

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Theresa E. Langford for the degree of Master of Arts in Applied Anthropology presented on May 5, 2000. Title: Diversity at Fort Vancouver National Historic Site: Processes of Diversification in Historical Interpretation, Visitor Services, and Workforce Management.

Redacted for privacy

Abstract approved: _____

Nancy Rosenberger

Issues of diversity are receiving significant attention within the National Park Service recently, due in large part to a growing awareness that its future as a relevant and viable agency is dependent upon improving its response to and management of diversity. A diversity assessment of Fort Vancouver National Historic Site was undertaken to assist the site in its diversification efforts involving three interrelated areas: historical interpretation, visitor services, and workforce management. Data from research and semiformal interviews with staff and volunteers were analyzed to identify appropriate, site-specific strategies for expanding dynamic interpretation of diverse groups within the historical context, improving the quality of visitation for diverse audiences, and more fully utilizing personnel and community organizations to strengthen the two topics outlined above. Historical interpretation is the main focus of the analysis, not only because it forms the fundamental duty of the historic site, but also because diversifying an interpretive program carries the most potential for forming emotional and intellectual connections with diverse visitors, thus increasing participation, financial security, and continued relevance.

**Diversity at Fort Vancouver National Historic Site:
Processes of Diversification in Historical Interpretation, Visitor Services, and
Workforce Management**

by

Theresa E. Langford

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

**in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of**

Master of Arts

**Presented May 5, 2000
Commencement June 2000**

Master of Arts thesis of Theresa E. Langford presented on May 5, 2000

APPROVED:

Redacted for privacy

Major Professor, representing Applied Anthropology

Redacted for privacy

Chair of Department of Anthropology

Redacted for privacy

Dean of Graduate School

I understand that my thesis will become part of the permanent collection of Oregon State University libraries. My signature below authorizes release of my thesis to any reader upon request.

Redacted for privacy

Theresa E. Langford, Author

Acknowledgements

Many thanks go to the staff and volunteers at Fort Vancouver National Historic Site who participated in interviews or informal talks for this project, without whom this thesis would still be a succession of blank pages. Names will not be included for the sake of anonymity, but I sincerely hope no one will feel that their contribution has been overlooked or neglected. I appreciate the enthusiasm and candidness that my questions most often Redacted for privacy

former Superintendent Tony Sisto for, to put it quite simply, allowing this project to happen.

The assistance and suggestions of my committee have been invaluable, and I thank them for their support throughout graduate school and beyond: Dr. Nancy Rosenberger, Dr. Sunil Khanna, and Dr. Laura Rice.

Heartfelt gratitude to my family, and especially to Scott, for the road was made possible.

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction.....	1
History of Fort Vancouver National Historic Site.....	3
A History of the Origins of Fort Vancouver	3
Population Diversity of the Fur Trade.....	8
Population Diversity of Fort Vancouver and its Environs	13
Fort Vancouver as a National Historic Site	18
Establishment Within the National Park System	18
Methods of Historical Interpretation	22
Visitor Population at Fort Vancouver National Historic Site.....	24
Diversity in the National Park Service	27
Diversity Assessment.....	32
Project Description and Methodology.....	33
The Inclusion of Historical Interpretation	37
Historical Interpretation.....	39
The Paradox of Interpretation and the Use of Multiple Perspectives.....	39
Differentials in the Historical and Archaeological Records.....	42
Living History and Rights to Cultural Perspectives.....	47
Visitor Services.....	50
Visitor Services at Fort Vancouver National Historic Site	50
Services for Diverse Visitor Populations	53
Workforce Management	59

Table of Contents (Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
Responses to Diversity Promotion Programs	59
Workforce Management.....	65
Review of Literature on Diversification in the National Park System	68
Literature on Diversification of Visitor Populations and Workforce.....	68
Literature on Diversification of Historical Interpretation	80
Comparison with Fort Vancouver National Historic Site	89
Theoretical Foundations of Differentials in Historical Interpretation	92
European Philosophies of Power in the 19 th Century.....	94
The Great Exhibitions and the Meaning of Reality.....	98
The “Colonization” of History	99
Recommendations for Diversification at Fort Vancouver.....	102
General Recommendations.....	102
Historical Interpretation Recommendations.....	103
Visitor Services Recommendations.....	104
Workforce Management Recommendations.....	104
Bibliography	105
Appendix	109

List of Tables

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Fort Vancouver visitor population distribution by a) place of residence; b) age; c)gender.....	25
2. Five-year hiring history of Fort Vancouver National Historic Site (data through Spring of 1999).....	61

Diversity at Fort Vancouver National Historic Site: Processes of Diversification in Historical Interpretation, Visitor Services, and Workforce Management

Introduction

This thesis is the culmination of data derived from an internship for the National Park Service at Fort Vancouver National Historic Site in Vancouver, Washington.

Although diversity issues have received a substantial amount of attention within the National Park Service and other federal agencies recently, very few studies have applied questions directly to varied levels of staff and volunteers at specific sites. This project investigates diversification as it relates to three areas: historical interpretation, visitor services, and workforce management. Since interpretation is one of the principal mandates of the site, the diversity assessment focuses primarily on the underrepresentation of minority perspectives in the current interpretive program, and the extent to which this bias affects endeavors in the other two areas.

The objective of this project was not only to allow the employees and volunteers at Fort Vancouver the opportunity to express their thoughts on the many diversity issues that affect their daily work, but also to supply the National Park Service with a project that investigated these issues in a very specific, local context. In the process of diversifying the agency as a whole, the detailed challenges and responses that occur at individual sites can be overlooked. The writing and distribution of this thesis, then, will serve a dual purpose: to function as an initial forum for discussion on diversity issues at

the site, and to share the results of this experiment with other sites and offices. The National Park Service has at times been criticized for failing to communicate its "best practices" throughout the agency. A report on the process of diversity awareness and improvement at Fort Vancouver, while not yet to the level of a best practice, will at least outline the struggles that may lead there.

I have been involved with activities at Fort Vancouver since 1989, either as an employee, contractor, or volunteer. I am currently a Museum Technician in the Cultural Resources division at the site. This internship was completed, with the permission of the superintendent, as a project separate from my duties as a member of the staff.

History of Fort Vancouver National Historic Site

A History of the Origins of Fort Vancouver

As to the appellation of Fort Vancouver, it is clearly a misnomer; no Fort Vancouver exists; it is merely the mercantile post of the Hudson's Bay Company. (Pierce and Winslow 1979: 62)

Captain Edward Belcher, in this quote excerpted from his account of the year 1837, alludes to period misconceptions of Fort Vancouver, due to certain connotations of what a "fort" should be, but while his blunt correction rids the place of military shadows, it relegates it to economics. Historians now describe the fort as an agricultural and administrative center, a supply depot much more than a mere trading post. The writing and reporting of history is a curious business, more dependent on popular and personal filters than on some unadulterated reality. A myriad of perceptions forms "what is" and another thousand interpretations form "what was." The modern interpretation of cultural heritage, the *raison d'être* for National Park Service national historic sites, faces the continual challenge of finding a representative version of history to tell, without being certain of where the balance between multiple perspectives should be.

For a history of Fort Vancouver, here is my version of choice:

Fort Vancouver, by the time it was established in 1825, was entering an ancient industry, a system of trading goods for furs that has been practiced at least since the Norse crossed the Atlantic almost a thousand years ago (Morrison 1999). For several hundred years, furs were prized as insulating additions to clothing or as sleeping blankets.

Eventually, the European market realized the potential of the soft underhair of beaver fur, which made some of the finest felt for manufacturing “beaver hats”, durable men’s hats that became an expensive and coveted commodity. So popular were these hats by the early seventeenth century, they became family heirlooms passed intergenerationally. The demand for beaver furs increased exponentially for many decades, and forced trapping companies to continually expand their territories. What had begun and thrived in the Eastern portions of Canada eventually spread westward, covering most of the northern part of the continent: an enormous swath from the coast, around Hudson’s Bay in the Canadian Shield, through the Athabasca drainage, across the Rocky Mountains, and eventually vertically along the Pacific Coast. This range provided the winter cold that developed thick coats on the fur-bearing animals, and the waterways that served both as habitat for the animals and as transportation avenues for the trappers.

The waterways... were almost miraculous in their range and intricacy. A trader could embark at Cumberland House [west of Lake Winnipeg] and, with no portage longer than a single day, could reach the Arctic Ocean, the Pacific, the Atlantic, or the Gulf of Mexico. (Morrison 1999: 32)

The Hudson’s Bay Company (HBC) was a London-based fur trading outfit, which in 1670 had been granted a royal charter that gave it exclusive British trapping rights over all the lands that drained into Hudson’s Bay. It’s North American headquarters were at York Factory, on the edge of the bay itself, and this placement coupled with the enforced monopoly provided a relatively secure, successful enterprise. In 1821 the Hudson’s Bay Company was forced into a coalition with the North West Company, its closest rival in a what was quickly becoming a self-destructive trapping and trading competition. This merger produced an almost unstoppable force that within a few years had spread the Hudson’s Bay Company to the Pacific Coast.

In 1825, when Fort Vancouver was first established, Great Britain and the United States were still vying for control over the areas west of the Rocky Mountains. Political jurisdiction was uncertain, and the HBC had moved quickly to take advantage of the potentially fur-rich lands from American competitors, including John Jacob Astor's Pacific Fur Company. Though both countries maintained a presence there, their ambivalence about ending a system of joint occupation reflected their doubts about profit realizations. This uncertain status was to continue for many years, and to haunt any long-term plans the HBC made for their posts in the area. At the time Dr. John McLoughlin (who would become the first Chief Factor, or head of Fort Vancouver) came to the Pacific Northwest, his headquarters were at Fort George, legally an American post as well as being on the south side of the Columbia River, a vulnerable land claim in a climate which rumoured the Columbia would be the southern boundary of British territory. McLoughlin's first assignment, as administrator of the area, was to select the site, on the north side of the river, for a new headquarters.

The headquarters would oversee the immense Columbia Department of the HBC, and control an area of 700,000 square miles (1,800,000 square kilometers) that stretched from Russian Alaska to Mexican California, and from the Rocky Mountains to the Pacific Ocean. The posts in this area were difficult to reach, by either of two options: sailing from London around Cape Horn, then to the Columbia via the Hawaiian Islands, or the yearly brigade overland from York Factory which crossed by a combination of canoe and snowshoe or horse, a journey over 2,000 miles that took three months. The two major concerns when choosing a location, then, were ease of shipping and agricultural potential. George Simpson, the Governor for the Company's North American operations, had long

supported an agricultural scheme that would enhance the self-sufficiency of the posts and decrease the cost of importing food and related products.

The new site was on the north bank of the Columbia, slightly upstream from the mouth of the Willamette River on the south bank. The fort itself, after an initial, arduous four years on a nearby bluff, would be built on a plain with easy access to the water, but just beyond the flood plain. The surrounding environment was broad areas of prairie and trees, sloping upward to dense fir forests; it was known as Jolie Prairie or Belle Vue Point because of its intense natural beauty (Erigeron 1992). McLoughlin's superiors were well pleased with the choice, not only for its situation, but most importantly for its rich pasture and amenable climate.

The Hudson's Bay Company, drawing on centuries of experience in the east of Canada, was ambitious to create and maintain a monopoly, overcoming its competitors before they had gotten enough of a toehold to draw upon the financial reserves of the Company. The HBC was accused of practicing a "fur desert" policy in many areas within their territory, especially around the Snake River; its trappers were instructed to bring in the highest possible number of furs, ignoring sustainable practices which were incorporated elsewhere, in order to leave no animals for the American companies trapping in the same area. Many creative trading practices were used when American ships were in the vicinity to maintain favored status with the Natives bringing in furs to trade. This highly ambitious scheme, to immediately outcompete all others, led the Company to establish an immense network throughout the region, eventually utilizing two dozen posts, six ships, and about 600 male employees during peak season. Fort

Vancouver was the administrative headquarters and the principal supply depot for this entire system, as well as the collection point for furs being shipped to London.

Fort Vancouver grew to become a center of intense activity and influence. Every year two supply ships (or frequently only one) would arrive with European goods for trade or internal use, and goods and raw materials from the Hawaiian Islands such as coral for mortar manufacture. Each summer after the cold season had been spent trapping, incredible amounts of furs would come in, both from organized employee brigades and from freelance European, Métis, and Native trappers. As the desire for and possibilities of increased self-sufficiency grew, so did the site's industries and practices. The agricultural enterprise expanded to cover 30 miles along the river and up to 10 miles north from the riverbanks, including grazing areas, large-scale cropping, ornamental gardens, and orchards, employing more persons than any other activity at the fort (Hussey 197-). Sawmills, gristmills, and dairies were built, both for materials for use at the fort and its subsidiary posts, and to produce a surplus to trade in the Hawaiian Islands and to supply the Russian-American Company. Many trades flourished at the post, including blacksmithing, carpentry, cooperage, and baking, expanding the physical size of the post as they did the amount of goods that could be internally supplied. A riverside complex developed on the bank of the Columbia, directly south of the employee village; here were areas for shipbuilding, a salmon store, tanneries, and a hospital built during the peak of malaria epidemics. As the post became more of a permanent presence, a separate church and schoolhouses were added.

Population Diversity of the Fur Trade

Our batteau carried as curious a muster of races and languages as perhaps had ever been congregated within the same compass in any part of the world. Our crew of ten men contained Iroquois, who spoke their own tongue; a Cree half-breed, of French origin, who appeared to have borrowed his dialect from both his parents; a North Briton, who understood only the Gaelic of his native hills; Canadians, who, of course, knew French; and Sandwich Islanders, who jabbered a medley of Chinook, English, and their own vernacular jargon. Add to all this that the passengers were natives of England, Scotland, Russia, Canada, and the Hudson's Bay Company's territories; and you have the prettiest congregation of nations, the nicest confusion of tongues, that has ever taken place since the days of the Tower of Babel. (Simpson 1847:107-108)

Governor George Simpson, the head of the Hudson's Bay Company's North American operations, was on his way to visit the Russians in Sitka when he wrote this in his journal. The ethnic and linguistic diversity that he records was the load of one boat.

Historically the fur trade, as an industry, offered opportunities to a wide range of peoples with varying degrees of ties to organized companies. The economic attraction could be great, but the trade also provided a route for those who wanted to be far from home, whether pushed by wanderlust – the fur trade was a glamorous occupation to those who were not members and this life of adventure called many an unsuspecting young man – or escaping from trouble, usually in the form of unpaid debts. Sometimes multiple generations of families joined the trade, for occupations are limited when one is raised in the land of frontier posts and sporadic communication.

Some of the officers of the Hudson's Bay Company were English or Scottish, but British persons were actually a minority at most fur trading posts, as were Europeans in general. The largest percentage of the officers and employees were from the lands in Lower Canada, roughly equivalent to modern Québec. The trappers that hailed from this

area, of French and sometimes Scottish heritage, were known as *voyageurs*, short and muscular men who were considered to be ideally physically-suited to the long hours in the canoes or on portage (Morrison 1999). Quite literally the backbone of the trade, these voyageurs were a very visible presence both out on brigade and at the forts when they returned for the annual encampment. Their chosen occupation was not a comfortable one – their rough appearance was said to reflect their lifestyle – but they often widely proclaimed their love for it. “There is no life so happy as a voyageur’s life, no place where a man enjoys so much variety and freedom” (Morrison 1999: 25). They had their own customs and code of honor, above and beyond the expectations of the Company, which were reinforced by group camaraderie. Recognizable by colorful handwoven sashes and an inexhaustable supply of *chansons*, paddling songs to keep rhythm and to help time fly, voyageurs formed the strong transportation system of the companies, moving freight and personnel across the continent.

Company policy concerning Native groups was variable for many years; the HBC had realized from the beginning that peaceful and sustained relations with Natives were required for successful and secure trading networks, and had attempted to keep to fair trading practices, interfering as little as possible in tribal affairs. A stickier question was that of European-Native alliances, which became more frequent as the amount of posts and territory increased. Official Company opinion was divided long after the alliances had become a standard practice in the field, and this is reflected in the contradictory policies, both outwardly stated and more covert, that existed. Indeed, differences existed between fur trading companies; the North West Company, before its merger with the HBC, had been one of the most openly supportive of employees choosing sustained

alliances with Native women. As the Hudson's Bay Company realized the benefits of Native wives for their employees, they began to support the practice of marriage *à la façon du pays*, or "in the fashion of the country." However, the Company policy for many years was to send retiring men back to the East, not allowing settlement which could compete with the supply of furs. The overall result was that most employees, whether officers or those of the lower ranks, took wives that were fully or partly Native, with varying degrees of commitment. Some men took multiple wives or attempted to abandon their families when they left the trade and went back east; the Company often enforced the responsibilities of the marriage and required exiting employees to provide financially for their families. Others formed faithful, lifetime unions that survived transfers and retirement from the Company; after the Company relented on the forced transportation of employees back east, it became quite common for a couple to settle in suitable areas near posts or Native reservations.

Native women seemed to adapt to the lifestyle of the voyageurs more readily than British women, and beyond providing companionship, they brought irreplaceable skills and knowledge that helped to ensure their husband's survival. They provided familial alliance with their tribe for the husband, a commodity not to be underestimated in the competitive and dangerous areas in which they trapped. While on brigade, the wives and children of voyageurs cleaned and tanned skins brought out of the traps, repaired clothing and mocassins, harvested and cooked food, and sometimes hunted or protected the camp with their husband's musket. They were as integral to the success of the brigade as were the voyageurs themselves. Native wives provided similar domestic and economic benefits to husbands of higher rank, or those that chose to stay at the post for other work.

The economic role played by Indian women in fur-trade society reflected the extent to which European traders were compelled to adapt to the native way of life. The all-encompassing work role of Indian women was transferred, in modified form, to the trading post, where their skills not only facilitated the traders' survival but actual fur-trade operations. (Van Kirk 1980: 53)

Although in the later years of the fur trade marriage with Native wives declined and more European women were brought to the New World, initially it was the most common relationship, supported by both fur trade employees and the Native families of the potential wives.

Marriage 'after the custom of the country' was an indigenous marriage rite which evolved to meet the needs of fur-trade society...It is important to emphasize that the Indians initially encouraged the formation of marriage alliances between their women and the European traders. The Indian viewed marriage in an integrated social and economic context. (Van Kirk 1980: 28)

As the amount of fur trade marriages increased, their offspring created a syncretic culture known as *Métis*, a population of mixed heritage that became one of the largest in the fur trade. Some of the children of these unions joined their mother's tribe, others followed the occupations of their fathers, becoming voyageurs, clerks or other junior officers, or wives of Company employees. For several decades Métisse wives became the spouse of choice for Company employees and other traders, yet this too declined as European values increasingly took hold in "frontier" areas. In the early years of this shift, only a few individuals, usually missionaries prompted by the rites of their religion, dared come to the posts and speak against the legitimacy of fur trade marriages. One of the most notable was the Reverend Herbert Beaver, who visited Fort Vancouver with his wife in 1836. Beaver was completely unsympathetic to the customs of fur trade society, and was especially vocal in his condemnation of those who engaged in marriages *à la*

façon du pays. Not surprisingly, this angered the influential Chief Factor McLoughlin, who himself had a Métisse wife, Marguerite, with whom he had joined in 1811.

