural Research, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia. 27 November 2002 (by phone)

Dix-Wilson, Tracey. Curator, Blists Hill, Ironbridge Gorge Trust Museums, Telford, Shropshire. 10 November 2002


Hoover, Terry (Curator) and Laura Mancini (Supervisor of Public Services, Benson Ford Research Center). Henry Ford Museum and Greenfield Village, Benson Ford Research Centre Dearborn, Michigan. 6 & 7 September 2002 (informal conversation)

Kjær, Brigitte (see Ravn, Thomas Bloch)

Mancini, Laura (see Hoover, Terry)

Myer, Nil (see Ravn, Thomas Bloch)

O’Byrne, L. (see Brent, M)

Ravn, Thomas Bloch (Director), Brigitte Kjær (Curator) and Nil Myer (Architect). Den Gamle By, Århus. 10 April 2001

Spittal, David. Archaeologist, Historic Fort York, Toronto, Ontario. 4 September 2001

Stephenson-Jackman, Mark. Programme Interpreter, Todmorden Mills Heritage and Arts Centre, Toronto, Ontario. 15 August 2001

Vyvyan, Rosemary. Heritage Operations Manager, Ste Marie Among the Hurons, Midland, Ontario. 22 August 2002
Brown III, Marley R. Director of Archaeological Research, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia. 16 September 2003

Carson, Cary. Vice-President, Research, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia. 16 September 2002

Carter, Genevieve. Curator, Ste Marie Among the Hurons Midland, Ontario. 22 August 2002

Cazaly, Peter. Interpretive Training and Research Officer, Upper Canada Village, Morrisburg. Ontario 28 August 2002

Chappell, E.A. Director of Architectural Research, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia. 27 November 2002 (by phone)

Dix-Wilson, Tracey. Curator, Blists Hill, Ironbridge Gorge Trust Museums, Telford, Shropshire. 10 November 2002


Hoover, Terry (Curator) and Laura Mancini (Supervisor of Public Services, Benson Ford Research Center). Henry Ford Museum and Greenfield Village, Benson Ford Research Centre Dearborn, Michigan. 6 & 7 September 2002 (informal conversation)

Kjær, Brigitte (see Ravn, Thomas Bloch)

Mancini, Laura (see Hoover, Terry)

Myer, Nil (see Ravn, Thomas Bloch)

O'Byrne, L. (see Brent, M)

Ravn, Thomas Bloch (Director), Brigitte Kjær (Curator) and Nil Myer (Architect). Den Gamle By, Århus. 10 April 2001

Spittal, David. Archaeologist, Historic Fort York, Toronto, Ontario. 4 September 2001

Stephenson-Jackman, Mark. Programme Interpreter, Todmorden Mills Heritage and Arts Centre, Toronto, Ontario. 15 August 2001

Vyvyan, Rosemary. Heritage Operations Manager, Ste Marie Among the Hurons, Midland, Ontario. 22 August 2002
Many of the discussions (within the interview) were located in the context of "the public" and their use, reactions to, and interactions with the site. In terms of change (to the site) the public "moves things forward" and the museums "feeds to" the public. The act of remembering is part of the success of the site and is a measure of what people think of the museum. The reminiscences provide a source of "constant assessment" for the site. Woolley defines the site and its limits in terms of what is and is not visible to visitors: the resource centre is "off site" whilst Pockerley Manor is "on site". There is no clear indication of where Home Farm sits but Woolley does note that it is the "least visited aspect". The physical limits of the site are "very clear". There is a buffer zone (made up of trees and considerable property) around the "theatrical landscape" of the site. Visitors have trouble discerning the site and often ask "where's the museum?". This is because people "don't understand the limits" (Woolley). Accuracy is an overarching theme—"in context". The site is "definitely a landscape" and "gives a different feel, a different essence". This is an important selling point for the museum. Woolley distinguishes Beamish from in-situ sites and implies that such sites are constrained whereas created sites [such as Beamish] have scope for creativity.

