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At the end of the first decade of the 21st century, the 2009 ratification of the *UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage* (2001) created a turning point for maritime heritage management globally. However, in the Caribbean region on a local level many small islands are disadvantaged. Management strategies are poorly defined but even more fundamental is the absence of information on the type and nature of the resource to be managed. This thesis looks at the state of heritage management on Anguilla, a 34 mi² island in the Lesser Antilles, and the process of developing a system for heritage management where no precedent exists. Analysis is based on participant observation and the local response to two field projects, a Shipwreck Survey to record previously undocumented underwater cultural heritage in 2009, and a land-based heritage trail (2010), both of which were completed during a 2 ½ year residency on Island. The first two chapters provide critical background data into the regional and international state of heritage management, the reasons for choosing Anguilla, and the island’s maritime heritage past and present. This history sets the stage for chapter 3, which presents the results of the 2009 Shipwreck Survey. Recognizing the strengths and weaknesses of this initiative, the following two sections are devoted to recognizing the reasons why heritage management has not developed earlier and suggests future solutions. Piloting a theory for heritage management, chapter six describes the Anguilla Heritage Trail, while the following chapters describe a heritage management strategy on Anguilla for the future. This provides a practical example of how the principles of the 2001 UNESCO Convention, particularly its Annex, may be applied and realized in areas with little infrastructure and/or previous experience managing cultural resources.
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Definitions and Abbreviations Used

ANT Anguilla National Trust

**Best Practice** is to manage the resource for future generations to enjoy, to prefer non-invasive or low impact methods over outright excavation, to excavate only when conservation and curation facilities are available and when necessary infrastructure exists and is in place, to not sell or disperse original collections and to make recovered material available to the public and for study.

**Culture** is defined as traditions and customs that govern behaviour and beliefs, which are transmitted through learning. Elements of maritime culture used in this definition consist of both tangible and intangible components.

**Heritage Tourism** is travelling to experience the places and activities that authentically represent the stories and people of the past.

**Intangible Heritage** as defined in this work includes oral traditions, memories, traditional arts and rituals, languages, values, spiritual beliefs and knowledge systems.

**Local Stewardship** occurs when local people take responsibility for the well-being of the archaeological record and are responsible for its sustainable management and development.

**Maritime Heritage** is defined broadly in this thesis, to include terrestrial as well as submerged resources that may be tangible or intangible, the former composed of objects or material elements including archaeological heritage (on land and underwater) and the latter including cultural representations and manifestations such as festivals and other activities.
Figure 0-1 Location of Anguilla
Chapter 1 Maritime Heritage Management in the 21st Century: The Caribbean

With the 2001 *UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage* passing into force in 2009, it is clear that the concept of preserving underwater cultural heritage is becoming more-widely accepted, especially in the Caribbean region. In 2007 when I began my research, St Lucia was the only English-speaking Caribbean to have ratified the Convention. Six years later, it has been adopted by eight of the fourteen English and Dutch speaking countries in the Caribbean (St Lucia, Barbados, Grenada, St Kitts and Nevis, Trinidad and Tobago, St Vincent and the Grenadines, Jamaica and Antigua and Barbuda) including five in the Lesser Antilles (*Error! Reference source not found.*). In addition to these English-speaking countries, Haiti and Cuba have also ratified the Convention. The British Overseas Territories are dependent upon the United Kingdom regarding ratification, but several including the Cayman Islands, Anguilla and the Turks and Caicos Islands have adopted the Annex to the Convention in principal through the endorsement of local historical and archaeological societies. While ratification does not automatically protect and preserve UCH (especially where there is no local legislation protecting UCH), this significant movement demonstrates regional cooperation and a willingness in the region to work to improve the protection of UCH.