The most bitter feud over the issue of marriage... erupted at Fort Vancouver... [Beaver] denounced Fort Vancouver as a 'deplorable scene of vice and ignorance'... [he styled] the traders' wives as concubines... chastising the men for indulging in fornication. This most insulting and unfair assessment of the well-regulated domestic situation at the fort understandably outraged fiery-tempered... McLoughlin. (Van Kirk 1980: 154-155)

Although many officers and other employees remained loyal to their Native or Métis wives and children as these shifts overtook society in the West, and experienced with them intense racism and acts of prejudice perpetuated by new generations of settlers and missionaries, the pattern of social networks had changed and the former levels of integration passed.

As the tenets of British culture took hold in the West, the traditions and practices of fur-trade society were demeaned and forgotten. The nature of the white-native unions which had once characterized fur-trade life was particularly subject to misinterpretation. Marriage *à la façon du pays* came to be regarded as something illegal and immoral... which reflected a growing antipathy in the nineteenth century toward mixed marriages... in terms of its racial ties, the early world of the fur trade became 'a world we have lost'. (Van Kirk 1980: 240-242)

Population Diversity of Fort Vancouver and its Environs

A site of the magnitude of Fort Vancouver, and one that offered economic opportunities not just in trade but in its needs for manpower as well, attracted a diversity of people like no other site. As was true for the trade overall, British men were a minority at this site, though there were some from England, Scotland, Ireland, and the Orkney and Shetland Islands. Sometimes they came from further afield: at different times the site hosted a Frenchman, a Portuguese, and three shipwrecked Japanese sailors who had been rescued from the Makah. Much of the population was from regions of Canada; the primary language at Fort Vancouver was Canadian French. In addition to the local Chinookan-speaking population, representatives from many Native tribes came with the fur trade routes and congregated around the post for trade, employment, and security. As malaria epidemics worsened, they came for medical care and surety of burial. The Catholic Church Records of baptisms, marriages, and burials (Warner and Munnick 1972), one of the primary documents for interpreting the historic population of the fort environs, records Natives from the following tribes:

Cascades	Clallam	Klickitat	Spokane
Californian	Cowlitz	Mowatwos	Tillamook
Carrier	Grande Dalles	Nisqually	Tsnoomus
Chaudieres	Iroquois	Rogue	Umpqua
Chehalis	Kalapuya	Shasta	Walla Walla
Chinook	Kholtl	Snohomish	

In addition to these groups, approximately 40% of the site's laborers were Hawaiian. As the English vessels stopped in the Sandwich Islands, now the Hawaiian Islands, to take on stores of food, water, and goods like rum and coral, Natives were offered (or sometimes forced into) short-term, renewable contracts with the Company;

they boarded ship (in fact, they gained a reputation as skillful aboard because, unlike most sailors of the day, they could swim) and joined the workforce at Fort Vancouver. The employee village, just southwest of the stockaded fort proper, came to be known as Kanaka Village because of the large population of Hawaiians residing there, though it was home to all the diverse employees of the Company.

The common languages were either Canadian French or Chinook Jargon, a trade language based on Chinook but incorporating elements from English, French, and Hawaiian. In the early years of the fort, English was used infrequently, with visiting missionaries or the remnants of unsuccessful American fur trading ventures.

The HBC, from the earliest days, had supported the existence of a diverse workforce, one of the beliefs being that the lack of a common language would prevent mutiny or organized demands. Whether or not this held true in the later years, as the workforce diversified even further through intermarriage and the use of jargon spread, the challenges of administering, and keeping the peace between, such different groups in this region remained. Dr. John McLoughlin, the Chief Factor of Fort Vancouver and in practice the head of the entire Columbia Department, ruled over this conglomeration for almost twenty years. His administrative style was characterized as just and firm, but he was occasionally given to outbursts of temper when aroused.

He had several violent encounters, and some distant tribes remained permanently hostile. He did, however, build friendship with those along the river and near his forts, based on his company's dual system: to respect the natives, treat them fairly, and make no effort to change their beliefs or way of life; but to respond with vigor if they harmed property or personnel. (Morrison 1999: 174)

Though in practice this policy seems idealistic, it formed the foundation on which the Company entered and settled new territories, and on which they based their treatment

of trading partners. The employees, on the other hand, were under strict expectations of behavior and were treated according to their rank in the Company. Fort Vancouver, like most of the fur trading posts, was characterized by an extreme class system, separated spatially as well as socially. Non-British or non-Canadian ethnicities, for the most part, were in the lower ranks of both prestige and pay, and lived in the employee village. British or Canadian men, usually with Métisse wives, had officer positions with substantially greater salaries and lived inside the fort palisade with higher levels of comfort and material goods. However, added to this description is the fact that the class system, at least for the non-laborer (a group that includes the higher ranks, such as Chief Factor or Chief Trader, and the lower ranks like clerks and apprentice clerks) in the fur trade, was more fluid than those of Europe, or even eastern North America. The trade offered advancement opportunities to a wide variety of men, and secondarily to their wives, based more on work ethic and applied skills than ethnicity.

The Fort Vancouver system, including not only the employees and free traders but also the surrounding population of Native groups, existed in relative stability during most of the tenure of the Hudson's Bay Company. As stated before, minimal European settlement was initially allowed in the surrounding areas, and McLoughlin's laws, in the absence of formal government, were legally binding for British subjects. The challenge to the Company's monopoly, both economic and over the physical lands, came from an unexpected quarter: American settlers, not fur traders. Although the "Bostonmen" had only nominal success in fur trading within the Columbia Department, they had returned to the States with tantalizing descriptions of the areas west of the Rocky Mountains, especially the rich agricultural lands of the Willamette Valley. American immigration,

finally fueled by the emotions of Manifest Destiny, started as a trickle that grew exponentially each year as word spread of the possibilities and new routes were opened.

Since the land claim question was still undecided, McLoughlin and his company could not legally stop the influx of immigrants. As Fort Vancouver was the original terminus of the Oregon Trail, the immigrants arrived at the fort, usually in dire need of supplies. McLoughlin, acting as his company's representative but many months away from instructions by his superiors, was faced with an economic and moral dilemma: for the sake of the fur trade he could not encourage American settlement, nor did he feel he could refuse the immigrants support in the form of food, medical supplies, and other essentials. At the same time, McLoughlin saw one possibility of salvaging his monopoly, and that was by bringing the settlers into the trade, taking in their agricultural and livestock harvests and supplying them with goods. The result was a compromise where McLoughlin helped the settlers materially, often on shaky credit, while striving to maintain the influence and control that the HBC had previously enjoyed. The settlers responded in a similarly confused way: many praised his aid and personal morality, others spread unsubstantiated tales of McLoughlin's nasty anti-immigration tactics. Whatever their reaction to McLoughlin personally, all wanted the power of the Company diminished, if not completely eradicated, and Fort Vancouver was the prime symbol of the continued British presence.

In 1846 the land claim question was at long last settled by the governments of Great Britain and the United States, setting the boundary at the 49th parallel, but leaving the Straits of Juan de Fuca, Puget Sound, and the Columbia River as free to both nations. British subjects were to retain former land claims, most important to French-Canadian

settlers in the Willamette Valley and to McLoughlin himself who claimed the town of Oregon City, including those lands under the claim of the Puget's Sound Agricultural Company, a subsidiary of the Hudson's Bay Company which helped to supply the contract with the Russian-American Company. However, things were not as secure as the boundary treaty may have implied. In 1849 the U.S. Army established the post of Columbia (later Vancouver) Barracks, just up the slope from Fort Vancouver. As the fort's trade declined, American immigrants grew to outnumber French-Canadian settlers in the Willamette Valley, and British political power waned with the creation of a Provisional Government for the Oregon Country, the army rented buildings and stores in Kanaka Village from the HBC. For a decade all groups coexisted in the Village and the environs of the fort. However, in 1849 the Company had transferred its headquarters to Fort Victoria in Canada, and in 1860 the Hudson's Bay Company presence moved north entirely.

Fort Vancouver as a National Historic Site

Establishment Within the National Park System

The physical remains of Fort Vancouver, long in disrepair, were burned sometime around 1866 and all the above-ground remains of the Hudson's Bay Company site were obliterated. The U.S. Army took ownership of the land after protracted land claim battles with a few retired HBC employees still living in the Village, and Catholic missionaries at the St. James Mission, which was begun in the 1830s; gravemarkers from the Company cemetery were removed and burned for fuel. At the time of the First World War, an immense mill was built on the site, the world's largest, for spruce used in early biplane manufacture, and numerous railroad berms were constructed through the site. Maps and panoramic photos of the mill show no remnant of Fort Vancouver or its surrounding community. Eventually the spruce mill was removed entirely, except for minimal archaeological remains, and the area saw a variety of use for the next two and a half decades, including a Civilian Conservation Corps camp, a government motor pool parking area, and an Italian-American detainment camp.

Local support for a public recognition of the role Fort Vancouver had played in the development and demographics of the Northwest coincided with political backing from Congresswoman Julia Butler Hansen (a native of Cathlamet, Washington who grew up in a house originally built by Hudson's Bay Company clerk George Roberts), and the site was added to the National Park Service system. It was designated a national monument in 1948, then upgraded to a national historic site finally in 1961.

More than five decades as a National Park Service site have equaled many reconstructive strategies and intensive changes to the landscape. When the site first joined the park system, it was a broad, empty field sloping up to meet Officer's Row, the houses of the officers posted to early Vancouver Barracks. Presently the site has nine reconstructed buildings, a one-acre garden, orchard, and visitor center. The first archaeologists, using methods considered unacceptable today, used heavy equipment and unskilled manpower to trench throughout the field in search of building foundations that could lead them to the placement of the original fort. Over twenty-five excavation seasons, by increasingly professional historical archaeologists using increasingly standardized excavation methods, have taken place. The history of Fort Vancouver as a national historic site is, in many ways, a microcosm of the history of historic research, interpretation, and archaeology.

The original Congressional act that designated the park a national monument was described in the Senate report on that legislation as an authorization to "preserve as a national monument the site of the original Hudson's Bay stockade [of Fort Vancouver] and sufficient surrounding land to preserve the historical features of the area" (Cogswell and Hori 1986: 71). The accompanying Department of the Interior report states that the two essential requirements of the land should be "the preservation of the historic stockade and the preservation of the historic parade ground of the later United States Army Post" (ibid.: 72). These statements of the purpose and significance of the site seem vague and overly focused on the stockade as the designated boundary of the post, compared to later documents that expand on the historical significance of the fort and its role in interpreting the history of westward expansionism. The Master Plan written in 1978, perhaps a result

of the legislation that enlarged the boundaries of the Fort Vancouver site and redesignated it a historic site, clearly has shifted more attention to its interpretive potentials:

Thus the purpose is to maintain the site of this primary center of early economic, cultural, and military development in the Pacific Northwest and to interpret the important part played in our nation's westward expansion by the fur trade and other activities carried on at the fort... Interpret, as the primary historical theme, the story of the fur trade and the important role played by the Hudson's Bay Company in the exploration, settlement, and development of the Pacific Northwest. As a secondary historical theme, interpret the story of Vancouver Barracks and the part played by the United States Army in opening the Northwest to American Settlement. (U.S. Department of the Interior 1978: 1-2)

These statements of purpose and interpretive themes were carried over, with little change, within each of the site's official documents, including the 1985 Interpretive Prospectus, the 1992 Statement for Management, and the 1998 Strategic Plan. It was not until very recently that the terms and spirits of these statements, long accepted as the foundation of the site's various plans, were questioned as being solely dominant versions of the history of Fort Vancouver and its place in the "progress" of the Pacific Northwest. The statement of significance of the site showed no less staying power. The Interpretive Prospectus of 1985 defines the historical value of the site:

As the center of all Hudson's Bay Company activities west of the Rocky Mountains, as the 'cradle of civilization' in the Pacific Northwest, as the terminus of the Oregon Trail, and finally as the location of the U.S. Army's Pacific Northwest Headquarters, Fort Vancouver is the best site to illustrate and interpret such broad themes in American history as the fur trade, expansion of the national boundaries to the Pacific, the western frontier, and agricultural developments in the northwest corner of the country... The site, still surrounded by an appreciable amount of open land as it was in historic times and still relatively open to the Columbia River, possesses integrity. (U.S. Department of the Interior 1985: 6)

The 1998 Strategic Plan concurs in historical significance but increases the categorization of the different “spaces” within the park, reflecting both recent political changes in the status of the site, and trends in preservation values of the both the National Park Service and the community.

[Fort Vancouver] is the site of the Hudson’s Bay Company’s only administrative headquarters and supply depot for operations west of the Rocky Mountains in the Pacific Northwest from 1825 through 1849... Vancouver/Columbia Barracks, U.S. Army, established in 1849, was the first military post established in the Pacific Northwest. FOVA contains the historic Army parade ground and a portion of the Army Aircorp airfield (Pearson Field) for the inter-war period (1914-1940)... [Fort Vancouver] contains significant archaeological resources, both in situ and recovered, from pre-history to 20th century, but containing primarily HBC and U.S. Army artifacts... The site’s green space, including the historic army parade ground and Columbia River waterfront, provides a place for recreation. This continues on historic use of the site, connects with the human need for open space in an urban environment, and contributes to the quality of life of the community. (Fort Vancouver National Historic Site 1998: 1)

In 1993, a political decision was made that would deeply affect the area and operations of Fort Vancouver. After an extended and emotional debate among the involved parties, Congress authorized the formation of the Vancouver National Historic Reserve, a joining of adjacent, historically significant areas into one entity controlled by four administrative partners. The partners – the National Park Service, the Department of the Army, the Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation for the State of Washington, and the City of Vancouver – administer a 366-acre area with support from the Vancouver National Historic Reserve Trust, a private non-profit organization. This Reserve contains Fort Vancouver National Historic Site and its surrounding cultural landscape, the U.S. Army’s Vancouver Barracks, Officer’s Row, and Parade Ground, Pearson Field, and portions of the Columbia River waterfront and the Water Resources

Education Center. These last two sites connect the Reserve proper with the waterfront and historically significant developments along it, including the Kaiser shipyards.

Though the partners retain full authority over their individual areas, the Reserve was formed so that the development of the historic areas – linked through common resources and overlapping histories – will be a coordinated effort towards the goals of preservation, education, and public use (U.S. Department of the Interior 1999).

Methods of Historical Interpretation

The most basic duty of Fort Vancouver National Historic Site is twofold: to preserve the site for future generations and to interpret its history to the public. The definition of interpretation used by the National Park Service is: "Interpretation in the national park system is an educational activity that aims to reveal meanings and relationships through the use of original objects, by firsthand experience, and by illustrative media" (U.S. Department of the Interior 1988: 7:1). This concept, as interpretation applies to historic sites, is an attempt to share history in a way that also communicates its significance and fosters a creative process in the mind of the visitor. Interpretation is much different from just telling bare facts.

Interpretation differs from information in many basic respects. 'Interpretation', by contrast with information, conveys the meaning of something through exposition or explanation. 'Information' is the knowledge derived from study, experience, or instruction. It is information that is so often given to a visitor; it is interpretation that should have been accomplished. If we put into simple words the end results we hope to accomplish through interpretation, they would be: understand, stimulate, and appreciate. (Grater 1976: 5)

There are several methods of interpretation that are utilized by the staff and volunteers at Fort Vancouver. These can include tours, fixed station, talks, and cultural demonstrations and evening programs. Tours are the most common type of interpretation for the public and visiting school groups. After giving a brief, orienting introduction to the history of the Hudson's Bay Company and Fort Vancouver, one guide leads a group through the buildings of the site, explaining the significance of the activities in each as they move through. Tours are a very flexible type of interpretation. Each guide decides which information, perspective, and style they will use for their audience. While the majority of tours are adapted to the audience, the frequency with which they occur also means that some guides fall into a static version. Fixed station interpretation is similar to a tour, but requires that each guide be assigned to one building, where they interpret only from that position. This is used at times of high visitation or on special event days, and means that each visitor hears from multiple employees or volunteers. Talks, cultural demonstrations, and evening programs differ from the two practices above, in that they investigate a more specific historical topic rather than giving an overview. Here again, the style and perspective change with the nature of the program and the choices of the involved personnel.

Each of the interpretive methods can be done using one of three styles: first person, modified first person, and third person. Third person interpretation, simply described as done in past tense, is the most frequently utilized of all the styles, whether the guide is in uniform or period clothing. First person, talking about the past in the present tense, is done at the discretion of the guide or as required for certain special event days. This style can be an extremely powerful experience for both the guide and the

visitor, and is a part of the practice described at the site as "living history." One example is the annual Candlelight Tour weekend, where all staff and volunteers portray a real personage from the Fort Vancouver of 1845. Visitors are ignored as they move through the buildings in order to protect the illusion of a return to the past. Despite the unique success of this type of sensory-based interpretation, it exacts a high toll. Each participant must know, in addition to the historical knowledge required by a third person interpretation, extremely detailed contextual knowledge about a specific character and daily life in the Oregon Territory of 1845. Besides the investment, the interpretation is limited by the fact that visitors cannot ask questions; this is remedied by a style of interpretation that is becoming newly popular at the site. Modified first person can be described as first person with knowledge of the future. Guides can retain the power of grounding their character and activities in the past, but can also answer questions about people and issues as they extend beyond what would be the character's sphere of knowledge.

Each of the styles of interpretation has been used very successfully at Fort Vancouver, as have different combinations. All work best when the words of the guide seem fresh, a continual challenge when trying to approximate the same basic information for every group.

Visitor Population at Fort Vancouver National Historic Site

The most current visitor survey at Fort Vancouver was completed in 1986. This study, completed by the Cooperative Park Studies Unit in the College of Forestry at

Oregon State University, investigated several issues relating to visitation to the historic site. Specific objectives were to provide “(1) an assessment of who is visiting Ft. Vancouver, (2) a description of their visit, (3) an evaluation of services provided by Park Service staff, and (4) limited information about park visitors’ travel in the surrounding area” (Lee et al. 1986: i). The study used on-site interviews and a mail-back questionnaire, with a sample size of 200 visitors; it was administered over one three-day weekend in August. Key findings regarding the visitor population included the following data on place of residence and age and gender distribution:

a)

Place of Residence:	Percent of Total (rounded)
Washington	33%
Oregon	36%
California	10%
Other States	19%
Other Countries	2%

b)

Age:	Total Number	Percent of Total (rounded)
12 years and under	146	25%
13-19 years old	44	8%
20-29 years old	49	8%
30-39 years old	118	20%
40-49 years old	84	14%
50-59 years old	63	11%
60 years and older	79	14%

c)

Gender:	Total Number	Percent of Total (rounded)
Male	267	46%
Female	309	54%

Table 1 Fort Vancouver visitor population distribution by a) place of residence; b) age; c) gender.