SITE: Benares Historic House Museum Mississauga, Canada
DATE: 20 December 2001
LOCATION: Benares House (Visitor Centre)
PARTICIPANTS: Annemarie Hagan (Museum Manager)
DURATION: N/A
NOTES:
SUMMARY:

This museum is new to Mississauga (since early 1990s). The city was "reluctant" to take over from Provincial owner due to the "Anne of Green Gables factor" [n.b. an iconic fictional Canadian character] but has owned/operated the house since circa 1996. The site has been interpreted to the World War I period—mostly to complement other museums in Mississauga. The central focus is on the house but is located within the context of the 6 extant acres and the original 300 acre holdings. Only six acres are left: the remaining area has been developed residentially since the 1950s. There is, and was, a very strong connection and interest amongst the neighbours and, as such, the house and property were "prominent". For people outside this area, the house "didn't exist in anyone's map of Mississauga". The Visitor Centre was constructed to "front" but "not block" the property. Hagan sees this as an "opening up" of the property. Initially neighbours were not enthused by the idea but are now "very supportive". The interpretation is centred on the house, although seasonally it will move outdoors. Most outbuildings are closed and/or are for storage but activities do take place in grounds. Hagan sees the site as a cohesive unit with the house taking prominence. For Hagan the site limits take in original (300 acre) holdings and she says that visitors "get a sense" of these limits. Hagan also defines the limits in terms of "the quality of the experience" and in this case there are "no limits". Benares is a landscape; it offers "a bridge between urban and rural, between past and present". The site is distinguished by its "integrity" (i.e., the quality of "real") thus, adding new (reconstructed) buildings would need to be reconciled with that latter quality.

SITE: Black Creek Pioneer Village, Toronto, Canada
DATE: 14 August 2001
LOCATION: Black Creek Pioneer Village
PARTICIPANTS: Marty Brent (Manager)
               Lorraine O'Byrne (Curator)
DURATION: 9:45-11:45 AM
NOTES: N/A

SUMMARY:

The museum developed out a "pioneer museum" of agricultural history. Buildings are chosen to fit "visual interpretative" rather than just "saving buildings to save buildings" (Brent). Both staff define the site limits in terms of the four bounding (modern) streets. There is an effort to make the site feel "real". Ongoing construction is not viewed as intrusive and Brent feels that it would be "devastating" to visitors to know that site is in a state of disrepair. Efforts are made to reproduce the landscape of the nineteenth-century village but age of site means that this does not always work well. For example, trees that were correct when site was created [in 1960s] are now too big. The goal of site is "historical accuracy and preservation in a fun way" (O'Byrne). Brent notes that can't have one without other and both are related to revenue
SUMMARY:

This museum is new to Mississauga (since early 1990s). The city was "reluctant" to take over from Provincial owner due to the "Anne of Green Gables factor" [n.b. an iconic fictional Canadian character] but has owned/operated the house since circa 1996. The site has been interpreted to the World War I period—mostly to complement other museums in Mississauga. The central focus is on the house but is located within the context of the 6 extant acres and the original 300 acre holdings. Only six acres are left: the remaining area has been developed residentially since the 1950s. There is, and was, a very strong connection and interest amongst the neighbours and, as such, the house and property were "prominent". For people outside this area, the house "didn't exist in anyone's map of Mississauga". The Visitor Centre was constructed to "front" but "not block" the property. Hagan sees this as an "opening up" of the property. Initially neighbours were not enthused by the idea but are now "very supportive". The interpretation is centred on the house, although seasonally it will move outdoors. Most outbuildings are closed and/or are for storage but activities do take place in grounds. Hagan sees the site as a cohesive unit with the house taking prominence. For Hagan the site limits take in original (300 acre) holdings and she says that visitors "get a sense" of these limits. Hagan also defines the limits in terms of "the quality of the experience" and in this case there are "no limits". Benares is a landscape; it offers "a bridge between urban and rural, between past and present". The site is distinguished by its "integrity" (i.e., the quality of "real") thus, adding new (reconstructed) buildings would need to be reconciled with that latter quality.

