
The protection and maintenance of heritage in the Caribbean is characterized by an ongoing series of challenges and triumphs with the intensification of development over the past fifty years. Weighing the governmental interests of commonwealths or newly independent nations against the needs of the people is at the heart of these struggles. “Progress” versus “protection” is a common refrain when governments, NGOs, and individuals confront the pressures of development and tourism. Of particular note is the fate of archaeological sites, collections, and records, both prehistoric and historic, that represent the past of a community, town, or island. Protecting Heritage in the Caribbean provides sixteen in-depth accounts of the legislative, political, and ethical status of cultural resource management (CRM) on islands throughout the Caribbean archipelago, assessed by those working on the “frontlines” of heritage management. Organized in roughly geographical order from north to south, each chapter summarizes the current state (at the time of publication) of heritage legislation, regulatory agencies, and archaeological practice within an island or group of islands, points to the remaining challenges, and proposes suggestions for future change.

As Peter Siegel notes in the preface, there is considerable variability between the number and type of policies and their efficacy. At the broadest level of the potential safeguard of heritage resources are the governmental regulations and standards currently in place or proposed. William F. Keegan and Winston Phulgence offer an impassioned essay entitled “Patrimony or Patricide?,” rightly asserting the role of a nation’s political status in determining the presence and persistence of heritage management laws. For example, while a commonwealth of a parent nation is legally under the jurisdiction of that nation’s antiquities laws, friction can result from the implementation of these laws due to inadequate staffing, local political agendas, and lack of funding. This problem is discussed by Benoît Bérard and Christian Stouvenot for the French West Indies, Jay B. Haviser and R. Grant Gilmore III for the Netherlands Antilles, Peter E. Siegel for Puerto Rico, and Elizabeth Righter for the U.S. Virgin Islands. Thus, even with the seemingly robust laws of the United States, France, and the Netherlands,
conducting CRM remains a challenge. For independent nations such as Cuba, Jamaica, and Barbados, governments that impose regulations must choose to update previous colonial-era statutes or adopt new legislation.

Several obstacles impede progress in the implementation of effective protection for heritage resources. Regulatory agencies charged with executing cultural heritage programs face numerous challenges including disparate regions to oversee (noted by Michael P. Pateman for the Bahamas), coordination of activities across multiple bodies (discussed by Andrea Richards and Ainsley Henriques for Jamaica, and Basil A. Reid and Vel Lewis for Trinidad and Tobago) and the authority to identify, protect, and maintain areas designated as “cultural landmarks” (discussed by Richard T. Callaghan for St. Vincent and the Grenadines) or “properties of interest” (assessed by Reid and Lewis for Trinidad and Tobago). Funding is also a clear point of contention within island nations that must decide which interest groups should pay for CRM programs: developers or governments. Siegel lists ideal conditions (what he terms “wishes”) for the future of heritage protection in the Caribbean, and raises the related issue of who should conduct archaeological investigations. Potential strategies include: a single governmental body, as suggested by Kevin Farmer in his review of imminent Barbadian legislation; private consulting firms selected by the developer, as recommended by Siegel; or government-sponsored, non-profit foundations founded by enterprising individuals such as SECAR in St. Eustatius, outlined by Haviser and Gilmore. Beyond differences in each group’s approach to fieldwork, all of these options still require a significant amount of coordination between government, developer, and NGOs to ensure the protection of an island’s sites, buildings, and objects. Without the authority conferred by “robust legislation that both rewards and punishes in the name of protection” (Farmer, p. 123), and the type of practical dialogue between interest groups outlined by Keegan and Phulgence (p. 150), none of the proposed measures in any of the regulations is feasible.

This dialogue also introduces the fundamental roles of education, public involvement, and the goals of descendant communities in policy-making and preservation planning. Nearly all of the authors express concern over the lack of educational programs related to heritage studies, the continued teaching of European history in schools, and the limited employment opportunities for those who wish to pursue a career in heritage management. Clearly these limitations are integrally related to the way the past is
remembered, shared, and preserved in tangible and intangible ways. The most poignant discussion of these ethical concerns and their impact on national and communal identity is Paul E. Lewis’s chapter on heritage in St. Vincent and the Grenadines. Comparison of his essay with Callaghan’s more optimistic outline of “recent efforts” (both legislative and grassroots) on those same islands reveals that even within the activist community there are varying perspectives on the status and progress of heritage protection.

Related to questions about the public and education is the role of professional archaeologists, both local and foreign, who are directly engaged in the day-to-day struggles of identifying and maintaining heritage resources. Cogent critiques by Haviser & Gilmore and Reid & Lewis highlight the responsibilities of resident and incoming archaeologists to act as go-betweens in the complicated network of agencies, NGOs, developers, and the public. As experts in the field, their knowledge and experience can serve in negotiating for the protection of heritage and the training of future generations of local archaeologists and volunteers.

As with many current treatments of globalization, transnational migration, and development in the Caribbean, the issue of tourism and its costs is raised by a majority of the contributors to this volume. Since “tourism has become the rationale for conservation, restoration, and the protection of heritage sites” (Murphy, p. 79), some view it as a viable venture to support lobbying for further protections, while others remain wary of its unchecked expansion. With respect to heritage resources, tourism remains a double-edged sword that could be immediately beneficial to economies and areas of cultural heritage, while also producing long-term, destructive impacts on Caribbean communities and landscapes.

Given the amount of detail included in the individual chapters, this volume could have benefited from a more specific introduction outlining the archaeological focus of a majority of the essays, and a commentary or conclusion synthesizing the current status of heritage protection in addition to recommendations for the future. Nevertheless, it is a benchmark in opening dialogues between nations, scholars, and activists across the Caribbean not only about the importance of protecting heritage resources, but also about the practical realities of that protection in places where societal needs outweigh preservation of the past. It is a powerful testament to the dedication of the editors and contributors, and to all those on the “frontlines,” that a
majority of the landmark legislative actions concerning heritage resources in the Caribbean have occurred over the past ten years.
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