A study of this type can be very useful in “reading” the characteristics of the site’s visitor population, allowing for appropriate responses in visitor services and distribution of funds that do not depend on unsystematic feedback. Probably the greatest need at Fort Vancouver right now is for an updated and more extensive visitor survey. The population of the Portland metropolitan area has changed dramatically in the 13 years since the last study was done and the site, according to experiential data, has seen an increase in the amount of international visitors and/or visitors with limited English-speaking ability in recent years. For example, current estimates place the Russian-speaking population of the metro area at 30,000-50,000 persons; the vast majority have emigrated since restrictive policies were lifted in the late 1980s (Willoughby 1996; Fitzgibbon 1998). Additionally, this report admits that national park visitation occurs in cycles, fluctuating greatly from season to season, and that “periodic monitoring is needed to provide managers with an update of who is visiting a site and the nature of that visit during a given time frame” (Lee et al. 1986: 1).

Revised to increase relevancy to the site today, a study of this type would be an irreplaceable tool in assessing the current visitor population and its relation to area demographics. As the 1986 study asserts, “Small historic sites in urban metropolitan areas benefit from the day use character of park visitation by sharing local culture and drawing customers from the population base” (Lee et al. 1986: 1). Knowing Fort Vancouver’s visitors and the surrounding communities is the first step towards visitor services that adapt to changing needs.

Diversity in the National Park Service

Diversity issues within the Department of the Interior, the bureau under which the National Park Service operates, are addressed within a specific context framed by various official documents outlining the Department's diversity policies and goals. In 1997, the Department set in motion a far-reaching chain of events with the publication of a strategic plan for improving the representation of diversity in each of its offices. The task force that developed the plan focused on addressing diversity issues as they pertain to five areas: strategic planning for a diverse workforce, targeted recruitment, retention, quality of work life for employees, and accountability. Diversity, here, covers three categories which include (in the terminology of the plan) race/national origin, gender, and disability. Within this document, the Department's image as a public service agency is readily apparent in the way it describes the empowering results of a diversifying workforce, both for the client and for the personnel involved in meeting their needs.

A diverse workforce enables the Department to provide a measure of understanding to its customers by relating to the diverse backgrounds of those customers. By including employees of all backgrounds, all DOI employees gain a measure of knowledge, background, experience, and comfort in serving all the Department's customers. (U.S. Department of the Interior 1997(b): 2)

The overall, stated vision is a department where the workforce is, at all levels, reflective of the nation's available workforce, and where the workplace environment is "one open and accepting of individual difference; all employees are encouraged to maximize their potential" (ibid.). The intermediary objectives to this end are to outreach to underrepresented groups and persons with disabilities, develop and use fully each employee's potential, enhance the quality of work life to aid in retention, educate

managers and employees regarding diversity, and enforce a 'zero tolerance policy' against discrimination (U.S. Department of the Interior 1997(b)).

Appendix C of this plan, a targeted outreach and recruitment guide, arguably contains the most proactive instructions for application to the workplace. It stresses that in order for diversity plans to receive managerial acceptance, they must be a part of an organization's business and strategic plan (*ibid.*). Especially for an agency like the National Park Service, where managerial changeover is relatively rapid, this report stresses that the inclusion of a diversity message into a site's plan is essential for any continuity of purpose and means.

Partially as a result of this plan and the strategies it outlined, the National Park Service has begun a self-reflective process aimed at analyzing its approach and response to diversity issues that relate to its operation, as well as designing various plans to fulfill the goals of outreach and recruitment put forth in the Department of the Interior's strategic plan. Part of this process entailed visitor surveys at major parks, to illuminate the characteristics of the visiting population and their conceptions of the purpose and significance of sites in the national park system. Studies were also done to categorize the current state of workforce diversification in the National Park Service, an agency that has operated under federal hiring regulations for some decades. These studies, taken as a whole, indicated that the Service was below an acceptable level of diversification, both in the workforce and the visitor pool. Approximately 79% of permanent employees were classified as Caucasian (Curtis 1999), while 85-95% of visitors to national sites were listed in this category as well. Statistics such as these are being denounced as an

unacceptable condition for an agency which depends on all Americans for its continued viability, and have prompted an array of actions internally.

Director Robert Stanton, the first African-American ever appointed to this post in the National Park Service, has been the most visible catalyst for increased attention and movement towards diversification. His definition of diversity and its management, taken from National Park Service websites, encapsulates the agency's core philosophies in regards to what diversity means and how it can be empowering to both employees and clients.

My vision of the National Park Service is to preserve and maintain the nation's treasures entrusted in our care, to the highest levels of quality possible, and to accomplish this through a highly skilled, dedicated workforce that exemplifies the rich diversity of our national parks and our nation. In our efforts to carry out this mission and vision, we are committed to recruiting, hiring, developing, promoting, and retaining a qualified diverse workforce. Diversity in the work place values employees in all occupations and at all levels, and provides them with the opportunities for working at their full potential. Diversity encompasses more than difference in race, national origin, disabilities, age, gender, religion, or sexual orientation; it includes the different values, cultures, and perspectives possessed by individuals from different groups. To succeed, diversity must be managed. For the National Park Service, this means maximizing the contributions of all employees... Managing diversity also includes the development and maintenance of a work place environment where the quality of work life is valued and all employees are encouraged to exhibit their commitment to providing quality service to their customers. (Stanton 1999)

Compared to the three categories of diversity described in the Department of the Interior's strategic plan, these are very inclusive ideas of how diversity can be illustrated; the encompassing idea of diversity is continued in the Pacific West Region's Strategic Plan for Diversity, the National Park Service document for the area which includes Fort Vancouver National Historic Site:

The Pacific West Region has a moral and ethical obligation to fairly and equitably treat our employees... we have a duty to reflect and represent the diverse cultures and interests that comprise the nation's population. Through our equal opportunity and diversity efforts, the Region can broaden our public support, encourage organizational growth and vitality, provide equal opportunity for public service, and meet our legal mandates for affirmative action... the Region reflects the diversity of the nation at all levels and in all occupations. It is reflective of a workplace that not only accepts, but actually values individual differences and where all employees are encouraged to maximize their intellectual contributions and career potential. (U.S. Department of the Interior 1998: 2)

These two documents together, the strategic plans for the Department of the Interior and the National Park Service Pacific West Region, provide the majority of administrative context for diversity actions at Fort Vancouver. The regional plan is the most relevant for the site, since it takes the diversity goals to a more specific level, assigning each to a responsible official, and includes a toolbox of references designed to aid individual sites in achieving these aims, including a bibliography, worksheets, and the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) annual diversity hiring goals. Accountability is promoted by requiring and sharing a quarterly report wherein is listed, by objective, the steps that each site has taken in the last quarter towards achieving the goals outlined in the strategic plan.

The Service's diversity message, very consistent throughout internally-produced publications, is shifted somewhat when reported by journalists for consumption. There is less focus on the moral obligations driving diversification, and more preoccupation with remaining financially viable in the face of changing national demographics. For instance, in an article from *The Oregonian* on the agency's first conference on diversity, Regional Director John Reynolds tied the idea of relevance to an endangered future for the national parks. "If we cannot be relevant, we will not be supported. We will fade from 'best idea'

to 'interesting anachronism'" (Curtis 1999: A13). A participant in the conference was even more blunt: "We're talking money now. The color of interest is the color green" (ibid.). Undeniably prompted both by a sense of responsibility and by threats to funding, the National Park Service under Stanton has initiated several projects designed to diversify its workforce and increase visitation by underrepresented groups. The Intake Trainee Program, a hiring and training process, has been reconfigured to improve workforce diversity. Recruitment strategies that target minorities have been used on certain college campuses and through minority-oriented media outlets. Additional parks have been added to the system that reflect a wider range of ethnic or cultural interests, and campaigns have begun that emphasize educating the public about stewardship and the values of national parks for all Americans.

Diversity Assessment

The idea to undertake a diversity assessment of Fort Vancouver National Historic Site was prompted by several things. I and others had become concerned, after years of conversations amongst staff and volunteers at the site, at the pervasive equation of history with truth. This concept of the nature of history, namely that it is a string of facts that can be fixed, in many cases led to a static historical interpretation that gave precedence to a single perspective. In this respect, I judged that anthropology – along with ethnohistory and current theories in public history – could be informative to the daily workings of the site. Simultaneously, I stumbled across a National Park Service website titled “Diversity in the Pacific West Region.” What caught my attention was that the parks were categorized by ethnic affiliation; none were mentioned as illustrating intra-site diversity. I became curious as to the interpretive challenges presented by the complex ethnic, cultural, and class diversity historically present at Fort Vancouver and its environs. More than a story of a single minority culture in the midst of a dominant one, I was intrigued by the history of interactions between many.

Concurrent with these personal motivations, at the site there has been discussion about methods to improve reconstruction and representation to more accurately reflect the historical circumstances of Fort Vancouver. Many employees and volunteers realized the importance of shifting the focus of the interpretive program to include underrepresented groups, and expanding the spatial boundaries to reduce the focus on the higher class areas of the establishment. There are many reasons for this general push for and support of diversity: the diverse interests of the staff and volunteers themselves, new theories from academic training, landscape changes in the Reserve that made areas newly

viable for inclusion into the interpretive program, and the overall focus on diversity from every division of the agency. Frequently, employees at the site commented on the seeming lack of relevance of the diversity studies being put forth: they felt that there was little site-specific data that did not come from one of the largest natural parks in the system. Understandably several people questioned the applicability of these studies and bemoaned the lack of qualitative studies that would investigate diversity issues as they related to a small cultural park. One of the prime reasons a diversity assessment can be valuable to the site is the timing: the park began the initial scoping stages of the next General Management Plan during January of 2000. A major updating of the site's primary operational document inevitably has led to a bout of self-analysis, and provides an opportunity to design overall interpretive philosophies and visitor services that take diversity requirements into account.

Project Description and Methodology

This thesis evolved out of an internship I completed for the National Park Service during the winter and spring of 1999. The project was designed to investigate the current state of diversification at Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, as well as to record employee and volunteer suggestions for improvements to the interpretive program and services that related to an expansion of diversity. An admitted bias was present in the operations of the site, and the goals of the project included promoting critical thought about interpretation and outreach. An internship report was submitted to the site, as well as to various offices of the Service, including the Columbia Cascades Support Office in

Seattle, the Regional Office in San Francisco, and the National Office in Washington, D.C. in June, 1999. In addition to my report, an appendix in hard copy form was included for the site which contained most of the materials I had used as reference. These included websites from the National Park Service and related offices, newspaper articles, journal publications, conference reports, and internal documents such as strategic plans and annual performance plans. This group of supplementary reading materials was included not only to provide additional context to a report that was necessarily brief, but also because I had found, in the course of interviews, that diversity literature is not successfully distributed.

The backbone of the internship report, and the raw data for my thesis, was formed through interviews with employees and volunteers at the site, combined with research data to illustrate the framework of diversity issues within the Service as a federal agency. Due to both academic requirements and time constraints at the park, my methodology was designed to be simultaneously rapid and thorough. After an initial memo outlining my proposed project was disseminated to park staff, I described the internship at the monthly staff meeting. After most employees were familiarized with the basic goals of the project, I arranged interviews with each division chief and each permanent or term employee in the Interpretation & Resource Management (I & RM) and Cultural Resources (CR) divisions. This included employees both at the fort site itself and at the General O.O. Howard House, the visitor center for the Vancouver National Historic Reserve. Howard House employees were included because most had prior experience working at Fort Vancouver seasonally, and this staff continues to be intimately involved with activities and changes at the fort site. Seasonal employees were not included in the

interviews, as their tour of duty had not yet begun during the interview stage of the process. Since the bulk of the report concerns diversity issues relating to the two divisions mentioned above, the I & RM and CR, I narrowed the scope of potential participants; employees in the Administration and Maintenance divisions were not interviewed unless an individual specifically asked to participate or approached me to informally discuss the issues involved in the project.

There were a total of 18 formal interviews, and approximately 10 informal discussions prompted by employees or volunteers who did not participate in interviews. Of the formal interviews, 12 were with males and 6 with females. Although the ratio of male to female employees has shifted since my internship, at the time of the interviews this constituted an interview with each female on staff in the relevant divisions. The ethnicity of the interviewees was, for the most part, Caucasian. A single interviewee was of a minority ethnicity. Their ages ranged from the mid-20s to the early-70s. Educational level varied as well, ranging from high school diplomas to graduate degrees.

A third of the interviews were with volunteers at the park. Fort Vancouver currently has over 180 volunteers of varying status. Since I did not feel it was feasible to interview all of them, I used several avenues to distribute information about the nature of my project and the opportunity for input. In addition to the memo sent out by the superintendent, an article was included in the Volunteer Newsletter and I made a presentation on the diversity assessment internship at the Volunteer Committee Meeting. I hoped this combination of avenues would suffice to inform each volunteer, regardless of their work area or schedule. I interviewed only those volunteers that contacted me and expressed an interest in the project, or that were directly suggested by one of their

colleagues. This approach likely led to a statistical bias in the sample of volunteer interviewees, favoring those that were already interested in and perhaps supportive of diversification. Another project in which each volunteer was contacted personally would be a helpful future endeavor.

The interviews were semi-formal: I utilized a list of questions to ensure certain topics were covered (see Appendix), but interviewees were free to guide the discussion. All participants in a scheduled interview signed a consent form which outlined the voluntary nature of the project, how confidentiality would be maintained, and the offices to which the report would be sent. To help assure confidentiality, all interviewees remained anonymous and no direct quotes were reported. Almost all were satisfied with these provisions and spoke candidly. Since I am currently a National Park Service employee, and have known Fort Vancouver personnel and issues for many years, I made an effort to reduce the bias this created without demeaning my own experiences as part of the staff at the site. Any data I received through participant observation was not included in the internship report unless independently seconded by someone else during the course of an interview. However, my recommendations to the park, both in the internship report and this thesis, were formed from a summary of interview responses and my own interpretation of the needs of the site.

The interviews and research were aimed at three interrelated areas: historical interpretation, visitor services, and workforce management. Historical interpretation encompasses the main purposes of the site, namely how the history and significance of Fort Vancouver is shared, which perspectives are utilized, and where the interpretation takes place. Visitor services was an analysis of the availability and outcome of visitor

services the site offers to its clients: the effectiveness of communication methods and the comfort level of the audience, as well as a look at how the park can increase proactive outreach to communities that are not currently utilizing the site. Within the area of workforce management, I questioned the staff and volunteers about federal hiring authorities and regulations, the strengths and weaknesses of diversifying, and processes whereby the site could improve its workplace community. Changes in any of the three areas strongly affects the others. For example, the site's visitors are sometimes a part of community groups that are involved in interpretive partnerships; outreach to minority groups is more successful if perspectives with which they can identify are a part of inclusive interpretive programs at Fort Vancouver.

The Inclusion of Historical Interpretation

The addition of historical interpretation makes this assessment different from many projects of this nature, but I believe that the cultural issues involved in diversifying the history of Fort Vancouver confront the staff and volunteers with challenges similar to those that arise when diversifying a client or workforce base: how to achieve fair representation for all groups in a respectful manner, and how to accomplish this so that diverse viewpoints work to empower the site rather than create conflict. Furthermore, historical interpretation, beyond being the fundamental responsibility of the park, is perhaps the ideal way to enhance the intellectual and emotional connections visitors feel to the site, if an inclusive version of history allows more people to identify with and appreciate it. Historical interpretation forms a building block for the other two areas; strengthening the diversity of this most basic duty will in turn make outreach to and

management of diverse groups more successful, and will also foster the National Park Service's goal of increasing stewardship values in a larger portion of the citizenry, and thus participation, financial security, and continued relevance. For these reasons, I have chosen to make historical interpretation the main focus of my assessment, while including a more brief analysis of interview data from the areas of visitor services and workforce management.

Historical Interpretation

The Paradox of Interpretation and the Use of Multiple Perspectives

As described before, historical interpretation at Fort Vancouver encompasses many methods and styles of communication. In the interviews, guides who participate in each of the different types of interpretation were included, so that the assessment could apply to the entire interpretive program in general. The area of historical interpretation provided the highest degree of consensus among those I interviewed. Almost unanimously they asserted that the most compelling aspects of Fort Vancouver involve the maintained cultural diversity and the resulting social aspects of the history. The array of cultures that existed within a relatively stable social climate is perhaps the most significant resource for historical interpretation at the site, because it highlights the uniqueness of Fort Vancouver in its time as well as its context of cultural contact and settlement in the western half of the nation. Where the interview responses diverged, however, was in a judgment of the ethical conclusions of this contact. The majority stressed the relative peace and prosperity of the fort environs, and the bloodless, just rule of John McLoughlin that allowed for the population transition to take place under economic activities. Several of the interviewees argued for a less forgiving version, focusing instead on the intense deculturation and displacement crisis suffered by the local Native groups and some Company employees; they mentioned such aspects as the spread of diseases originating in Europe, a governing body that was structurally colonial, and the poor standard of living that typically characterizes those in the lower levels of a status hierarchy.

The staff and volunteers disagree on a fundamental interpretation of history; yet, these views that could seem irreconcilable are in essence both valid interpretations of the history that happened at Fort Vancouver. Much of the difference lies in the intellectual approaches they utilize to interpret the history: some guides focus on the specific site, while others give precedence to the “fort-as-symbol”, a representative of a global colonizing phenomenon following economic spread. There was a rich conglomeration of cultures and traditions, yet no cultural group at the fort could escape their definition in relation to the British social world and its accompanying hierarchical structure. This hegemonic relationship highlights the basic paradox required for interpretation: the mistreatment and inequalities that the European presence represented occurred, here, within a domain that was fair and enlightened by contemporary standards. Regardless of the detrimental effects of British and American expansionism, Fort Vancouver was an enterprise that attracted even those that resented its economic and political power.

The portrayal of Fort Vancouver as a scene of diversity and syncretic interactions is an approach that has not yet come into its own. Though the concept was brought forth in every interview, most people were dissatisfied with the extent of its inclusion in interpretive activities and exhibits. Many interviewees were unsure how to incorporate diversity issues or multiple perspectives into their interpretation, especially with time constraints during the busy seasons, and so continue to present a more simplified, traditional version of Fort Vancouver history. Descriptions given during the interviews, along with my own observations, present a “traditional” interpretive history that can be quite different from the version I gave in the beginning of this paper. Put into general terms, it is primarily an Anglophile history that focuses on the male, higher class British

perspective on Fort Vancouver. The interpretation of the site thus becomes dependent on the dichotomy of "British vs. Other" that denies the actual complexity of the social context. Because of this, tours and related activities have tended to give precedence to the spaces inside the fort palisade, ignoring the interpretive potentials of Kanaka Village, the Riverside Complex, St. James Mission, and even to some extent the U.S. Army presence. Both the preoccupation with the higher class male perspective and the physical focus on the interior of the fort lead to interpretation that at times is object-driven rather than progressing by concepts; it slips into "information" rather than "interpretation."