SITE: Black Creek Pioneer Village, Toronto, Canada
DATE: 14 August 2001
LOCATION: Black Creek Pioneer Village
PARTICIPANTS: Marty Brent (Manager)
Lorraine O'Byrne (Curator)
DURATION: 9:45-11:45 AM
NOTES: N/A

SUMMARY:

The museum developed out a "pioneer museum" of agricultural history. Buildings are chosen to fit "visual interpretative" rather than just "saving buildings to save buildings" (Brent). Both staff define the site limits in terms of the four bounding (modern) streets. There is an effort to make the site feel "real". Ongoing construction is not viewed as intrusive and Brent feels that it would be "devastating" to visitors to know that site is in a state of disrepair. Efforts are made to reproduce the landscape of the nineteenth-century village but age of site means that this does not always work well. For example, trees that were correct when site was created [in 1960s] are now too big. The goal of site is "historical accuracy and preservation in a fun way" (O'Byrne). Brent notes that can't have one without other and both are related to revenue
O'Byrne defines presentation and preservation "like a husband and wife—neither is more important". Authenticity is important: you "need it in order to provide an environment that's different from everyone else". The site portrays a typical village not a specific place. Buildings at the site are from local area and have a "remembered identity" (Brent). The goal is to make "[village] look as unchanged as possible to the public so they can leave with an immense amount of satisfaction". Black Creek is very much a landscape and O'Byrne characterises it as "an interpretative whole. If you don't have streets, boardwalks, gardens and creeks as a whole then you don't have an environment.". Brent says that the site bounded by trees making visitors "less aware" of the city.

SITE: Blists Hill Victorian Town (Ironbridge Gorge Museums Trust), Shropshire, England
DATE: 10 November 2001
LOCATION: Blists Hill
PARTICIPANTS: Tracey Dix-Wilson (Curator)
DURATION: 11:00-12:05
NOTES: N/A

SUMMARY:

The site developed out of the creation of Telford New Town in 1960s. It has been listed as a World Heritage Site since 1986. Volunteers were heavily involved with the site in the early period. Extant (structural) elements on-site formed "a perfect horseshoe" and subsequently there has been a concerted effort not to build on original site of Madely Wood Company and Blast Furnaces. Dix-Wilson describes the early site as a "sculpture park" where there was no "tying together". Blists Hill has complex relationship with other eight IBGMT sites and needs to be "all things to all people". Some "purist" curators in the Trust see Blists Hill as "reconstruction" [i.e., negatively], others see it as a "theme park". Those who are "here" [i.e., work there] have a "natural feeling" about what Blists Hill is but Dix-Wilson also notes that you "wander thought lots of Ironbridge Gorge without knowing". One cannot see the limits of the site, says Dix-Wilson. The idea of naturalness or a "real" site is apparently very important. Presentation "wins" over preservation and the latter comes about as natural result of the restoration (Dix-Wilson). Site is "as accurate as can be" and the museum tries to use "real" artefacts in a "real setting" as much as possible. Blists Hill is a landscape primarily because "there is an awful lot of original landscape". It is a preserved oasis of green and rural (as it was in past). The site fits into the larger landscape.

SITE: Colonial Williamsburg, Williamsburg, Virginia
DATE: 16 September 2002
LOCATION: Colonial Williamsburg
PARTICIPANTS: Marley R Brown III (Director of Archaeological Research)
DURATION: 11:30-12:30 PM
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Brown notes that Colonial Williamsburg is not the same as "ordinary" historic restorations because of the dual obligation to preserve the eighteenth-century past as well as preserving the legacy of Rockefeller and Goodwin's vision of the past. Preservation leads on the physical remains but the emphasis is on presentation (with constraints). Boundaries are also heavily influenced by Nicholson's 18th century street plan and some limits are linked to the "radial roads" to Jamestown and the development away from core. The site limits tend to be reflected in those of the Historic Area. Brown acknowledges a buffer zone around Historic Area and defines it as both visual and commercial. Accuracy is an overarching theme and is reflected in the way the place looks, in dress, in deportment, in terms of what is imparted about daily life. He notes that there is a lot of "facadism" and that the exteriors might be more important than the interiors. The museum is "scrupulous" about exteriors. In some ways the Historic Area (i.e., the site) is connected with the larger environment although it is now surrounded by something "so awful... that it's almost painful". Colonial Williamsburg is a landscape and achieves an "aesthetic at the level of landscape".