None of the interpretive activities I witnessed at Fort Vancouver were wholly biased or fit precisely into these generalities. However, this is the version as described by interpreters, both in speaking about themselves and when referring to others. Admittedly the tendencies towards these types of bias are constantly present. A more widespread hesitation, with a few remarkable exceptions, concerns moving beyond mentioning the existence of cultural diversity to presenting multiple perspectives on the "facts" of history. The weakness in the interpretive program is in investigating topics that require a multi-layered analysis or that are inherently contradictory. During the interviews, some topics were suggested that could precipitate a conscious shift towards a use of multiple perspectives: translations of Old World status systems applied to the fur trade enterprise, missionaries in territories where the norm was an acceptance of marriages *à la façon du pays*, the rise of the Métis as a distinct cultural group, or John McLoughlin as "saviour and villain." Subjects such as these, which have been investigated in cultural demonstrations and evening programs, perhaps more obviously require the use of non-

dominant perspectives and could serve as practice tools for more sophisticated interpretation in other areas.

Differentials in the Historical and Archaeological Records

Though the interviews established that unequal levels of representation do exist in the interpretive program, few respondents could elucidate the cultural forces, both historic and current, that create these differentials. Only a minority were aware of how the site is often unintentionally continuing to enforce the precedence of a single viewpoint as the status quo of historical interpretation. Some interviewees did point out obstacles to a more inclusive history, the primary one being a bias inherent in the historical and archaeological records that underrepresents women, Natives, and other minority groups. Traditionally, the park historians and interpreters have relied on first-person, written accounts as the core of reconstructing historical circumstances and personages. This narrows the potential perspectives to those who were literate enough to leave an extended personal record: most often educated European males from an upper class. Those people who appear in the writings of others, or in accounts of business proceedings or employment records, also tend to be restricted to a similar subpopulation. This dependence on primary written accounts creates a substantial handicap when attempting to portray minority or lower class viewpoints, a fact that is exacerbated at Fort Vancouver because Company employees usually formed alliances with Native or Métis women who were rarely literate. The extreme differences in educational level, usually drawn along ethnic, economic, and gender lines, means researchers have a pre-selected

pool of informants that excludes most of the population of the Fort Vancouver site. It also means that the corporate aspects of the establishment are the most readily retrievable; it is much easier to represent the working day of a clerk than a laundress.

The “ways of knowing” that are accepted as appropriate are limiting when diversifying an interpretive program. Two solutions were mentioned in the interviews, and in subsequent communication. The first was to expand the range of sources that are utilized in research, including such resources as oral traditions and related ethnographic materials, personal letters, theses and dissertations, and extrapolations from cultural studies or period literature. All of these have been used in the course of interpretation at Fort Vancouver, but they have never been utilized to their full potential or been given the trust that primary accounts are awarded. More fully utilizing these types of sources may require a substantial time investment and flexible researching skills, but they have the potential to greatly expand historical knowledge regarding underrepresented groups. The second suggestion was to use the primary sources in creative ways; several interviewees mentioned techniques that allow the reader to analyze a document as a cultural construction, rather than as “facts”, in order to move beyond the dominant voice. Applying a skeptical approach when researching can produce a more valuable result than embracing a given perspective at face value.

A related complaint in the interviews was a lack of exposure, during initial training, to reference materials that would allow the formulation of an interpretation that includes multiple perspectives. The current reading list for new employees and volunteers is not sufficient to promote a diverse interpretation on an individual level, and materials are sometimes misapplied. Several interviewees recounted receiving Historic Structures

Reports as an initial reading assignment, documents that were meant primarily to assist in reconstructing and interpreting the physical Fort Vancouver. As mentioned before, these types of practices can lead to an overemphasis on the buildings and objects of the site, rather than on interpreting a social history to which these form a backdrop. Many employees and volunteers suggested a two step process: a reassessment of the required reading list, coupled with the creation of a packet of excerpts from varied sources to make multiple perspectives more readily accessible.

Another problematic development mentioned in several interviews was a misrepresentation of minority groups. Interviewees were concerned at what they expressed as an ignorance of cultural or gender specifics. This concern was illustrated by two recent occurrences. The first involved the recruitment of a Native American man to help portray, at certain special events, the local Native presence at the fort which historically was Chinookan. Some questioned that he could accurately represent a tribal culture different from that of his Plains heritage, and expressed dismay at an assumption that Native cultures were similar enough to be interchangeable. According to several sources, he acted inappropriately and behaved with an aggression that would have been intolerable to John McLoughlin and the local Native chiefs. The other issue is an ongoing dissatisfaction with the portrayal of women. As mentioned before, female characters have traditionally been underrepresented in the interpretive program due to their indistinctness in primary accounts; the established interpretive approach, when confronted with gaps in historical data, has been to allow the lack rather than to augment with extrapolated information or to create a composite character. This has, in the majority of cases, led to singularly flat and invisible female characters who participate in a very finite set of

activities. Of those I people I interviewed, most asserted that although women were not at the forefront of political or business decisions, they were hardly unconscious of current events and opinions, and would have been highly vocal within a certain sphere. As the representations in the interpretive program diversify, it must be certain that the site is not settling for inappropriate or minimum re-creations.

The effect of the archaeological record is another obstacle to diversification of the history of Fort Vancouver. Typically, this record has been a vastly underutilized research tool, due largely to past curatorial strategies. Until 1995, artifacts and field records were stored in a variety of inefficient and inaccessible locales. When the Fur Store was reconstructed that year, part of the building was designed as a curation facility, housing a preparation room, cataloging area, offices, and two climate-controlled collection storage rooms. The archaeological collection was transferred here in bulk, as were the archives, and extensively reorganized. The new environment has made the holdings more usable as an interpretive resource, and is part of an overall transition from repository to research center that also features rotating exhibits, open houses, a research guide, and a planned online study collection with digital images.

Though the research potential of the material culture has grown with this philosophical shift, the Cultural Resources division is still contending with the legacy of almost fifty years of excavations and curation that did not have a representation of diversity as a goal. The bias of archaeology at Fort Vancouver is found primarily in the positioning of excavations; the majority of seasons have focused on interior areas of the palisade, and reconstruction over the prepared ground has followed this trend. Thus the visual tools of interpretation, the buildings, are clusters of higher class dwellings and

business centers. The true physical parameters of the Company's enterprise have been almost ignored. Those excavations that were completed in Kanaka Village or the Riverside Complex encountered highly disturbed stratigraphy. Since the external portions of the Hudson's Bay Company land were used by the U.S. Army even earlier than the site of the fort proper, occupation in the Village became contemporaneous with the American presence beginning in 1849; the primary location for material culture associated with underrepresented Fort Vancouver groups has a narrower timespan of deposition and has, in certain areas, lost much of the integrity of its provenience. This is not to say that archaeology in the fort environs is less informative than that inside the palisade. Rather, it is less conclusive and has less historical documentation to bolster interpretations.

Every interviewee recognized the prejudice of excavation and reconstruction – the two events can rarely be separated in the cultural resource management-oriented approach to archaeology at Fort Vancouver – and asserted that a focus on the external areas of the site should continually be the top priority. Two strategies were expressed: restoration of the cultural landscape and reconstruction in Kanaka Village. The cultural landscape is a way of providing the fort with a physical context that is historically appropriate, but any restorative work faces formidable intrusive features. The challenge in devising the cultural landscape, as stated by staff and volunteers, will be in depicting an immense agricultural center while still providing visual boundaries that give a sense of wilderness and separation from modern intrusions. There were few concrete suggestions for interpretive techniques in the Village; most framed it in terms of a token reconstruction of significant dwellings and structures to roughly delineate its size, paired with a trail for interpretive use and wayside signage.

Living History and Rights to Cultural Perspectives

An obstacle to expanding the interpretation of diverse groups that arose in several interviews was summarized as an “internal comfort level.” The assumption that the interviewees were describing was this: we recreate that which we know. While interpreting history and historical personas, people are prone to utilize their own internal perspectives, the viewpoints with which they feel most “culturally in tune”, and to focus on historical characters with whom they most easily identify, those most like the interpreter’s self. Overcoming this predilection will be difficult, even with recurrent training or consultants from underrepresented groups. The staff and volunteers’ exhilaration from the challenge of consciously interpreting an unfamiliar perspective or character is tempered by hesitation, a response to a larger issue that came up in many interviews. Personal experiences have proven to most staff and volunteers that interpreting history, no matter how knowledgeable the interpreter, makes one vulnerable to challenges from visitors. Many brought up the question of “who has the right to tell which story?”, a reference to whether there are cultural rights to certain historical perspectives. All interpreters agree that their responsibility is to present a history that is respectful of the involved parties, and there is an undercurrent of doubt that they can effectively tell a minority point of view. For example, some interpreters hesitate to interpret from the Native viewpoint, including such topics as catastrophic malaria epidemics and uneven distributions of quinine, forced marriages and other liaisons, or even more controversial topics such as slavery among Native groups, because of the way in which modern Natives may perceive their motivation or the substance of the history. The issue becomes even more complex when applied to living history interpretation: is it

disrespectful for a Caucasian woman to portray a Cree Indian? Interestingly, each of the examples given during interviews involved a Caucasian portraying a Native or Métis; none referred to a Caucasian portraying a person of a different European heritage. Several times at Fort Vancouver women have asked to portray blacksmiths, traditionally a solely male occupation, at living history events. The *de facto* policy at the site has wavered with different superintendents and remains a controversial aspect (for a discussion of “race and gender-blind interpretation” see Cook 1995; Cook vs. Babbitt 1993 presents a legal ruling on gender bias in living history interpretation with far-reaching implications).

The question of cultural rights led to two very different responses in interviews. The majority of interviewees argued for open access to multiple perspectives, asserting that quality interpretive skills and a respectful demeanor should be preferred over ethnicity, and that representing minority perspectives, regardless of the interpreter, should be the first priority. Some pointed out that an attempt to have each interpreter match their living history character nears impossibility; imagine the difficulty in finding an interpreter who is exactly a quarter Hawaiian, a quarter Chinook, and half Scottish. Additionally, a few individuals referred to witnessing problematic occurrences at other sites where minorities hired to interpret “their” viewpoint were more concerned with sharing their political aims at a federal site than portraying their heritage at a historic site. At the same time, they recognized that minorities in staff or volunteer positions could bring valuable input and powerful visual effect to the interpretive program, and supported a limited amount of targeted recruitment with these goals in mind.

A significant number of interviewees supported cultural rights to certain perspectives of history. They asserted that “like” should portray “like” – but rarely

specified a definition – and argued for recruitment targeted at descendants of groups that are currently underrepresented in Fort Vancouver’s interpretive program. A few of those I interviewed viewed it as insulting that minority peoples were not allowed to tell their own stories, and regarded inclusion of modern representatives as a moral necessity. This approach, as several of them admitted, would generate both positive and negative consequences. Besides the difficulties mentioned above, there is no guarantee that specified groups would agree to participate or act as consultants. However, if minority participation was successful, the site would benefit from the perspectives of people who were inheritors of a cultural legacy and who might be able to bring certain continuities with them. Several interviewees assumed that inclusion of minorities would guarantee that the more unpleasant, unsavory aspects of the site’s history would be regularly included in interpretation, generating a more emotionally inclusive version.

Overall interviewees supported an expansion of the underrepresented perspectives in Fort Vancouver’s interpretive program, but disagreed on how best to achieve this goal. Though they differed on strategies, all did agree that required, recurrent training on diversity issues and increased facilitation of information sharing were minimum requirements to improving the diversification of interpretation at the site on a continual basis.

Visitor Services

Visitor Services at Fort Vancouver National Historic Site

The second area of this project was designed to investigate the staff and volunteers' response to the clients of Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, including visitor services, outreach to underrepresented groups, and adaptation to differing visitor needs. The choice of the term "client" is my own – National Park Service documents often use "customer" – and is used to highlight a shift that has been encouraged recently at the site and in the National Park Service as a whole. With threats to its survival, the approach that regards visitors as clients has been reinforced throughout the agency as a strategy to remain viable and dynamic. During the project interviews and in unrelated internal meetings, many of the personnel have focused on the public service aspects of the historic site instead of giving precedence to preservation responsibilities. In the past, the site's responsibilities to visitors have been viewed as, if not wholly irreconcilable, at least secondary to the responsibilities of preserving the integrity of the site. At times there was a covert attitude, among a minority of the staff, that visitors "interrupted" work. Creativity in resolving the requirement of both the mandates of the site, and a shift to a mindset where the site responds to "clients", has guaranteed more energy put into both existing visitor services and proactive outreach.

There were many ideas shared in the interviews that were designed to improve visitor services in general, without targeting a particular group. These included more living history interpretation, expanding interpersonal interpretive activities whenever

possible, stationing a greeter at the front gate, and involving the site more directly in activities of the Vancouver National Historic Reserve. The degree to which Fort Vancouver will participate in Reserve events remains an unresolved issue for many of the staff and volunteers. Since the Reserve was created amidst an atmosphere of contention, much of the resentment has evolved into indifference or distaste. Others support a high degree of cooperative interpretive effort between the other areas of the Reserve and Fort Vancouver. The majority of those I interviewed, however, chose a stance that accepted the political realities of the situation: the site is undeniably a partner in the Reserve, and should utilize this as a resource to promote the contextual historical features of Fort Vancouver. Allowing time and practice to decide the relationship between Fort Vancouver and the Reserve, and especially between the site and the General O. O. Howard House visitor center, will greatly affect visitor services and any potential cooperative outreach.

Other than more firmly situating the site within the Reserve, most often interviewees mentioned the need for an updated visitor survey. As I mentioned previously, no reliable baseline data exists for visitor demographics. When I asked guides to describe the characteristics of visitors they encounter on tour, the estimates for representations of diverse groups varied widely. For instance, the estimated percentages of international visitors to the park ranged from 2% - 30% of the total visitor population. Anecdotal evidence is not generating any consensus that would allow appropriate decisions in adapting visitor services to current needs, since it is affected significantly by the individual's perceptions of their audience and their tour of duty. The other benefit that a current visitor study would provide is external feedback on the interpretive program;

direct response from the clients at whom it is aimed would help the site improve the interpretive program, and could potentially emphasize where bias is occurring.

In general, all interviewees rated visitor services positively, excepting a few areas where improvement is needed. The primary one was active outreach, especially plans designed to target groups in the local community that are underrepresented in the visitor population. Specific groups that were mentioned include youth, ethnic/language minorities, and non-staff researchers. Besides outreach strategies such as off-site presentations, press releases, and other common communication tools, almost all staff and volunteers were highly supportive of utilizing the opportunities of the Internet. They described it as not only accessible to a large number of people, but also a form of communication that, to some extent, transcends limiting factors such as income level, gender, ethnicity, age, and distance. A sophisticated, diversified website would be extremely effective for these reasons, and additionally because it could contact a large audience of potential clients for relatively little financial output. The Internet can make multiple perspectives of Fort Vancouver's history and images of its archaeological collection accessible to an incredibly diverse range of people who would not otherwise be aware of these resources; it could also provide a space for correspondence between the site and its visitors, creating a continual method of feedback. The reservation forms required for school group tours were recently put online, making the process more efficient and sustainable, leaving staff time and funds to be utilized elsewhere. Not only does the Internet provide an effective method of outreach, but can streamline other projects so that more resources can be devoted to improving visitor services at the site itself.

Recruiting and serving individuals from diverse groups, through the Internet and otherwise, will require flexibility and perseverance from management and guides. Most agreed that part of the responsibility of a public service agency should be to assure that their services are reaching all potential clients, not only those who are easily accessible or instantly responsive. The staff and volunteers are dedicated to making the site a highly regarded asset to all areas of the community, not only to increase visitation and the types of visitors, but also to increase the adaptability of this specific site over the long-term political and social climates.

Services for Diverse Visitor Populations

Responding to the sense they do have of visitor demographics, most of those I interviewed saw a need for improved preparation for groups with special needs, especially those who are visually or hearing impaired (for discussions of related issues see Thornton 1997 and Ruddell and Ruddell 1991), as the site is near the State School for the Deaf and the State School for the Blind, and those who have minimal English-speaking abilities. Interestingly, several interviewees asserted that the site's primary responsibility, being a federal site supported by tax dollars, should be to the taxpaying population. The implication was that this is comprised of English-speakers; there seems to be little realization, despite years of diversity messages, that the nation includes a large percentage of taxpayers for whom English is, or is becoming, a second language. I would add that, in the interest of promoting preservation and valuation of history and material

culture internationally, the site should not draw the scope so narrowly; even a federal site should not place international researchers or visitors as a second priority.

All of those interviewed gave the site high marks on accessibility for the disabled. The Maintenance division has been focused on improving accessibility for the last few years, and has done numerous projects involving ramp construction, lowering countertops, and installation of a wheelchair lift. The majority of reconstructed buildings are fully accessible, and a wheelchair is available for temporary visitor use at the fee station. The only criticism was that the courtyard, during the wet seasons, sometimes mires wheelchairs or becomes a slip hazard. To lessen this obstacle, a few staff members suggested constructing a stable pathway connecting all the buildings.

There are several strategies that staff and volunteers suggested would allow them to more effectively serve these special-needs groups. While a few interviewees mentioned providing language interpreters, most of them pointed out that the majority of non-English-speaking groups are accompanied by language interpreters. Fort Vancouver does provide American Sign Language interpretation on a regular basis. Since many guides have noticed that the reading comprehension of visitors with minimal English-speaking ability is often at a higher level than their listening comprehension, a common phenomenon during second language acquisition, they suggested that all standardized verbal presentations should be transcribed and the text made available to visitors. Also, many interviewees would like the site to provide multilingual signs and literature in the languages that are encountered most often; this could also include braille. Last month, the Fort Vancouver brochure was translated into Japanese and Russian for the first time. However, the quality of the translations cannot be judged since they were

not done by professional translators, and may include idiom, regional variations, or imperfect translations. Currently, the documents are literal translations of the National Park Service-issue brochure outlining the history of the fort and a map of the site. Some interviewees suggested that, in addition to these translations, handouts in various languages could be composed that tailor the history to specific cultural groups. For example, a Japanese-language handout could include information on the three Japanese sailors that were rescued from the Makah and brought to the site in 1834. I would propose that both be made available, not one or the other as some suggested. Visitors may be interested in connections individuals of their heritage had with the Hudson's Bay Company, but they should also have access to standard literature that is distributed to every visitor.

Another suggestion from the interviews was for the site to provide training in intercultural communication for staff and volunteers. An instructor could provide information on appropriate and simple techniques that can make the exchange more worthwhile for all involved, including avoidance of insulting body language, correct use of a language interpreter, negotiating communication barriers, and how to work through misunderstandings when they occur. Beyond this, guides could share experiences about what works successfully: relating the "universal concepts" which communicate the site's history best to a variety of groups, creative approaches to communication difficulties, and other skills they have learned in the field.

At a recent living history training workshop given by one of the rangers at Fort Vancouver, one of the topics discussed was how to tailor a tour or living history activity to one's audience. The response to this type of training was enthusiastic, and almost all

participants agreed that more training of this level is needed for responding to diverse audiences of all types. Many interviewees talked of the importance of having a dynamic approach to historical interpretation, one which allows the guide or presenter to adapt talks and demonstrations to the needs, abilities, and interests of the audience. From my observations and the assessments of others, I judge that the majority of interpreters at Fort Vancouver do attempt a flexible and responsive interpretation, but some fall into a standard, stale tour. Ridding the site completely of rote tours, through recurrent training and auditing a selection of tours for evaluation, would promote an interpretive program keyed to its target audience. Currently, many guides whom I interviewed call this method of tailoring an intuitive process which they do instinctively after assessing their audience; describing it as an almost automatic process makes it challenging to explain to others. A training style that utilizes an interactive workshop arrangement could draw benefits from both the trainer and the participants.

In general all interviewees agreed that the goal of interpretation should be to achieve an understanding of the historical message through emotional connections with the audience. Methods of accomplishing this for diverse audiences, taken from both interviews and informal discussions, depend greatly on the use of multiple perspectives and flexible interpretation strategies. One suggestion was to interpret history as it links to the background of the audience; interpreting historical events that involve the cultural heritage of the audience could allow individuals to identify more readily with Fort Vancouver. Russian visitors have responded well in the past to interpretation that highlights the important trading relationship between the Hudson's Bay Company and the Russian-American Company in Sitka. However, this strategy is threatened by the same

dangers as the multilingual handouts tailored for certain groups: solely interpreting specific connections to a cultural audience, assuming that they will only be interested in this information, is a false conclusion that must be avoided. Specialized interpretation, culturally-based in this example, should be supplemental to the core historical interpretation that shares the overall significance of the site.

Another suggestion was to increase the use of fixed station interpretation. Since this style means that each visitor encounters a minimum of three different guides, there is a better chance that multiple perspectives will be presented. As mentioned before, an interpretive program that incorporates more than one perspective of history – and one that admits doubt and gaps in historical knowledge – will attract a diverse visitor audience. The less guides pretend to hold a monopoly on the story, the more likely they are to appeal to audiences that may hold different opinions on what happened at the site and within its realm of influence.

In the interviews, several members of the staff mentioned problematic responses to visiting international dignitaries and colleagues. A scenario, described as typical of the site's response to these types of visits, occurred just over a year ago. A group of archaeologists and curators from Russia came to Fort Vancouver, toured the buildings and spoke with staff, and distributed gifts from their native city. Many employees felt that the site's welcome to this group was not adequate, and proposed that a standard procedure be developed that would guide staff in responding to visits by dignitaries and reciprocating gift exchange, especially since many groups arrive unannounced. This procedure, partially tailored to specific groups, should aid the staff in becoming aware of cultural characteristics, and be designed to construct appropriate and respectful

receptions; it could include descriptions of traditional customs and greetings, multilingual resources on the site, suggestions for appropriate gifts, and other information.

The other sphere of visitor services, attracting those groups that are not represented in the site's current clients, is more complex than responding to those already present. Several ideas, which will be investigated more fully in the literature review chapter, came out of the interviews with staff and volunteers. The most common response was that certain minority groups, especially African-American, simply aren't aware of Fort Vancouver; this could be somewhat remedied by the various forms of outreach already outlined. Some mentioned a related complication, in that public transportation inadequacies make the site virtually inaccessible from certain areas of the Portland metropolitan area. The root of underrepresentation, according to some interviewees, lies in differing cultural patterns for the use of historic sites or recreational outdoor spaces. Some groups do not come because they hear interpretations of a history that is not meaningful to them. Minority groups are not interested in Fort Vancouver, do not consider it a valuable or useful resource, or cannot afford the luxury of free time that a visit would require. As will be evident, most of the ideas from the interviews are reflected in recent literature dealing with the underrepresentation of minorities as visitors in the national park system.

Workforce Management

Responses to Diversity Promotion Programs

The last section of the diversity assessment project investigated diversification issues in the workforce, currently one of the most visible promotions in the National Park Service. The federal hiring authorities, as well as the programs specific to the National Park Service, provide a relatively rigid framework for recruitment activities; as I mentioned previously, several initiatives dedicated to promoting diversification of the workforce have begun in the last few years. There are few, if any, studies of how these promotions are being received at the level of the individual site, or the effect they have on interpersonal relations of the staff. This could be a dangerous internal oversight, leaving a diversifying workforce open to a backlash and other repercussions.

At Fort Vancouver, interview questions about the various diversity promotion programs resulted in a wide spectrum of responses. Many of the negative responses, but not all, seem due to misunderstandings as to the nature of the programs, or because of outright or covert abuses of the different hiring systems. Several dismissed diversification as the latest fad coming down from management. Some interviewees also felt that the promotion of workforce diversification by the National Park Service fails to directly express the official views on issues like cultural rights to history, while implying certain controversial opinions.

Most of the misunderstanding about diversification programs, especially those geared towards targeted recruitment and training, stems from a simple lack of information. The main reason I attached an extensive appendix to the internship report

distributed at the site was a widespread ignorance of diversity aims or specifics; division chiefs were well-informed about details, but the information distribution seemed to stop there. This is not to say that problematic communication flow at the site is the only obstacle, however. Most employees had not taken the time to question management or investigate the various websites that carry information about diversity promotion in the National Park Service, and have failed to inform themselves about an issue that profoundly affects each site and every employee. At the same time, detailed descriptions about diversity programs were difficult to find; most references did not go beyond an explanation of a program's framework, or how certain criteria differentiated the ranking of applicants. The National Park Service websites, ostensibly designed for public view, used acronyms for the majority of hiring authorities and did not link to more explanatory pages. Misunderstanding in regards to diversity promotion programs is inevitable given the bidirectional impediments to communication in the National Park Service network.

Several employees admitted to feeling threatened by diversity programs, including legal mandates for affirmative action, because of misapplications they have witnessed or heard rumored. This tends to color their view of diversification as a whole. Unsatisfactory manipulations of the hiring system are perhaps more common than is officially recognized, and unfortunately lead to a resentment against the spirit of the program because of an individual's actions. Though it is difficult to differentiate between actual and fictional abuses during hiring, this is to some extent a moot point. The portion of the staff that feels threatened, usually Caucasian males, react identically to both. Thus each affect the success of diversity programs and staff relations. In a related vein, a few interviewees suggested that in the National Park Service, one's expectations to be hired

for a permanent position are usually unrealistic, which leads to a paranoia about competition for positions or being replaced. Whenever a position is open at the site, some of the male employees discuss the inevitability of a female being needed to fulfill quota requirements. This is a curious preoccupation that perseveres despite a site hiring history where women have outnumbered men consistently over the last five years (Sisto 1999):

	Permanent Hires – all divisions	Permanent Hires – I&RM Division	Term Hires – all divisions	Seasonal Hires – all divisions	Total Hires – all divisions
Male	2	1	2	7	12
Female	5	3	2	12	22
Total	7	4	4	19	34

Table 2 Five-year hiring history of Fort Vancouver National Historic Site (data through Spring of 1999).

Most of those people I interviewed were dissatisfied with workforce diversification programs because they are promoted throughout the National Park Service, yet the agency fails to make explicit its views on the cultural issues involved for interpretation at historic sites. A newspaper article reporting on a National Park Service conference on diversity stated that:

[Stanton] sees a link between the relatively small number of ethnic minorities visiting the parks and the fact that only a handful of minorities work for the Park Service. Nonwhite visitors might feel more comfortable in the parks, he and other officials have said, if they see employees who share their culture and history. (Curtis 1999: A13)

Some interviewees interpreted this opinion to imply that minorities would only be comfortable visiting a site if minority staff members were visually present, regardless of

the quality of the interpretive program or the perspectives used. Several saw it as an insult that implied, for instance, that a skilled Caucasian interpreter could not interpret minority history well enough to attract minority visitors. Whether or not Stanton's assertions are true for a large percentage of minority visitors, and other data has shown that they indeed may be, they were not well received by many of the employees and volunteers I interviewed. Most who resented statements of this type were displeased that they read them in brief external articles, rather than having the issues addressed at length in internal documents. Almost every interviewee was against hiring quotas, asserting that it was simultaneously insulting to minorities and harmful to the site to hire anyone but the most qualified applicant. It is interesting to note that an automatic dichotomy was perceived between "quota hire" and "qualified." As mentioned before, all rated job skills such as talented interpretation above gender or ethnicity or veteran status. The majority argued that their interactions with visitors, and that of the site as a whole, were not adversely affected by the homogeneous nature, ethnically, of the staff. These views are hard to reconcile with ideas of visitor comfort levels and the implications that more minorities on staff will lead to higher percentages of minorities as visitors to national parks. Part of the difficulty may be in applying a single perspective to both natural parks and cultural sites. Several interviewees pointed out that hiring minorities at large natural parks to attract minority visitors would be received differently than the same move at a historic site, where the objective gets tied up with issues of cultural rights to history, interpreting multiple perspectives, and related issues of structuring representation.

While many interviewees had negative feedback about the diversity promotion programs, at the same time most supported diversification in theory. Staff and volunteers

overall consider equal access and workforce opportunities a moral obligation, and recognize the strengths that a diverse staff can offer to a historic site. Not only are multiple perspectives on history available, but diversification can lead to an overall improvement in creativity and responsiveness to different kinds of visitors. Some interviewees considered diversification an essential first step towards a more equal representation of historic cultures, implying that a Native American staff member, for example, would guarantee that the perspectives of the Native groups would be included in the site's interpretive plan. As mentioned before, others countered that the assumption that an individual can necessarily represent their cultural group successfully is naïve.

The pervasive tension at Fort Vancouver overall is a support of diversity promotion tempered by a defense of one's own position. Reconciling these two responses – regarding diversity hiring programs with suspicion and realizing the benefits of a diverse staff – has led to a support of diversification in the volunteer or partner sphere rather than the salaried positions. For many at the site, it becomes more acceptable to add to the volunteer pool, or create consulting agreements, than to “replace” someone in one of the finite paid positions. For hiring, most interviewees supported the potentials of targeted recruitment, rather than hiring preferences, coupled with “blind” hiring practices. This would require anonymous applications, containing no identifying information such as name, gender, ethnicity, etc. A few employees also suggested that the top applicants for a position be interviewed by multiple people, rather than a single individual, to negate the potential for bias.

The fact remains that few employees were satisfied with diversity hiring practices as they now exist. One of the frequently mentioned reasons this attitude persists is

because they feel that affirmative action-type programs are providing opportunities to minorities in the wrong way and too late. Many mentioned that more attention should be assigned to promoting the National Park Service, as a career option, to young people who have time to build the appropriate qualifications and compete for positions without preferential treatment. This idea, that perhaps current methods of providing equal opportunity are misguided, was a common interview topic during this project. Some supervisors at the site feel limited by the structures of the hiring authorities in this respect, and feel forced to work creatively within recruitment alone. The Fort Vancouver staff has initiated several programs incorporating young people, designed not only to increase awareness of the types of work available at a historic site, but also to expose young people to themes of stewardship, preservation, and representing and interpreting history. The site has arranged for participation from Youth Conservation Corps (YCC) and Career Focus students from local high schools and interns from Washington State University, and has designed volunteer recruitment strategies targeted at children and young adults. Since these programs are relatively recent developments, they have been going through a process of assessment and improvement, but many at the site are dedicated to a continuous process of outreach to establish student involvement with Fort Vancouver beyond the role of visitor.

During the interviews, several staff members commented that few minorities applied for jobs in the National Park Service, and suggested possible reasons. The first was that the image of the agency is not conducive to minorities, that the shared, cultural image of the park ranger (despite the variety of divisions and positions in the NPS, this seems to be considered its public symbol) is a Caucasian male, which forms a subtle but

underestimated obstacle to minorities who might apply for work in this non-traditional arena. The other idea was that the structure of the park network, in which one must usually transfer to be promoted, is not favorable to minorities, whom many interviewees assumed to have particularly strong familial and community ties. A career which requires transferability would not be attractive to someone who wanted to remain in a certain locale.

Workforce Management

Besides discussing diversity promotion and hiring practices, the interviews most often turned to a management of diversification. Since, as I mentioned previously, many at the site consider historical interpretation a sensitive practice, as the staff becomes increasingly diversified, the multiple perspectives and opinions this creates will have to be appropriately managed. Should differing viewpoints be mistaken for professional affronts, insurmountable conflict could be generated if a diverse workforce is not managed so that each employee feels valued and empowered. The workplace climate at Fort Vancouver is an especially vulnerable one, even with its currently low levels of diversification. Interviewees described the existing workplace as one characterized by "territorial competition", a communication chasm between management and staff, and an overall lack of direction. At the same time most of the staff, especially those employees who have been at Fort Vancouver long-term, is drawn together interdivisionally by common goals stemming from a dedication to the site itself.

An impressive range of suggestions for improving the workplace community in general were offered in the interviews, some quite vocally. In general, a better facilitation of communication and idea exchange is needed to lessen feelings of exclusion from decision-making processes. This will become even more essential as the staff diversifies, in order to maintain a cohesive interpretive program. At the same time, employees cannot simply give lip service to involvement in various projects; they have a responsibility to visibly participate in open meetings and offer input to draft documents. The interview responses showed that the sometimes crippling intense rivalry over work duties and projects could be improved through a combination of several methods: strict boundaries applied by division chiefs, and community building activities designed to lessen antagonism. A lack of cooperation, in some instances, has led quite a few of the volunteers to describe the workplace as disorganized and ineffective, an inexcusable result of the staff's neglect to function complementarily.

The absence of a focused direction, mentioned by both staff and volunteers, proved difficult to discuss in interviews. Most who mentioned this lack could not pinpoint the root of the problem. The writing of the new General Management Plan in the near future may help to clarify the goals of the site for the next decades, and lessen the sense of aimless operation. Another possible solution is to require that each staff member define personal goals on a seasonal or yearly basis, similarly to the site's Annual Performance Plan, as part of their evaluation process. Self-defined objectives may lead to more proactive movement and a sense of flexibility for those who feel limited by narrow position descriptions. The initial need, however, is to increase the staff and volunteers' accountability; critical feedback from visitors and researchers, as well as internally,

would inform the site about past decisions and potential future directions. Without the use of consistent standards – set by the National Park Service, the site, and its clients – workforce management cannot empower each employee to meet them.

Review of Literature on Diversification in the National Park System

Literature on Diversification of Visitor Populations and Workforce

Literature on the process of diversification related to the national park system, with a few exceptions, tends to revolve around the promotion of diversity in the workforce and visitor base. More than that, diversification is presented mainly as a response to a perceived need: to remedy a lack of diversity based on statistical studies. The National Park Service is seen as failing the perpetually underrepresented groups, both in the visitor population and within applicants and hires for staff positions, since it does not actively work to make the parks attractive to them. Where the articles diverge, however, is in interpreting the core of the underrepresentation; several theories exist as to the forces which create such differentials in hiring and use, and the best solutions to counteract these. Several of the ideas in the literature are similar to ones from the interviews with staff and volunteers at Fort Vancouver, causes of minority underrepresentation they have accepted both from publications and from experiences in the field.

Two of the articles which have addressed diversification in the national parks most publicly are newspaper articles, perhaps prompted by the National Park Service's first conference on diversity in January of 1999. This conference, called *America's Parks – America's People, A Mosaic in Motion: Breaking Barriers of Race and Diversity*, was co-sponsored by the National Park Service, the National Parks and Conservation Association, and a number of organizations focused on minority and community involvement. The first article (Curtis 1999), describes the conference as a response to

criticism that the agency's "workforce is mostly white and the vast majority of park visitors are, too" (ibid.: A13). These data are linked to the fact that a relatively small number of minorities visit the parks; it implies that "nonwhite visitors" would feel more comfortable coming to parks if more minorities, of the visitor's ethnicity or cultural heritage, were employed there. As mentioned previously, many interpreters at Fort Vancouver found this assumption both insulting and intellectually questionable. Other than quoting Director Robert Stanton on this concept, Curtis does not delve into fundamental causes of ethnic underrepresentation.

However, Curtis does enumerate several steps the National Park Service has taken to combat the statistics. Since the primary focus here is on the lack of ethnic minorities on staff and the few people of color visiting the sites, the strategies are designed with promoting these groups in mind. The NPS Western Regional office recently compiled a list of media outlets aimed at ethnic communities, as reference for park superintendents when sending out news releases, announcing job openings, and doing public relations. The National Park Service has also begun recruiting summer seasonals from college campuses that are traditionally African-American and in inner cities. Additionally, Curtis mentions several sites commemorating cultural diversity that have been added to the national park system in the past decade; all of those mentioned represent historic sites associated with African-Americans. The article ends with an admission that the NPS faces difficulties in "aggressively recruiting minorities and mounting costly outreach programs" (ibid.: A13), because of a low rate of staff turnover and financing shortages.

Another article (Wilkinson 1999) focuses on the National Park Service's attempt to attract ethnic minorities to parks. The vital question here, stated by Laura Loomis of

the National Parks and Conservation Association, is: “Will 21st-century Congresses, filled with constituents who are increasingly urban and non-Caucasian, look upon national parks as essential investments or antiquated relics?” (ibid.: 3) The familiar worry about relevancy is once again brought to the fore, but this article also expands on the analysis of why minorities have been such a low percentage of visitors to park sites. The main reasons are shifting demographics and associated traditional practices:

White Americans raised on the idea of spending summer vacations in national parks will give way to a new majority of Asians, Hispanics, and African-Americans. This emerging plurality may not possess the same affinity for exploring crown jewel nature preserves... or historical sites that largely celebrate the feats of white males. (ibid.)

The warning here is that not only are changing cultural patterns of outdoor use occurring, but the demographic shift also means that cultural sites can no longer portray the dominant history and expect to attract their traditional numbers of visitors. Wilkinson does a skillful job of illuminating the somewhat overlapping theories that exist in analyzing minority underrepresentation. The first focuses on the idea that minorities don’t hold national park traditions reaffirmed by childhood experiences, and also, along with most urban dwellers, hold a “very different set of conservation values” (ibid.). Contrary to typical demographics decades ago, 80% of Americans – including the majority of new immigrants and minority groups – live in cities. And this trend is likely to continue. “Statistics indicate that by the year 2020, ninety percent of the population will live in 13 metropolitan centers... these city folks will have little or no understanding of their responsibility to protect and preserve our natural and cultural values” (Mott 1991: 6). Roger Kennedy, former National Park Service director, argues that “providing accessible,

affordable experiences in parks near urban areas" (Wilkinson 1999: 3) should be a priority along with making the large, natural parks an attractive destination.