**SITE:** Colonial Williamsburg, Williamsburg, Virginia  
**DATE:** 16 September 2002  
**LOCATION:** Colonial Williamsburg  
**PARTICIPANTS:** Cary Carson (Vice President, Research)  
**DURATION:** 3:20-4:30 PM  
**NOTES:** One of three interviews (c.f. M Brown, above and E Chappell, below). Some interviews include discussion of the Carter's Grove. Carson declined to answer the background questions as he said that the interviewer "already knew the answers" 

**SUMMARY:**

Carson dates the beginnings of the site to the first moments when people began "memorialising" the place—for him this is the placing of the Botetourt Statue (at the College) in the nineteenth century. He describes the limits as changing "numerous times" and particularly in terms of where the "locus of importance" is. Carson defines the Historic Area boundaries as roughly those of the site but notes that besides the physical boundaries (described as within "walking distance") there are also boundaries of change measured by "whatever is defined as the eighteenth-century community". The Visitor Centre sits without the site boundaries. When discussing reconstruction versus original Carson notes that visitors know that "it's an original place not a Skansen". Further, he defines Colonial Williamsburg as "theatre essentially" with the buildings as sets. Colonial Williamsburg is "much more" about
presentation. "It's not about preserving to preserve—this is a theatre"; thus, if they don't sell tickets there is "no point". However, preservation has a role and Williamsburg would "cease to be if we sold it off with ease". "It goes without saying" that they try to strive for accuracy and authenticity but it is more of an issue of "getting the footnotes right". Colonial Williamsburg is a landscape: "We create to the best of our knowledge to resemble an eighteenth-century landscape with the obvious concessions to modernity and that we are a museum rather than a living town". The site works "profoundly" as a landscape to convince visitors (through a 3-D visual) that they can believe the non-visual things they hear.

SITE: Colonial Williamsburg, Williamsburg, Virginia
DATE: 27 November 2002
LOCATION: Conducted by phone from Cambridge, England to Williamsburg, Virginia
PARTICIPANTS: Edward A Chappell (Director of Architectural Research)
DURATION: 4:05-5:48 PM (GMT)
NOTES: One of three interviews (c.f. M Brown and C Carson, above). Some interviews include discussion of Carter's Grove. The Chappell interview took place after the site was closed, the other two interviews before.

SUMMARY:

Like Carson, Chappell dates the beginnings of the site to pre-Rockefeller/Godwin period. It was "one of those places..." where there was a high degree of antiquarian interest in the mid-nineteenth century. The Rockefeller involvement has meant that "the flame was turned up". The current appearance has been affected by changing aesthetics (throughout the twentieth century), influenced by architecture and often represents a "classical" or baroque plan. The site has been envisioned from "the get-go" as a "whole landscape" or a "complex"—it was not just about the buildings, it was also about the walking between them. Chappell identifies a buffer zone which takes in Merchant's Square, Duke of Gloucester Street and "15 minutes in most directions with varying degrees of effectiveness". For him, the boundaries can be within the "new" [i.e., largely the Historic Area as seen on the map] but also the "traditional". Chappell "embraces" the latter. Ideally, the Foundation should cultivate the site as an eighteenth-century portrait that is as visually, socially and racially complete as it can be. Chappell sees the pastures as important elements of the boundaries and is different to sites that use "berms with evergreens" to block view. Here, you can "see" boundaries. Chappell feels it is important to have a sense of the town as "open" rather than tightly surrounded. The site has a "bunch" of entrances and the visitor experience is "random" rather than lead; this is good as it makes it more like a "real" place and in high contrast to a theme park where movement is highly controlled. Accuracy is an overarching factor but there are "hugely divergent" views among staff. Preservation and presentation are both equal but at a "basic level" must get to preservation. "Obviously" Colonial Williamsburg is a
landscape, it is what “ties the site together” and is not a series of separate, discrete buildings or sites.