Yet, Wilkinson points out, connecting to minorities culturally, not just making it easier to get to parks, is key to attracting them to sites in the national park system. Roger Rivera, founder of the National Hispanic Environmental Council, argues that "There are many middle-class [minorities] who have the money to travel to parks, but they don't do it" (ibid.). Audrey Peterman, who publishes a newsletter about national parks for African-American subscribers, says that "African-Americans still do not view national parks as touchstones that represent their own heritage" (ibid.). Including culturally relevant sites does not guarantee diverse visitation; the site that encompasses the birthplace, church, and grave of the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., draws many Caucasians and far fewer African-Americans. However, adding sites to the national park system that celebrate a certain culture, coupled with "proactive efforts in the communities to tell people these places are yours, you own them, too" (ibid.) may provide the impetus for minority visitation. These different concerns are reflected in Stanton's three main diversification strategies as described in this article: adding more parks and cultural sites to reflect a wider range of ethnic interests, expanding diversity in the workforce that "has been accused of being 'lily white'" (ibid.), and increasing visitor diversity by making overtures to urban inhabitants.

The National Parks and Conservation Association's (NPCA) report on the *Mosaic in Motion* conference, though perhaps less objective than the two articles above, outlines not only the diversification goals of the National Park Service, but also preliminary conclusions on the barriers that have "separated people of color from our national parks"

(National Parks and Conservation Association: 1999). The conference report contains a brief overview of topics that were covered, including National Park Service culture, the role of minority educational institutions and community groups, and the benefits of NPS-minority groups alliances. These lead to preliminary findings that, more than the two former articles, focus on cultural differences rather than demographics or accessibility. Conference participants characterized the National Park Service culture as exclusive; many people of color related experiences that left them feeling isolated and separate from the agency and its ideals. The report asserts that it is this culture of the National Park Service that affects diversity in hiring, partnerships, and visitation.

Rather than the conference report itself, however, it is the participant comments that are the most engaging. Many of them highlighted what I would consider conflictual or weak points in the theories behind the agency's concerted approach to diversity, and proved that a deeper discussion of diversification is occurring, beyond what is implied in many National Park Service distributions. For example, one participant said, "I am disappointed that only groups reflecting race were present. Where were women, youth, homosexual and disabled groups?" (ibid.) As in the Fort Vancouver interviews, a wide definition of diversity is described that applies to multiple groups. At the site in fact, several employees and volunteers argued that the National Park Service's diversity strategies are overly segmented, and that more attention should be given to outreach and accessibility projects that would apply to underrepresentation in general, rather than focusing programs each time on a different category.

Two comments from conference participants emphasized theoretical complications in current understandings of diversity. "I think the two young women who

said they were multi-racial and don't belong to any 'group' were heralds of the next set of diversity/unity issues." "I wonder: How do we measure diversity? How do we declare success? Maybe we don't, maybe we create an ethic of striving for greater diversity all the time" (ibid.). These comments challenge some of the fundamental concepts of diversification in the agency: the idea that people can be categorized clearly enough to yield visitation and hiring statistics, and that progress and success can be quantified. In the interviews I asked staff and volunteers how we could measure improvements in diversity representation. No one gave concrete answers, especially as the question applied to expanding perspectives in historical interpretation. Some of the hesitation in implementing diversity programs perhaps stems from a sense that an end goal is not visible or defined.

A symposium on diversification prompted a supplement (Federal Employees News Digest 1999) to provide background on issues relating to diversity. This article provides a succinct report of the history of diversity programs – including the initial predictions that minorities and women would represent a dominant share of the available workforce, and the failings of "sensitivity training" and "politically correct behavior" – then presents four ideas that should be considered during current diversification processes. First, agencies must get a clear understanding of why diversity can improve an organization, and how managers can take advantage of employees' differences rather than allowing them to lessen cohesion. Second, awareness training is not sufficient for successful diversification; leadership and unity of the workplace community should be included in internal training schemes. Third, management of diversity is essential, and should address how the organization's operations as a whole can benefit from a diverse

workforce. Fourth, diversification strengthens, rather than threatens, the management process when decisions about methodology and application of diverse expertise remain with the managers. The return for a selective use of correct strategies is an agency that enhances almost every aspect of its operations; the article lists predictable results as including improved communication and teamwork, better allocation of time and resources, and greater customer satisfaction. Management of diversity is the main aspect of the supplement, and diversification of the workforce is presented as an inevitable part of changing demographics that may be used to the benefit of the agency.

Despite a history of welcoming special groups – including senior citizens, the disabled, and foreign visitors – to the national parks, ethnic minorities are still largely unseen at the sites their tax dollars help support (Goldsmith 1994). Statistics from two studies show that the visitation percentages are far below those of the general population: at Yosemite, African-American visitors accounted for only 4.2% of visitors, while at Grand Canyon they were only 3.5%. Latinos were low as well, Grand Canyon National Park receiving only 6.1%. However, this article moves beyond these data to investigate why, decades after policies were implemented to “boost a variety of public services and add urban sites” (ibid.: 20), the visitation imbalance still exists for the system overall. Goldsmith states that “the problem for parks is one of integration, incorporating all aspects of experience and history” (ibid.: 21), and goes on to argue that creating specialized sites, while a valuable endeavor, is not equal to offering full access to the most popular sites: the large natural parks.

Although he admits that most of the natural attractions are isolated from metropolitan population centers that best reflect the nation’s diverse demographics,

Goldsmith argues that geographic placement is not the dominant obstacle to minority visitation. A 1991 study by the Travel Industry Association found that 6 out of 10 African-Americans are travelers – a rate comparable to Caucasians – and in fact tend to take longer trips than other groups. They just don't travel to national park sites.

Goldsmith says that staffing at parks may influence visitor patterns since minorities do not see themselves mirrored in employees. However, he points out the extreme need for additional data on cultural travel and recreation patterns. Without more studies on the reasons for minority underrepresentation, “federal dollars [are in] danger of being wasted on ineffective measures” (ibid.: 22). His overall assertion, that national park diversification activities are hampered by insufficient research, is still echoed by staff and volunteers over five years later.

Another article (Gantt-Wright 1999) presents a similar argument: “the park system must reflect the changing face of America and extend an open invitation to all” (ibid.: 47). The author begins by recounting her own visit to the Sierra Nevada Mountains. Despite being accustomed to minority status as a person of color working in environmental advocacy, she says that her initial feelings of rejuvenation at the natural beauty of the site turned into fear as, all alone, she noticed that the only other people around were white men in pickup trucks with gun racks. Ashamed of that fear and her own biases that it admitted, Gantt-Wright nevertheless offers that her sense of the “proverbial stranger in a strange land” (ibid.) as a partial explanation for why national parks have traditionally drawn a white constituency. She also describes other factors that influence minority visitation: the perception that parks are not important to daily living, issues of accessibility, and the “old culture and traditions” (ibid.) of the National Park

Service. Given these barriers, how do we accomplish the goal of having the national parks and the storehouse of cultural knowledge they represent available and protected by all Americans? Gantt-Wright asserts that it will take not only the incorporation of diverse histories, cultures, and values, but also the inclusion of sites that acknowledge shameful events in the country's history as well as those we like to celebrate. Inclusion, for her, means that we cannot "allow ourselves to brush the real stories into a place of cultural amnesia" (ibid.). Though she describes specialized sites, her arguments for a holistic type of historical interpretation can be applied within a historic site as well; the use of multiple perspectives at sites like Fort Vancouver would allow awareness of both ideas simultaneously and provide an acknowledgement of the viewpoint-driven nature of history and its records.

Along these same lines Department of the Interior Deputy Secretary John Garamendi says that "one of the ways a nation defines itself is by the choices it makes in remembering its history, in how it memorializes the peoples and struggles of the past" (Garamendi 1997: 1). The idea that the national park system symbolizes America is not a new one, but the expression that it symbolizes the national self-image means that parks, as Garamendi says, "can play a major role in [the] effort" (ibid.: 2) of educating Americans about diversity issues and the process of confronting biases. Garamendi presents one of the most common descriptions of diversification: a moral responsibility that coincides with strategies that will increase visitation: "Achieving this goal will not only be good for our nation's consciousness – it will be good business" (ibid.: 3). Domestic and international visitors, the number of which is expected to increase every year, want an "authentic American experience... they want to visit the sites and places

that show not only the greatness of America's natural resources, but the greatness of our people and richness of our heritage and history" (ibid.). For Garamendi, showing this richness means portraying America as a nation of immigrants who brought many different cultural backgrounds and perspectives with them. Overcoming the current social prejudices and fulfilling the educational potential that attracts visitors both require a diversity within the system, giving the capability to fully experience diverse aspects of American tradition. However, this article does not address the fact that a large segment of the population, minority groups, are underrepresented in the visitor base despite continual diversification of the national park sites. The creation of specialized sites has not countered the extreme inequalities in client representation in the system as a whole.

Several studies have attempted to analyze changing outdoor recreation trends and correlate these to uses of the national parks (Steop 1990; Floyd 1999). Steop is notable mainly because she ties recreation participation changes to increased impacts on park resources and calls for increased communication between managers and users to mitigate these effects. In an investigation of minority uses of national sites, Floyd reviews the social science literature on racial and ethnic minority use of the parks. Floyd presents four current theories on participation differentials, and the strengths and limitations of each. In striving to make the parks offer "experiences meaningful to visitors from varied ethnic backgrounds" (U.S. Department of the Interior 1997(a): 55), it is required that the National Park Service understands the factors influencing minority visitation to and use of national parks.

The first perspective is the marginality hypothesis: minorities, historically targeted for discrimination, have limited access to socioeconomic resources which would

allow them full access to sites: income and employment status, access to transportation, and to a lesser extent educational level. The marginality hypothesis is appealing because it relies on factors that are easily quantified and for which statistical analyses can control. However, while this theory can be somewhat informative, Floyd points out its several weaknesses. While it addresses the causality of historical forces of discrimination, it neglects to incorporate the effects of current and continual prejudices. Furthermore, it is not explanatory for affluent groups that choose not to visit national parks, and it does not illuminate on-site use or experiences for minorities.

The second idea is the subcultural hypothesis; it focuses on cultural factors that form outdoor recreation activities and preferences. Differences in visitation behaviors can be attributed to diverse social norms, value systems, and socialization practices among racial and ethnic groups. The theory implies that site visitation is independent of socioeconomic characteristics. "It has been argued that the same values that attract Whites to national parks, [a sense of refuge or an escape from the urban environment], engender indifference toward parks among people of color" (Floyd 1999: 3). As in Wilkinson's article, which remarks on conservation value differentials, low visitation here is construed as a cultural practice. Although it directs deserved attention to cultural determinants, the subcultural hypothesis is not clear as to identifying and measuring (and counteracting) these influences. Specific variables that affect visitation and use are not clearly discussed, and it cannot account for intra-group diversity and actions that fall outside an ethnic pattern.

The third hypothesis is the assimilation theory, a concept that:

Greater assimilation among ethnic minorities leads to patterns of recreation similar to the majority population...it suggests that as members

of ethnic minority groups acquire cultural characteristics of the dominant culture, or affiliate with majority groups members, they will exhibit national park visitation patterns similar to those of the majority. (ibid.: 5)

Significantly, this theory suggests that minority participation in the national park system is not unquestionably positive, since it implies that ethnic distinctiveness is being lost to conformity. Moreover, it is unclear how this theory applies to non-immigrant populations; high levels of assimilation cannot be assumed to be inevitable, as they were in the past. Yet despite its association with ethnocentric assumptions, assimilation theory has several strengths: not only does it account for intra-group diversity (due to differing rates of assimilation), it also suggests quantifiable indicators of changes in cultural characteristics and patterns.

The last theory presented by Floyd is the discrimination hypothesis. As is seen in several of the previous articles as well as the Fort Vancouver interviews, contemporary discrimination, whether perceived or actual, is often cited as a cause of minority underrepresentation. "It is generally assumed that perceptions of discrimination or actual experiences... exert a negative affect on visitation... sources of discrimination arising from interpersonal interaction with other visitor groups or management personnel" (ibid.). As Floyd asserts, discrimination is widely blamed for current visitation statistics: such is implied in mentions of visitor comfort levels, the "culture" of the National Park Service, an unwelcoming and passive attitude, and other related comments.

Unfortunately, this hypothesis has been the least tested in the field.

Significant theoretical or empirical work... has yet to be conducted. In the few studies that attempt to offer insight into the relationship between minority recreation use patterns and discrimination, either substantial empirical evidence, or a comprehensive analysis of the process... is lacking. (ibid.)

Furthermore, the majority of studies – and less formal accounts – have focused on discrimination at the individual level; analyses of institutional discrimination or embedded discriminatory practices, which are potentially more informative, have been missing from the research. This theory, Floyd argues, rests largely on intuitive conclusions and experiential evidence rather than empirical studies.

Literature on Diversification of Historical Interpretation

As should be evident, the majority of articles on diversification within the national park system address diversity issues within the workforce and visitation. Expanding the representation of ethnic minorities in the staff and increasing their use of park sites is foremost in strategy discussions. There is a heavy reliance on these two aspects of diversification, while less attention has been applied to representational discrimination in historical interpretation. Several of the Fort Vancouver interviewees asserted that diversification programs, like many initiatives within the National Park Service, are designed for the large natural parks and cannot be applied equally comprehensively to historic sites; others rather cynically pointed out that diversifying interpretive programs would not generate statistical data to confirm improvement in minority representation. Though several of the articles briefly mention specialized cultural sites and their attraction for minorities, expanding the perspectives utilized in an individual site's interpretive program is a potentially more powerful approach to the same issue. Several articles, and several historic sites, have been addressing the use of

perspectives in historical interpretation; the reported successes and failures can be intensely informative to diversification processes at other sites.

The first article (Silverman 1997), while not addressing the use of minority perspectives directly, discusses the realms of experience which visitors draw upon when synthesizing interpretive experiences at historic sites. Silverman analyzes the perspective known as “meaning-making”, the belief that “understanding visitors’ frameworks and past experiences is critical to successful interpretation” (ibid.: 7). Similarly to the contrasts between the goals of linear communication and historical interpretation offered earlier, Silverman describes how visitors understand the past at historic sites, where they “bring to bear their *own* conceptions, experiences, and expectations to make sense of what they see” (ibid.: 1). The importance of this idea for interpretation is the awareness that history is inevitably conceptualized through the visitors’ own contexts, and that interpreters can capitalize on this by relating the site’s history to the perspectives or experiences of the visitor.

At Fort Vancouver, almost every interviewee vocalized the importance of matching an interpretive activity to the characteristics of the audience: age, knowledge of history, level of attention, ethnicity, native culture, etc. What this article offers beyond that simple necessity is an awareness that a successful interpretive exchange is dependent on the guide’s skill in recognizing the audience’s contexts for historic site experiences. Silverman offers three strategies for empirically driven historical interpretation, based on the schemata that form meaning for visitors. The three critical directions for interpretation are: addressing the nature of history and visitors’ associations, incorporating everyday life behaviors, and interpreting for the social nature of the site

visit. It is the first that can be the most informative for interpretation at Fort Vancouver, through Silverman's several proposals for an interactive interpretation that addresses the process of representing history itself.

"The literature about visitors' associations with and knowledge of history suggests that many people appear to feel disconnected from history, believing it has little to do with them... However, [they] generally look to sites and site personnel for guidance and information" (ibid.: 7). Given these two ideas, Silverman offers that it would be wise for interpreters to confront these feelings of indifference by investigating the nature of history, the process of representation, the presence of multiple perspectives, and the importance of historical research for modern life. All of these strategies, by encouraging the visitor to become personally involved with and critical of historical interpretation, can guide them into understanding the history-making process and how it informs everyday activities. In the future, historic sites need to "consider how to engage current visitors more effectively as well as how to attract new audiences... Interpretation must be based on a solid understanding of the nature of visitor behavior" (ibid.: 10). Strategies for historical interpretation must facilitate the internal methods by which visitors personalize the past and understand its meaning.

Due to recent and well-publicized renovations in interpretive programs, several articles have featured Colonial Williamsburg as a case study for historical interpretation diversification (Associated Press 1994; Bentley 1993; Montgomery 1994/1995; Clawson 1994/1995; Handler and Gable 1999). One specifically (Eggen 1999) succinctly presents both the positive and negative reactions that a diversification of interpretation can elicit from visitors. Colonial Williamsburg, traditionally known for its sanitized version of

history and its policy of encouraging “good vibes” with visitors (Peers 1999: 51), recently began an interpretive program called “Enslaving Virginia.” This new representation of colonial life – featuring reenactments so vivid they have prompted violent reactions from visitors who become emotionally involved – includes the history of slavery in the story, “underscoring a Revolution fought for the liberty of some, but not all” (Eggen 1999: A1). The intense responses to the program, an interactive one where visitors find themselves in various roles participating in the event, have forced Williamsburg to hold debriefing sessions after living history activities.

The new emphasis on slave perspectives has generated a wide variety of reactions, especially among African-American visitors. Some are proud that frank discussion, as well as the inclusion of shameful historical episodes, is now possible. Others are disturbed by continual images of subjugation and demeaning treatment. Williamsburg was often dismissed by minorities, who thought it had nothing to offer after witnessing the former interpretive program, but many are now revising their judgments: “I used to think, ‘Why go to Williamsburg? There’s nothing there about us.’ Now there is, even if it’s not something I’m happy about or comfortable with” (ibid.). This highlights the main difference between the reactions of visitors to the new programs: “white visitors tend to view the depictions as relics of the past while blacks draw comparisons to the present” (ibid.).

The impetus for expanding the park’s inclusion of race relations was a 1994 reenactment of a slave auction; the NAACP and Southern Christian Leadership Conference members protested its “trivialization” of African-American history, which was treated as a “trifling aside” (ibid.). Williamsburg management responded by

expanding the interpretation of slavery perspectives, and now says that most blacks have indicated they are impressed with the program, despite enduring sometimes painful emotional responses or taking issue with some of the portrayals. "As blacks, I've always felt like we had to justify ourselves as Americans, as if we hadn't contributed anything. But this shows that we did. This shows that we helped make this country what it is from the very beginning" (ibid.). Williamsburg, though experiencing controversy with its experimental interpretive programs, has made a precedent-setting move in the use of multiple perspectives and profound revision of living history philosophies.

Much attention has been given lately to revising traditional histories, targeting both scholarly publications and educational curricula. While these arguments can be helpful in increasing awareness of differing perspectives and including "unwelcome" events in historical interpretation (e.g. Coughlin 1992; Dillon 1994; Gwaltney 1995; Stuckey 1995; Glen 1997) only a few specifically addressed diversifying interpretation by utilizing minority interpreters rather than simply modifying which perspectives are shared (James 1991; La Mere 1993; Peers 1999). Peers' article addresses the use of minority perspectives in historical interpretation, focusing on First Nations and Native American interpreters at living history sites. She discusses the inclusion of minorities and their histories in the interpretive programs at five historical sites around the Great Lakes region of the United States and Canada. She examines the implications of diversification at the sites – Sainte Marie among the Hurons, Colonial Michlimackinac, the North West Company Fur Post, Old Fort William, and Lower Fort Garry – as it relates to their attempts to represent Native peoples both visually and interpretively. Lower Fort Garry has the most historical relation to Fort Vancouver, as it was an 1850s Hudson's Bay

Company provisioning post with a culturally diverse population that included Europeans, Ojibwa, Cree, and Métis. Although the five sites range in size, nationality, and temporal interpretation, all have gone through similar diversification developments and tell similar interpretations of Native peoples and cultural relations.

The sites all employ Native staff and have reconstructed Native dwellings to represent the presence and interactions of Native peoples. The priorities of interpretation now include themes of economic and political interdependence rather than “settlement” or “exploration.”

Fur trade sites focus on the existence of intermarriage between peoples, and of widespread kinship networks between European and Native communities... mission sites discuss traditional Native religious beliefs, the struggle to choose one faith over another, and the consequences of conversion. (Peers 1999: 41)

These types of emphases attempt to equalize the interpretation at sites which, like Fort Vancouver, have traditionally focused on events and perspectives of the dominant society. “Lower Fort Garry was interpreted for several decades more as a village of Scottish pioneers than as the economic and industrial hub of a multicultural community supported by the fur trade” (ibid.: 41-42). Yet revisions in historical interpretation and the field of public history have not necessarily trickled down to the population in general. “If professionals have changed the stories they tell about the past... much of the audience for these sites has not. Despite attempts to attract nontraditional audiences, these sites... continue to be visited largely by whites..., members of the dominant society” (ibid.: 42). The expectations of the visitors, influenced by the schemata mentioned by Silverman, often vary dramatically from the information that interpreters, especially if they are Native, are trying to communicate. As Peers points out, all the initial visual clues of the

sites – the palisades with the European-style architecture inside and Native-style architecture outside, bastions, cannons – remind the majority of visitors about stereotypes of the “frontier” and Hollywood westerns. More importantly, they also hint at the accompanying power structures and processes of domination. Native staff members are faced with both traditional European and popular media stereotypes which together provoke a “discourse which assumes the inferiority of Native cultures” (ibid.: 43). Peers does an exceptional job of presenting the interpretive challenges for Native interpreters, who must overcome cross-cultural dynamics set in the present while referring to the past. “Before they can deliver the historical information that they were hired to communicate, Native interpreters have to respond to this misinformation and prejudice” (ibid.: 49).

I would argue that any dedicated interpreter, to a greater or lesser degree, must perform this feat. However, Native and other minority interpreters encounter the added dimension of representing their culture to an extent that Caucasian interpreters never experience. “These people are ambassadors, not actors; they represent their communities, past and present, not just dead people” (ibid.: 47). This role, often reinforced by a sense of immediate connection to the history they portray, configures a dual requirement: fulfilling historical interpretation according to the site prospectus while simultaneously reflecting on the “continuing power of historical events to affect present-day lives” (ibid.). It is one resolution to this balancing act that led some interviewees at Fort Vancouver to report that Native interpreters at other historic sites were more concerned with their “political soapbox” than with interpreting a minority perspective of the history. As do non-Native interpreters, Natives are continually “constructing the history they present: they choose certain narratives and information and use these as historical

'ammunition' with which to 'destroy [visitors'] preconceptions" (ibid.: 52). Finding a construction that satisfies the interpreter, management, and visitors can be an intricate process; part of the necessity of a documented interpretive plan is to negotiate through some of these dilemmas.

Managers need to discuss this information with interpreters and work with them on both the historical facts they use and the narratives into which they weave these facts. History is always constructed: the histories that sites used to tell, which downplayed or omitted Native peoples and their roles and experiences, were just as problematic as those that result from Native interpreters sometimes overcorrecting visitors' assumptions about colonial superiority and Native inferiority. (ibid.: 53)

Peers' article, given the difficulties and tentative solutions she presents, can be extremely beneficial to sites like Fort Vancouver as they diversify within their interpretive programs. Not only does she list potential interpretive themes that include multiple perspectives, but Peers also describes dynamics, both negative and positive, of the diversification process itself. Disputes over authenticity in historical interpretation, one of the most common aspects, are inextricably linked to contemporary issues of power and representation; tensions stemming from the combination of existing staff and "Native people who very much want to communicate their perspective but who may be distrustful of mainstream, government-sponsored institutions" (ibid.: 54) were found at every site she studied. The process is further complicated by the fact that many managers, under political pressure to diversify, are aware of questions of authority and so are reluctant to challenge inaccurate information given by Native interpreters or partners. She acknowledges that forming relationships with local Native groups can be a difficult and long-term process for a historic site. Interestingly, she implies that Native interpreters on staff, and the resulting inclusive interpretation, was not necessarily attracting more Native

visitors to the sites. Yet despite all these challenges, the historic sites she studied have made progress towards diversifying their interpretive perspectives and educating visitors about cross-cultural representation. The most important lesson from this article is that differing perspectives “will not always mesh neatly”, but that historic sites can, and perhaps should, be used as “forums for discourse between peoples who hold different views on the past” (ibid.: 58).

These articles together provide precedents for diversification at historic sites; the successes and failures of their experiments can deeply inform actions at Fort Vancouver. It is especially important that the “best practices” of interpretation diversification at other sites be widely shared, since this arena is not currently among the most visible efforts within National Park Service diversity promotion programs. Although several sites within the national park system and Parks Canada are attempting to expand the perspectives utilized for interpretation, the current lack of communication between site management on these topics means that many are “reinventing” each stage of diversification, and neglecting to utilize available data. This is not to assume that there will be a single strategy that can be applied to all historic sites; on the contrary, improving representation in historical interpretation is an elusive process not easily conquered or measured, and one that is utterly dependent on local circumstances. But among sites there are certain consistencies that would make a shared discourse advantageous.

Comparison with Fort Vancouver National Historic Site

Fort Vancouver, while it could potentially gain much from literature on diversification at other historic sites, also contends with some unique, situational aspects. Fort Vancouver, because of the extent of its economic influence and its geographic position, grew to become a site of unparalleled cultural and ethnic diversity. The ultimate challenge for its interpretive program will be expanding minority representation in site history while retaining the clarity of the overall message. Additionally, National Park Service diversity strategies are often patriotic in theme – featuring phrases such as “reflect the face of America”, “diversity that comprises the nation’s population” – and the British Fort Vancouver can have trouble fitting in with these messages. One current suggestion for an advertising campaign designed for outreach to minority groups carries the slogan “Experience Your America.” Though Fort Vancouver’s effect on regional culture and settlement was extensive, and its status as a national historic site reflects this, some staff members feel that the site’s uniqueness as a British holding leads to an ironic dischord with campaigns based on patriotic feeling. This is compounded by the fact that the peak of its power, and the temporal interpretive focus, was the year 1845, during which the Hudson’s Bay Company worked to undermined all American competition and stationed a sloop-of-war in the Columbia River. It would be interesting to see how other British or Canadian fur trading posts in America are responding to such initiatives.

Amongst both general and site-specific challenges, Fort Vancouver has slowly made progress towards diversification. Though far from the level of diversity in interpretation portrayed at other sites, such as those outlined in Peers’ article, many at the site are dedicated to diversification and an awareness of the responsibilities it entails.

Over the past few years, staff and volunteers have initiated programs and literature designed to increase the awareness of minority populations historically and diverse perspectives on the fort's history.

Cooperative projects with the local Hawaiian community have yielded a wayside exhibit detailing the story of Kanaka Village and Hawaiian employees of the Hudson's Bay Company, several lectures on Hawaiian immigration to the Pacific Northwest, and a traditional hula demonstration at the General O.O. Howard House. Similarly, a monument to the three Japanese sailors who were brought to Fort Vancouver was erected near the site visitor center where Japanese boy scouts hold a ceremony semi-annually to honor the men. Probably the most comprehensive of the strategies has been the series of cultural demonstrations and evening programs, which feature topics related to the diversity of the site and social issues. Titles from the past season include: "Songs of Old Hawaii and Fort Vancouver", "*La vie et les chansons des voyageurs*" (The Life and Songs of the Voyageurs), "Chinook Jargon, Language of the Fur Trade", "Children's Games of the 1840s", "Reverend and Mrs. Gary, American Missionaries", and "*A la façon du pays*" (In the Fashion of the Country). The advantage of these programs is that the presenter is allowed a great amount of flexibility in preparation and interpretation. For example, two Hawaiian men from the local community designed the demonstration of Hawaiian music, and received very little staff guidance on how they should interpret the history of Hawaiian immigration to Fort Vancouver. Their portrayal of the motivations for employment contracts and the voyage to the mainland was quite different from a traditional historian, and the audience received a perspective not usually offered.

Fort Vancouver has utilized written documents to expand diversification in interpretation, and their response to diverse audiences, as well. As mentioned before, a bilingual pamphlet explaining the Hudson's Bay Company – Russian American Company trading associations was handed out at a ceremony for the Chkalov monument to the first trans-polar flight. An article featuring men of African descent was distributed for Black History Month, which included James Douglas, a Chief Factor of Fort Vancouver and Governor of British Columbia, and York, the slave of William Clark. However, this action proved controversial since Douglas, though historically called "Black Douglas", was likely only a quarter African, born in British Guiana of a Creole mother and a Scottish father; the pamphlet refers to him as a "black man" and a "man of color" and neglects to mention the ethnicity of his father. Other projects in the near future include producing transcripts of all standard presentations, and expanding the translations of the park brochure, now available in Japanese and Russian.

What is lacking at Fort Vancouver, as in the literature on diversification within the national park system, is a comprehensive diversity strategy that explicitly admits the extreme interdependence of the three areas of historical interpretation, visitor services, and workforce management. To me there is an implied promise within the diversity promotion programs, not supported by actions, that minorities on staff and as visitors will mean the inclusion of their perspectives in interpretive activities. It is irresponsible to diversify in the other two arenas – visitor services and workforce management – without complementarily utilizing multiple interpretive perspectives at each site. Indeed, without simultaneous diversification the success of related diversity initiatives will be limited and the potential of the three areas to be mutually supportive will be lost.

Theoretical Foundations of Differentials in Historical Interpretation

Diversification of historical interpretation programs requires, above all, an awareness of the biases and obstacles that hinder an inclusive version of history. The use of multiple perspectives, especially those of minority groups, traditionally has not been a widespread practice; most sites have relied on narrow perceptions of “facts” that spread unquestioned from the historical record to contemporary educational programs. The bias of the historical record is a coy one. Though it has certain consistencies that have been typically described as a perspective of the white male (as long as he’s wealthy), a deeper analysis set in a cultural and temporal context can be informative. While the literature on historical interpretation describes the dangers of depending on a single perspective and presents methods by which one may alleviate biases, there are few studies that investigate the philosophies with which these men, the authors of the historical record, were entering the Pacific Northwest.

The philosophies prevalent in 19th century Europe, and especially in Great Britain, unerringly had an effect on the men who formed the management of the Hudson’s Bay Company fur trade industry. The officers, the literate minority who left the first-hand accounts on which historians have traditionally relied, were most often educated in Great Britain, regardless of their place of birth. A British education was a way for upper class families to prepare their sons for employment in the higher ranks of an enterprise. This practice was inevitable for several reasons: not only were European educations highly regarded, but there were no competing institutions anywhere in the fur lands. With the majority of the officers educated in Great Britain and the governing body based in London, the Hudson’s Bay Company was very much a British economic power.

Fort Vancouver was, in many important ways, a Little Britain in the Pacific Northwest. This is not to imply that the Hudson's Bay Company did not adapt to their surroundings – their phenomenal success across the continent depended on this adaptability – but that the way in which the Company's representatives viewed the world relied on British rather than New World philosophies. Their methods of representation and patterns of colonization – for settlement in the Northwest was colonization under economic flags – were formed by Great Britain and imported to the Pacific Northwest, as they had been elsewhere in the world. Furthermore, these specific viewpoints were inherited via the historical record to plague later diversification attempts.

The lack of minority perspectives is a phenomenon that rests on an abstract framework of issues related to power and representation. The structuring of history, an active though perhaps unconscious process, is a privilege that belongs to the dominant group. Formation of a one-sided history – what I am calling here a colonial mentality – capitalizes on the dominance inherently gained through configuring the representations of others. Britain in the 19th century was a culture characterized by several philosophical concepts that affected the way its power was produced and practiced. Its unprecedented colonial domination was created through acts of representation and definition: hegemonic creations of the “Other” that were accepted, at least by the dominant group, as true and accurate descriptions. The governing body of the fur trade was educated in a reality characterized by three cultural ideologies. The first, later termed Orientalism as it applied to the East, was “a style of thought based upon on ontological and epistemological distinction made between ‘the Orient’ and... ‘the Occident’” that allowed “European culture [to] gain in strength and identity by setting itself off against the Orient as a sort of

surrogate and even underground self" (Said 1979: 2-3). The second was the idea that classification and order were necessities for civilization. A dependence on classifying others was not a new urge in the 19th century, but it was coupled by the dominant class, arguably to an unprecedented extent, with productions and behaviors of power. The third was a belief in the rehabilitating, moral effects of discipline as opposed to older forms of punishment. The colonial structure, as well as more mundane forms of settlement, is directly related to Europe's elaboration of modern forms of "knowing" through representation and a reliance on sustained order as the prime characteristic of civilization.

European Philosophies of Power in the 19th Century

The climate of Great Britain in the 19th century was ideal for the creation and maturation of a discourse dependent on representations of the "Other." While it culminated in Orientalist thought, the same type of construction was also applied to other subordinate worlds. The analysis of the European bourgeois' depiction of the poor in his own country, presented by Stallybrass and White in *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression*, illuminates the social background of the fur trade officers and the ingrained meanings they later applied to the "poor" of the New World: Native Americans, Métis, and other minority groups employed as Company laborers. The rising bourgeoisie, using a particular talent, established a fictive description of the country's poor that functioned, specifically in its exclusions, as their own self-definition. "In the slum, the bourgeois spectator surveyed and classified *his own antithesis*" (Stallybrass and White 1986: 128; emphasis in original). The root of the formulated dichotomy was

distrust and a lack of understanding, which created an intense desire to separate one's bourgeois self from the subject of representation.

In the nineteenth century that fear of differences... was articulated above all through the 'body' of the city: through the separations and interpenetrations of the suburb and the slum, of grand buildings and the sewer, of the respectable classes and the lumpenproletariat. (ibid.: 125)

The physical distinctness that promotes the division between classes, and the manner in which they interrelate, resonates in the New World as the palisade wall. The stockade "protects" its inhabitants, since the flow of people and goods can be regulated through physical control. The Village could overlap with storehouses and riverside necessities, but never with the domestic dwellings or offices of Company managers.

All of the sites... have a palisade or outer wall, all have European-looking buildings inside the wall and Native areas outside the wall; all have props that visitors associate with pioneer life... they tend not to see the site as representing 'the multicultural fur trade'... but rather as the frontier... Our image of the frontier contains within it a set of power structures: it was a place of... the necessary conquest of wilderness and savages to establish European civilization, and it was dominated by whites. (Peers 1999: 42-43)

The construction for Orientalism was begun in this climate, in the urban centers where the bourgeoisie sought to strengthen their own position and identity with a hegemony that firmly placed the poor classes in the lower social strata and solidified their subordinate status.

As the bourgeoisie produced new forms of regulation and prohibition governing their own bodies, they wrote ever more loquaciously of the Other – of the city's 'scum'... The body of the Other produced contradictory responses. Certainly it was to be *surveyed*... At the same time, new forms of propriety must penetrate and subjugate the recalcitrant body. (Stallybrass and White 1986: 126; emphasis in original)

The dominant class regarded the poor as less-than-human, as a contradictory source of both contempt and fascination. Above all, they were a potential threat to the

status quo of the bourgeoisie that must be controlled through bodily discipline and constant observation. The upper realms of society, moral goodness, and hygiene were commonly invoked to describe and support one another in a metaphoric language. The conditions of the poor – described as “dirt” – were taken as proof of their degradation, but also potential deviance from acceptable norms and susceptibility to disease. Moreover, the poor were choosing to exist in such circumstances; without intervention they would remain in such an uncivilized state. Among fur trade employees, these notions were translated into ideas of attractiveness related to literal and symbolic cleanliness. A Native woman, before joining an employee in a marriage *à la façon du pays*, was scrubbed and redressed by women of the fort.

It became customary for a new Indian bride to go through a cleansing ritual performed by the other women of the fort, which was designed to render her more pleasing to the white man. She was scoured of grease and paint and her leather garments were exchanged for those of a more European style. (Van Kirk 1980: 37)

The poor were regarded with a mixture of disgust and responsibility, and therefore the bourgeoisie regarded it as a duty to administer to and sanitize the slums of the city. Since this was impossible so long as the poor were invisible and anonymous, the efforts of the dominant class turned to making the residents of the slum visible and subjecting them to an ever-present gaze. This done, it was easier to discipline them into an ideal state of being, namely one similar to that of the middle classes. “The ‘labouring’ ... classes would be transformed , it was implied, once they became visible... there was undoubtedly an increased categorization and surveillance of the ‘unrespectable’ poor” (Stallybrass and White 1986: 135).

This same cultural period was one in which, Foucault argues, modern discipline came into its fullest power. The centralization of visibility, and of segregation, in the value system of the bourgeois society led to the formation of panoptic methods of domination.

Hence the major effect of the Panopticon: to induce in the inmate a state of conscious and permanent visibility that assures the automatic functioning of power... it is not that the beautiful totality of the individual is... altered by our social order, it is rather that the individual is carefully fabricated within it, according to a whole technique of forces and bodies. (Foucault 1977: 201)

Discipline shifted to be coercive rather than punishing, an automatic operation of power that ideally resulted in an internalization of society's morals. However, the "transgressor" is never actively involved in the discourse; he is the only the recipient of parameters given by the middle class which are based on their representation of him. These modern styles of domination were not only found in prisons applied to criminals; they became located in the entire structure of enforcement of segregation and disciplinary power: hospitals, schools, factories, and military installations. The structure became inseparable from the European way of conceiving the world, and acting within it. The British colonial enterprises reproduced the paradoxical philosophies of this structure. The construction of opposites that characterizes Orientalism, the value systems of the bourgeoisie and the poor that were designed to be mutually exclusive, and the notions of the "gaze" as essential to discipline all contributed to the peculiar way in which Britain approached foreign parts of the world. Conceptually, the "uncivilized" were equated with the "poor" from home. Those in the lower ranks of the Company, ethnic minorities, were subject to the same mechanisms of power as the poor in England: representation by others, rigid classification and a spatial arrangement that reinforced their subordinate

status, and rehabilitating doses of discipline should the hegemony be threatened. In an economic enterprise, it is never a coincidence when employment rank and ethnicity coincide as they do, with a few outstanding exceptions, in the Hudson's Bay Company.