SITE: Den Gamle By, Århus Denmark
DATE: 10 April 2001
LOCATION: Den Gamle By
PARTICIPANTS: Thomas Bloch Ravn (Museum Director)
               Birgitte Kjær (Chief Curator)
               Nils Myer (Chief Architect)
DURATION: Additional site tour/discussion took place with Nils Myer following the main interview. The tour focussed on the interior of the Mint Masters house and a discussion of the conservation/ restoration of the structure.
NOTES:  
SUMMARY:

The site grew out of Peter Holm’s vision and his interest in the urban history movement in Denmark. Ravn thinks of site in two terms: “totality” (walking into an environment) and “Chinese box” (lots of different museums). His vision of the museum is that one “walks into” the past. Separates firmly between the Tivoli, noting that if people thought Den Gamle By was “entertaining” it would lose “the unique quality of the museum”. “Authenticity is very important here and is identified as one of the draws (Ravn). Both Ravn and Myer envision the site as a landscape: Myer sees that the site “follows” the natural landscape and is created “in harmony” with it. Kjær sees continuity between interior and exterior spaces and notes that “the streets are rooms too”.

SITE: Historic Fort York, Toronto, Canada.
DATE: 21 September 2001
LOCATION: Head Office, City of Toronto Culture Division—Museums and Heritage
PARTICIPANTS: Carl Benn (Chief Curator)
DURATION: N/A
NOTES: One of two interviews (c.f., D Spittal below)
SUMMARY:

Benn details the history of the site and the considerable preservation movement that has grown up around it. He notes that the “historic environment” in “most cases” exists only in remnant form. The modern site of Fort York is “historically rich but visually thin”. Benn suggests that the site probably remained “isolated” between circa 1880s [after it was abandoned as a garrison] and the 1980s when the “replacement” of industrial Toronto began. In terms of the boundaries Benn sees several definitions including (a) the “basic seven or nine acres within the iron fence that equals the “historic defence perimeter”” (b) the Fort as part of the Conservation District (a legal boundary) and (c) in a broader defence context with other military sites in city.
For Benn it is the first definition that is key but he also acknowledges the web of relationships it has with other areas/sites/structures. At the time of the interview a plan was in place for a Heritage Park (probably as part of proposed development towards Toronto’s 2008 Olympic bid). Re: preservation versus presentation he is emphatic and definite that it is preservation which is most important. The object is to be “as accurate as possible”. When asked if the site is a landscape the response was “of course. It’s a dynamic and subject to change over 200 years. Evolution of landscape is the important story.”. Expanding this question to include the other City of Toronto sites, Benn describes three [authors note: all possess extensive grounds] as landscapes, another site [an historic house museum] is also a landscape, although its “historical place in the city” has been obliterated. Together, he feels, that all of the sites fail to form a landscape—they are too disparate and too disconnected to form a museological landscape.

SITE: Historic Fort York, Toronto, Canada.
DATE: 4 September 2001
LOCATION: Fort York
PARTICIPANTS: David A Spittal (Archaeologist)
DURATION: 
NOTES: One of two interviews (c.f. C Benn above)

SUMMARY:

The site, for Spittal, is defined by “the ethics in reconstruction”. Locates it (a) geographically with Garrison Creek [now underground], (b) defined via the modern industrial landscape and (c) with a new landscape of refurbishment and development within the city. The last, he notes, is associated with an increased need to define the boundaries. In terms of the site, Spittal sees the boundaries as “a very thick line on a map” and occupies a very discrete area on that map. For him the [physical?] site is “the walls, parapets and garrisons”. Everything else is “buried and gone....the places exist, the sites don’t”. There is a concern, with the reconstructed buildings, that when they reconstruct although they have “shown good faith” with the archaeology, each time one of these new buildings is built, they replace the “in-ground real” with “fake” at the expense of the real. The interview included considerable discussion of archaeology and the role of restoration within the fort. In terms of preservation, Spittal feels that the first and most important job is preservation—“even if it [the site] languished unvisited”. In his mind, the exterior and interiors have different values and there is a “powerful urge” for the museum to make structures “fit the cultural and historical landscape”. For Spittal, the question of accuracy is so important that he feels that if one is not willing to hold strictly to principles then one “need not do it at all”. The site in his mind is “an historical and cultural landscape” When he sees the fort he sees “a quiet, almost rustic view, an underdeveloped landscape that sits comfortably within its environment” Soon this will be replaced by a “park-like setting”. The landscape is not just the site itself but also the site within the landscape—even thought it is presently hard to see.
Carter sees the site mandate to present the early history of Canada (very focused on the Native/French interaction). She sees the site as its own environment and that it is “separate” to anything around it. Carter considers that preservation and presentation operate together: “can’t have one without the other”. The site “tries to be as accurate as possible” but the lack of “scholarship” presents a problem. She also notes that a “great adherence to accuracy is not good tourism”. Ste Marie is largely confined within the walls of the palisade and “in a way” is tied to the [Wye] Marsh. Carter appreciates the fact that visitors “leave the museum” and have to walk to the Visitor Centre—“you sort of forget where you came from”. Carter says that visitors to site “don’t care about current research themes—they just want to see the axes” and “you never get academics at historic sites”. Carter discussed Wilfred Jury’s [an early archaeologist at Ste Marie] vision of the site and his influence on traffic patterns and locating buildings.

The site has “never [been] lost from memory...they always knew”. The ruins have always been visible. Archaeology has been carried on (on and off) since 1940s and is ongoing. The reconstruction of the site is based upon archaeological work and is very much the vision of Wilfred Jury. There is great emphasis on the quality of “real” at site and lack of signs etc are cited. However, fenced off fireplace foundations and walls that do not follow this philosophy of display are valued highly by Vyvyan who cites them as some of the earliest stonework in the New World. “Realness” is evoked by Vyvyan: “there is the intrinsic value of standing where Brebeuf did, the same stars are in the sky”. The Visitor Centre is a “filter”. She is very emphatic that
preservation is first, though admits that this may depend on what Ministry they are under at various times. The site boundaries are defined by the palisade that is, in turn, “blocked in” by the marsh, the river and the road. Ste Marie “fits” within the larger environment. However, Vyvyan notes that the Martyr’s Shrine is “quite distant” and suggests that the link between Ste Marie and the Shrine is not close. However, email correspondence from Vyvyan (February 2004) reveals the area in the Chapel enclosing Martyr's “grave” has direct access to Shrine under agreement with the Society of Jesus of Upper Canada.

SITE: Skansen, Sweden, Stockholm
DATE: 15 July 2003
LOCATION: Skansen
PARTICIPANTS: Karin Blent (Curator, Social History Department)
DURATION: 10:15-11:00 AM
NOTES: One of two interviews (c.f. M Wikander below)

SUMMARY:
The site was set up with buildings from all parts of Sweden and, to some extent, this continues to the present day. This, says Blent, is what is “so fantastic” about Skansen. Arthur Hazelius’ original goal was to preserve ways of life that had been abandoned. There is no particular period adhered to although there are not any structures from the twentieth century on site. The site began as a “picturesque” representation of the past but now is “more regional”. From the outset, copies (of structures) have been part of the site—“ideally” these are constructed using traditional materials and methods. Eventually, says Blent, the site will become full but the individual areas are being treated differently: for example, in the country side areas the strategy is more a case of filling in of holes [i.e., physical spaces], whereas in the Town Quarter area there is a consideration of the different types of structures which may be added or altered to enhance the interpretation. At the moment, change has a reduced role and the site is “static” which is, says Blent, a point of discussion. In terms of preservation versus presentation, Blent says that it is “hard” as they “want to be correct but also want visitors”. In the end, it is presentation that is the more important. Blent defines the site limits as the legal landholdings and “as on the maps”. She considers Skansen as fitting “very well” into its surroundings.