The Great Exhibitions and the Meaning of Reality

This convoluted intellectual composition is seen most obviously in the exhibitions that soared in popularity during this time period. The concept that the world and its peoples could be rendered up to the view of the white male, for discovery and appropriation, created a method of representation that was translated as actuality. Modern forms of representation, where the distance between the symbol and the symbolized is so unrecognized it becomes meaningless, became crystallized in the assumed realism of the 19th century exhibits. The Great Exhibition of 1851, in London, presented its six million visitors with a panorama of the development of mankind in the Crystal Palace, reflecting the organization of many contemporary European museums. Artifacts and souvenirs were gathered from all over the world and organized in their "proper" order, allowing the objects to assert Europe's geo-historical sequences of cultural evolution. It is not hard to guess where European culture was positioned, and where various indigenous cultures fell.

The Exhibition forced some to think about the origins and progress of the civilization it epitomized. Much in the Crystal Palace encouraged speculation of a more specific sort: the overall system of classification... the character of the different national exhibits, which led one along a line of progress from the Tasmanian savage through the 'barbaric' civilizations of the East, northwest across the European continent toward an apex in Great Britain... The classic works of British sociocultural evolutionism... if one were to encapsulate in a phrase their most general contextual definition, one could do worse than to describe these works as an attempt

to understand the cultural experience symbolized by the Crystal Palace.
(Stocking 1987: 5-6)

The significance of exhibits such as these is that they were interpreted as truisms; Europe really had surpassed foreign lands to a pinnacle of “progress.” Those who went to the exhibitions witnessed an entire “machinery of representation” which laid out foreign scenes in a ordered and sensible manner. With their realistic presentations and detached viewpoints, these exhibitions were more than a quirky pastime; they essentialized philosophies of the European nations, who looked outward with a similar gaze. “World exhibition here referred not to an exhibition of the world but to the world conceived and grasped as though it were an exhibition” (Mitchell 1988: 13). Reality presented itself as a display. The colonial enterprise – coming from a Britain where, as described before, distinctions were founded on oppositions, internalized discipline was the hallmark of civilization, and representations meant knowledge – moved to establish this brand of meaning on its territories. The techniques of settlement promoted by the London headquarters of the Hudson’s Bay Company and the higher ranks of employees were formed by a culture which penetrated new notions of “knowing” into new areas.

The “Colonization” of History

These philosophies are the ones that led the fur trade industry during the era of Fort Vancouver. Though their effects are more subtle in areas of economic settlement than in formal colonies, these ideas nonetheless had a profound effect on how Britain’s presence in the Northwest was constructed. The educated men who left writings as the core of the historical record, the literate bourgeoisie, not only left their own as the

dominant voice but also bequeathed their created representation of others to be taken as truth. Current interpretive programs have uncritically inherited, as our cultural legacy, these ways of knowing that rely on majority representations of minorities. In effect, the historical record at Fort Vancouver is a product of Britain rather than of the Northwest and the site's diverse population.

This colonial bias has not only affected the "facts" used in historical interpretations, but the ways of sharing public history as well. As Peers noticed at the five sites she researched, many Native interpreters first have to struggle through the audience's stereotypes of the "Other", begun long ago and molded by the intervening centuries, before they can share their cultural perspectives. The historic site, through physical arrangement and often its neglect of social history, constantly reminds visitors of subordination and conflict. Native interpreters must, in essence, enter into a re-creation of the colonial framework and tell their story to visitors who are prone to perceiving tokenism and represent the powers of the dominant worldview. No wonder, as Peers writes, it appears exhausting.

Some researchers have concluded that this worldview, strengthened by a survival of Orientalist tendencies, is irreversible. "Joan Laxson, who interviewed tourists at Native... sites in the Southwest, concluded that 'stereotypic beliefs are too strong, and tourist encounters and museum visits too short, to lead to any real challenge to the worldview of many'" (Peers 1999: 56). However, Peers asserts that Laxson's work, along with that of John Urry who describes the "tourist gaze" and the way in which tourists tend to read their own cultural meanings into their experiences, "denies the agency of Native people, and misses the potential for this gaze to be interrupted or returned by those

who are gazed upon” (ibid.: 57). Contrary to exhibits which represent the world for the gaze of the European, incorporating minority interpreters into programs at historic sites dissolves their passive status.

Fundamentally, the bias present in the historical record is one transmitted from the views and structures of Britain in the 19th century, its perpetuation justified by trappings of truth. The historical record was written by men who were British, by birth or education, and who brought British techniques of power to the Pacific Northwest. Since the privileged position of this history relies heavily on its reputation as “reality”, contemporary attempts to modify interpretations of the historical record often fall back on moral rationalizations. Diversifying historical interpretation is not a moral action, but rather should be regarded as a critical, intellectual endeavor that considers the historical record from outside its cultural and temporal boundaries.

Recommendations for Diversification at Fort Vancouver

These recommendations, though strongly informed by the Fort Vancouver interviews, come from my own analysis of the needs at the site. I have tried to keep them general, since an overarching diversification scheme has yet to be composed for the site, and focusing on specifics could endanger the creation of a comprehensive plan.

Diversification is a vulnerable process that requires cooperation, respect, and sometimes a good-natured sense of humor. It has infinite advantages to offer if successfully initiated and managed, especially to a site like Fort Vancouver which has the responsibility of interpreting a rich historical diversity. The full potential of the site will not be achieved until simultaneous diversification in historical interpretation, visitor services, and workforce management allows an inclusive system of representation and response.

General Recommendations

- Compose a diversity strategy that incorporates the three interdependent areas of historical interpretation, visitor services, and workforce management, and include it within the new General Management Plan. For concerted and successful diversification efforts, it is essential that a plan be treated as standard policy.
- Outline diversification goals for each fiscal year, both for the site overall and each individual staff member, and incorporate these into the annual evaluation process. This will increase personal accountability and investment in diversification projects. The goals should encourage interdivisional and cooperative work.
- Increase outreach and response to diverse audiences as visitors, potential staff or volunteers, and community partners; strenuously recruit minorities to become involved in the site's activities. This could include, for example, a board of community members that aid the park in diversification efforts.

- Create a folder of diversification references and resources for use by staff and volunteers. Increased communication about experiences at other sites can only benefit Fort Vancouver's actions, and management here should proactively contact other parks to promote discussion of diversity issues. In addition, representatives of parks who have set precedents in diversification could be invited to the park as guest speakers.

Historical Interpretation Recommendations

- Guidelines should be composed that create standards for all interpretive activities by staff and volunteers. These should include not only evaluatory criteria, but also expectations of an inclusive interpretive program that utilizes multiple perspectives and sophisticated living history techniques. The guidelines should also, minimally, state the site policy on cultural rights to perspectives and living history portrayals.
- Continual training, based on these interpretive guidelines, should occur to assure consistency and distribution of new research data. It should also include cross-cultural communication topics, adaptive interpretation strategies, and critical researching skills. Another possibility would be recurrent, facilitated discussion groups focused on a single diversification issue.
- A complete reassessment of the required reading list should be undertaken. For many sources, excerpts should be extracted and compiled for easy reference. Interpreters should be encouraged to augment with diverse resources, including ethnographic materials and cultural studies, personal letters, period literature, theses and dissertations, and oral tradition.
- Outreach for the interpretive program should be coordinated by one staff member, whose responsibilities would include increasing participation by local community groups, universities, and professional organizations. Recruitment for interpretive volunteers should emphasize minority groups.
- The curatorial facility, conducted as a research center of material culture, could function as a significant tool for interpretive research on minority peoples. Complementarily, archaeological excavations and analysis should be increased, especially in areas outside the fort proper.
- Reconstruction of buildings and the cultural landscape should be a priority, giving priority to Kanaka Village, the Owyhee Church, and other areas which were primarily associated with the lower classes. The reconstructions must be used to support interpretive purposes; they should not exist for more mundane reasons.

Visitor Services Recommendations

- A visitor survey, written internally to enhance its relevance to Fort Vancouver specifically, should be conducted at a variety of times throughout the year. Reliable, updated data is essential to improvements in visitor services.
- The site overall should increase its accountability to its clients and rely on its status as a public service agency. It should offer a responsive, flexible approach to diverse visitors and their needs, including limited multilingualism.
- Outreach should increase, especially targeted at groups that are currently underrepresented in the visitor base. Diverse media sources, off-site presentations, and specialized interpretive activities can reach diverse audiences and invite emotional investment in the site.
- The site should fully engage the potential of the Internet: web pages should be designed to visually and intellectually attract visitors, and inform them as to current events and research at the site.
- Services to international visitors, who do pay entrance fees, should not be a second priority. Principles of stewardship and protection, as well as research enquiries, do not conform to national boundaries.

Workforce Management Recommendations

- Staff should inform themselves as to the nature and use of hiring authorities, as well as the consequences for abuse. Management should be available for inquiries and clarifications.
- All staff should be trained in cross-cultural communication and participate in community-building activities. Successful diversification of the Fort Vancouver workforce will require a more cooperative spirit than is currently present.
- The site should proactively recruit minorities, both for the workforce and the volunteer program. Despite the protests recorded in the interviews, skilled minority interpreters have unique perspectives and approaches to offer.
- The Interpretation & Resource Management division should be reorganized to lessen overlap and inefficiency in job duties; job boundaries overall should be more clearly defined. Simultaneously, managers should be flexible enough to allow staff members to capitalize on their talents despite limiting position descriptions.

Bibliography

1. Associated Press. 1994. "Colonial Slave Auction Re-enactment Moves Some to Tears, Angers Others". *The Plain Dealer*, October 11.
2. Bentley, Rosalind. 1993. "Changing the Face of Colonial Williamsburg: Presence of Slaves No Longer Ignored". *Star Tribune*, June 20: 1G-2G.
3. Clausen, Michelle Carr. 1994-1995. "In a Different Tongue". *Colonial Williamsburg*, Winter: 32-33.
4. Cogswell, Marilee and Nancy Hori, compilers. 1986. Legislative History for Fort Vancouver National Historic Site: 64th Congress through 96th Congress Vol. I. National Park Service, Pacific Northwest Regional Library, Seattle, WA.
5. Cook vs. Babbitt. 819 F.Supp. 1 (D.D.C. 1993).
6. Cook, Michael. 1995. "Race and Gender Blind Interpretation at MHS Historic Sites". Unpublished manuscript.
7. Coughlin, Ellen K. 1992. "Scholars Confront Fundamental Question: Which Vision of American Should Prevail? Multiculturalism Issue Draws Historians into Debates Over Framing the Nation's Past". *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 29: A8.
8. Curtis, Mary. 1999. "Park Service Weighs Diversity Issues". *The Oregonian*, January 18: A13.
9. Dillon, Costa. 1994. "Interpretation Myths and Misconceptions of U. S. History". *Legacy*, 5 (1): 10-11.
10. Eggen, Dan. 1999. "In Williamsburg, the Painful Reality of Slavery". *Washington Post*, July 7: A1.
11. Erigeron, Patricia C. 1992. Cultural Landscape Report: Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, Vol. II. National Park Service, Cultural Resources Division, Pacific Northwest Region, Seattle, WA.
12. Federal Employees News Digest. 1999. "Leading Diversity in the New Millenium: Orlando Symposium Highlights Ways to Improve Agency Operations". *Federal Employees News Digest*, February 8: 1.
13. Fitzgibbon, Joe. 1998. "Ukrainian Refugees Settle in, Take on American Dream". *The Oregonian*, February 27: B02.

14. Floyd, Myron. 1999. "Race, Ethnicity, and Use of the National Park System". *Social Science Research Review*, 1 (2): 1-24.
15. Fort Vancouver National Historic Site. 1998. Strategic Plan and Annual Performance Plan, Fiscal Year 1998. National Park Service, Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, Vancouver, WA.
16. Foucault, Michel. 1977. Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison. Vintage Books, Random House, Inc., New York, NY.
17. Gantt-Wright, Iantha. 1999. "Breaking Barriers". *National Parks*, 73 (1): 47.
18. Garamendi, John. 1997. "Parks: Preserving and Remembering Our Heritage of Diversity". California Roundtable on Recreation, Parks, and Tourism, Angel Island, CA.
19. Glen, Michael H. 1997. "Tackling Taboos: The Interpretation of Crime, Strife, Belief, and Relief". *Legacy*, 8 (2): 18-28.
20. Goldsmith, Jack. 1994. "Designing for Diversity". *National Parks*, 68 (5-6): 20-21.
21. Grater, Russell K. 1976. The Interpreter's Handbook. Southwest Parks and Monuments Association.
22. Gwaltney, William W. 1995. "Interpreting Diversity, Diversifying Interpretation". *Legacy*, 6 (6): 4-5.
23. Handler, Richard and Eric Gable. 1999. The New History in an Old Museum: Creating the Past at Colonial Williamsburg. Duke University Press, Durham and London.
24. Hussey, John A. 197- The Fort Vancouver Farm. National Park Service manuscript, Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, Vancouver, WA.
25. James, Katherine. 1991. "Increasing Racial Diversity: a Philosophy for Change". *Legacy*, 2 (5): 16-19.
26. La Mere, Karen. 1993. "American Indian Interpretation from an Indian Perspective". *Legacy*, 4 (2): 22-24.
27. Lee, M. E., D. R. Field, and G. Baker. 1986. 1986 Fort Vancouver Visitor Study. National Park Service, Cooperative Park Studies Unit, College of Forestry, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR.
28. Mitchell, Timothy. 1988. Colonising Egypt. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire, UK.

29. Montgomery, Dennis. 1994-1995. "Resolving Good and Evil at the History Forum: Audience Takes a Guided Tour Through Ideas and Beliefs of Early America". *Colonial Williamsburg*, Winter: 72-75.
30. Morrison, Dorothy Nafus. 1999. Outpost: John McLoughlin and the Far Northwest. Oregon Historical Society Press, Portland, OR.
31. Mott, William Penn. 1991. "The Future of Interpretation". *Legacy*, 2 (6): 6-7.
32. National Parks and Conservation Association. 1999. "A Step Forward at the Mosaic in Motion Conference". Available at <http://www.npca.org/home/npca/dvrsconf/confinfo.html>.
33. Peers, Laura. 1999. "'Playing Ourselves': First Nations and Native American Interpreters at Living History Sites". *The Public Historian*, 21 (4): 39-59.
34. Pierce, Richard A and John H. Winslow, eds. 1979. H.M.S. Sulphur on the Northwest and California Coasts, 1837 and 1839: The Accounts of Captain Edward Belcher and Midshipman Francis Guillemard Simpkinson. Limestone Press, Ontario, Canada.
35. Ruddell, Edward J. and Carol G. Ruddell. 1991. "Some Perceptions and Misperceptions About Cognitive Abilities of Hearing-Impaired Students: Implications for Park Interpreters". *Legacy*, 2 (5): 14-19.
36. Said, Edward W. 1979. Orientalism. Vintage Books, Random House, Inc., New York, NY.
37. Silverman, Lois H. 1997. "Personalizing the Past: A Review of Literature with Implications for Historical Interpretation". *Journal of Interpretation Research*, 2 (1): 1-12.
38. Simpson, Sir George. 1847. An Overland Journey Round the World, During the Years 1841 and 1842. Lea and Blanchard, Philadelphia, PA.
39. Sisto, Tony. 1999. Personal communication.
40. Stallybrass, Peter and Allon White. 1986. The Politics and Poetics of Transgression. Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY.
41. Stanton, Robert. 1999. "Diversity in the National Park Service". Washington, DC. Available at <http://www.cr.nps.gov/history/divst.htm>.
42. Steop, Gail A. Vander. 1990. "Interpreters, It's Time to Sit at the Loom and Weave". *Legacy*, 1 (2): 21-30.

43. Stocking, George W. 1987. Victorian Anthropology. The Free Press, MacMillan, Inc., New York, NY.
44. Stuckey, Michael. 1995. "Interpreting Controversial Issues: Sensitivity and Awareness". *Legacy*, 6 (5): 12-14.
45. Thornton, Melanie P. 1997. "Breaking the Sound Barrier: Communicating Effectively with Visitors Who are Deaf or Hard of Hearing". *Legacy*, 8 (4): 10-13.
46. U.S. Department of the Interior. 1978. Master Plan: Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, Washington. National Park Service, Washington, DC.
47. U.S. Department of the Interior. 1985. Interpretive Prospectus: Fort Vancouver National Historic Site. National Park Service, Division of Interpretive Planning, Harpers Ferry Center, Harpers Ferry, WV.
48. U.S. Department of the Interior. 1988. Management Policies. National Park Service, Washington, DC.
49. U.S. Department of the Interior. 1997(a). National Park Service 1997 Strategic Plan. U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, DC. Available at <http://www.nps.gov/planning/sp>.
50. U.S. Department of the Interior. 1997(b). Strategic Plan for Improving Diversity. U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, DC. Available as 98doi_strategic_plan.pdf at <http://www.doi.gov>.
51. U.S. Department of the Interior. 1998. Strategic Plan for Diversity in the Pacific West Region. National Park Service, San Francisco, CA.
52. U.S. Department of the Interior. 1999. Vancouver National Historic Reserve: Cooperative Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement. National Park Service, Denver Service Center, Denver, CO.
53. Van Kirk, Sylvia. 1980. Many Tender Ties: Women in Fur Trade Society, 1670-1870. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman, OK.
54. Warner, Mikell de Lores Wormell and Harriet Duncan Munnick. 1972. Catholic Church Records of the Pacific Northwest: Vancouver, Volumes I & II, and Stellamaris Mission. French Prairie Press, St. Paul, Oregon.
55. Wilkinson, Todd. 1999. "Attracting Minorities to National Parks". *Christian Science Monitor*, February 1: 3.
56. Willoughby, Brian. 1996. "Russian Radio? Local Immigrants Hope to Start Foreign-Language Program". *The Columbian*, May 27: 1.

Appendix

Interview Questions Included in Each Semi-Formal Interview:

Historical Interpretation:

What do you think are the unique features of this site? What makes it significant?

Do you think current interpretive talks, exhibits, etc. present an accurate picture of the cultural makeup of the site?

How could we measure such a thing?

Do you feel you have sufficient research information to draw upon when interpreting diverse cultural groups?

Do you see differing representations in the historical and archaeological records? Describe.

How does this present a challenge?

How could the interpretation of diverse groups be expanded?

Visitor Services:

How would you describe the cultural makeup of visitors to Fort Vancouver?

How many "foreign" visitors would you estimate you see each (month)?

Ask about specific groups: international; residents with minimal English ability; hearing-impaired, etc.

What would you estimate, in general, their language ability to be?

How would you describe their experiences at Fort Vancouver and the amount of knowledge they gain?

Do you think Fort Vancouver could improve the way they respond to special-needs groups?

What are some recommendations you would make for responding to such visitors?

Do you tailor your interpretive talks to your audience? How?

Do you feel prepared to respond to diverse audiences?

Training - have you been, do you want to attend, which?

Workforce Management:

How would you describe the current workplace community? What characteristics does it have?

Do you feel that the cultural makeup of a staff will affect their interaction with their audience?

Is a diverse staff desirable?

What are the strengths and weaknesses of a diverse staff?

How does the NPS promote a diverse staff, if they do at all?

Is this an advantageous or disadvantageous method?

What are some methods you would recommend using?