SITE: Skansen, Sweden, Stockholm
DATE: 16 July 2003
LOCATION: Skansen
PARTICIPANTS: Marita Wikander (Director of Public Relations and Marketing)
DURATION: 11:10 AM--
NOTES: One of two interviews conducted at site (c.f. Blent above). Interview began in office and continued informally over lunch at outdoor site restaurant
SUMMARY:

Skansen was created in a “nationalist” perspective (embracing “nation building”) and portrays an “ideal” Swedish history and landscape. The site was founded on the ideas of “rich landscape, rich dress, big tradition”. Because Swedish society is more diversified some of the traditions of “new” Swedes now have been incorporated into the museum—something that would not have been so in the early days. There are issues with portraying and welcoming new (immigrant) cultures as well as representing the indigenous (Sami) people. The picture presented by the museum is somewhat “false” and the differences between “past and present” are not emphasised. However, “more modern” issues now are starting to be portrayed. Skansen is an “ideological”, folk icon figuring prominently in Swedish literature—many Stockholmers would not consider site as “a museum”. Wikander quotes Ulf Lundell [a pop singer] that Skansen is “paradise” and “you can go there”. It is a park, a zoological garden and a place for concerts and dances. The museum, in turn, does not want to make visit a “didactic experience”. Wikander characterises the guidebooks as for “serious” visitors and interpreters (in structures) can offer “real” information. The map offers suggested routes but Wikander indicates that there is a high degree of familiarity with site and that the map is a “compromise” for tourists. The Town Quarter, the brown bears (in the zoo) and the animals, overall, are the most visited. The limits of the site are defined by Wikander as the legal boundaries; however, she suspects that visitors only see the centre (i.e., the area around the top of the hill). It is, she says, easy to see Skansen as a “façade” and “simple” but you need to “work at it” and “go deeper".
SITE: Todmorden Mills Heritage Museum and Arts Centre, Toronto, Canada
DATE: 15 August 2001
LOCATION: Todmorden Mills
PARTICIPANTS: Mark Stephenson-Jackman (Programme Interpreter)
DURATION: 10:00-11:45 AM Site Tour 12:00-1:15 PM
NOTES: Interview was conducted in Stephenson-Jackman’s office and was followed by a site tour.

SUMMARY:
At the time of the interview, Todmorden Mills and other “borough” museums had recently come under the City of Toronto during the amalgamation of several suburbs into the city government. The site has been in continuous use throughout time and was designated as a “heritage park” in 1964. The mill itself (and in-situ structures) represent the “first industrial site” in Toronto. It is “technically connected” to the Don Valley Brickworks [a 19th century site separated by a river and a motorway]. The site mandate is to preserve and to present the industrial story of Toronto. Re: the relocated railway station, Stephenson-Jackman thinks it appropriate that it is there as “it is more important to have historical tie-in versus ‘real’”. He notes that his boss thinks otherwise. The arts centre was part of the original site plan (in 1960s) and continues as part of a multi-use site. Stephenson-Jackman acknowledges several kinds of boundaries (to the site) including “a boundary of people”. This is defined as people not knowing the site is there; however, programming is able to broaden these boundaries.

SITE: Upper Canada Village, Morrisburg, Canada
DATE: 28 August 2002
LOCATION: Upper Canada Village
PARTICIPANTS: Peter Cazaly (Interpretive Training and Research Officer)
DURATION: 11-12:15 PM
NOTES:

SUMMARY:
The site developed out of the movement to relocate houses and individuals after flooding for St Lawrence Seaway and was designed as part of a “Heritage Park”. It now portrays a typical, riverfront community of the 1860s. It is located within Dundas County but is a “mythical city that never existed”. Cazaly defines presentation as the “current goal by all means”. This contrasts with the 1950s when it was a “display” museum. Cazaly defines the boundaries as those established by Parks Commission [see map] which are “untouchable. There was a remit from the outset that nothing should interfere audibly, visually or interpretatively, making certain the “illusion is protected”. The buildings were originally placed zonally or decoratively and the site itself

310
is centred around a common green lay out borrowed from New England villages. It is now hard to change identity of the buildings are there are living people who are very familiar with structures. Cazaly notes that the site is, for some, associated with grief and trauma (of the relocation and loss of house). There is no visitor centre at site. Ideally, the site would like one to act as a “walk-through” to get to the village—it would be a “tunnel of time”. In terms of boundaries, the site is delineated both physically and naturally (including sheep pastures, berms, and vegetation) and also by the Seaway. However, interior boundaries are also delimited by the fencing styles (over 25) found within site. Cazaly sees the site as a landscape—“it is not just a collection of buildings it’s how you go from one to another”. The “nature of the illusion [at Upper Canada Village] is that one is walking into another world.”.
Example of Questionnaire

Questions: Ste Marie Among the Hurons

1. Tell me about origins of site.
   (a) how old is site?
   (b) who and how was the idea developed?
   (c) who owned it, owns it now? Is it private or public?
   (d) funding?

2. What is mandate of site?
   (a) what is site being presented as?
   (b) How many stories—what is prime story
   (c) is primary goal preservation or presentation?

3. What time period are you portraying and how closely does one adhere to that?
   Issue of site cohesiveness

4. What was here before prior to the development of the site?
   was site 
   (a) empty
   (b) full—if so what was it and where did old go?

5. If something here before; how does site “fit”?
   (a) what percentage of site represented?
   (b) what determined(s) boundaries?

6. What was original idea behind site? Is it still being adhered to?

7. How is the site defined? Is it part of the larger surroundings?

8. What percent of the original site is represented here

9. How were these limits decided upon—who owns surrounding?

10. How much signage do you have within the site? What is role (purpose) of signage? Why? What was decision-making process that resulted in this mode of presentation? Does this help cohesion

11. Do you see change as an important force in this site…does it take place?

12. Is there any change at the site or is it static?

13. When change occurs what level does it most commonly happen?
   Site/building/room/artefact/

14. What is catalyst for change? Repairs/Maintenance; accuracy; availability?
   What role does archaeology play in the major changes?

15. What about changes within buildings—does this occur at all?

16. How do you decide what goes in a building—especially when it is something that is not what it was

17. Are new buildings/site brought into the site?

18. How are additions assimilated?

19. Will you add any more—if not why not?
   Are there any more buildings planned?
   What about “filling in holes” syndrome?

20. How many buildings when opened. When did last one come into the fold?

21. Do some buildings have greater status? If so, why (age,archaeological merit, date of entry into site, location within site)? Do visitors see some buildings with greater or lesser status?

22. Are some buildings valued over others? Is this conveyed to visitors? How? Why?
23. Is everything is reconstructed—is everything based on archaeological data?
   —is there anything “real”?  
24. Is there anything “not real”? Would you consider creating a building in order fill in spaces or missing elements?  
25. What is earmarked for the future?  
26. What do people come to see?  
   Do they worry about change?  
   How is change presented?  
   How is change accepted?  
25. How do visitors understand the site?  
25. Visitors? Who are they? Where are they from?  
27. How does each person (based on jobs) see site (not physically)?  
28. What about relationship with Midland or surrounding area? Formally and informally.  
29. How important is accuracy and what role does it play in the presented story?  
30. Which is more valued—building as a whole or individual bits?  
31. Are all buildings within the fort exhibition sites? What is the process that determines exhibition building versus “museum”? What about washrooms etc?  
32. Visitor centre—what is the role?  
33. How do you  
   a) envision > movement through the site  
   b) direct  
34. Do visitors understand this?  
Do you see the site as a landscape?
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