**Aims and Objectives**

This thesis is not a usual PhD. Its primary objectives are to 1) analyse the status of Underwater Cultural Heritage (UCH) management on Anguilla including any pre-existing systems and determine the nature of the resource and 2) initiate efforts through grass-roots projects to improve that situation ‘on the ground.’ In the process, this research raised a number of issues relating to the value of heritage, particularly on small islands. Recognizing and working in the presence of numerous challenges, this thesis adds a valuable piece to a small but growing body of literature on heritage management in the region. Research questions raised during this endeavour included:

- How does an initiative become sustainable and what are the key elements for successful, sustainable heritage management?
- How can small islands incorporate and recognize aspects of intangible heritage including non-monumental architecture and living heritage so that these are protected from the globalizing forces of encroaching development?
How can small islands sustainably apply maritime cultural heritage resources to promote heritage tourism and tourism in general to create a win-win situation where heritage and culture are protected and an island’s economy benefits?

How is the preservation of heritage representing historic injustices or poverty perceived by the public?

How can small islands use maritime cultural heritage in education to encourage national pride and stewardship?

How can small islands develop the infrastructure necessary to manage cultural heritage?

How can small islands improve heritage management by creating a system that builds institutional memory of heritage resources?

How are the experiences and views of people from small islands integral to the interpretation of these heritage resources, and how can community archaeology be encouraged locally?

How can small islands unify different aspects of maritime heritage including tangible and intangible forms of heritage located on land and under water?

What is the role of the past in the present and in the future?

The history of heritage management in the region has been largely project-based (see Leshikar-Denton 2005: 27). Archaeologists have recorded underwater sites on most if not all of the major Caribbean Islands, including Anguilla (Rodgers et. al) and nearby St. Maarten (Bequette 1996), St. Kitts and Nevis(Spooner 2005), and Eustatius (Nagelkerken 1989). This thesis contributes to knowledge of heritage management in the region in two ways. First, it provides new data on previously unrecorded underwater cultural heritage in Anguilla. Second, it provides a paradigm for other researchers in the region for engaging the community in active heritage management on a grass-roots level.
Described and promoted as ‘tranquillity wrapped in blue’ by the Anguilla Ministry of Tourism (2007), Anguilla offers a seemingly idyllic background for postgraduate research. Here, amid 16,000 permanent residents, 30 white beaches and an unknown submerged heritage, the building blocks were laid for a heritage management system. The dusty limestone roads lined with prickly pear cactus, frangipani and twisted tamarind trees seem at first incongruent with the unfinished concrete buildings, rusting rebar, and ranging goats. Powdery white sand and turquoise water complement the opulent homes of the rich and famous and gated villas ringing the coast.

On the beach between popup bars sails flutter in the breeze. The smell of ‘koal keel’ (charcoal), roasting corn, and pork ribs makes the bleached dry air friendly to the nose. Soca music and sweat mix, essential ingredients of a good ‘jam’. Hundreds of men, women, children, and a few island dogs churn the sand with expectation of the coming race. August Monday celebrates the emancipation of slaves in the British Caribbean and today Sandy Ground is alive to mark the occasion. Off the beach sailboats test the winds and waves. They return and bring the boats around, bows facing the sea. Anticipation
builds. Arching backs braced on straining lines, holding the boats while white sails fill. Each hull (28’ for Class A) is packed with village men wedged between undecked frames and sand bags packed for ballast. At a gun’s blast they cut and run, reliving an ancient competition and heritage that is felt deeply but best expressed simply. ‘The sea is in our blood.’

**What is Maritime Heritage?**

Heritage is broadly defined as a legacy, a combination of physical artefacts and intangible attributes. While history is supposedly factual heritage is interpreted, so its meaning is constantly changing. While 50 years ago, ‘heritage literature’ addressed heredity, probate laws, and taxation, today it features discussions on antiquities, roots, identity, and belonging. This shift in meaning has been accompanied by a shift in public attitude towards the past.

* A century or even 50 years ago the untramelled future was all the rage. Today we laud legacies bequeathed by has-beens. Once the term patrimony implied provincial backwardness or musty antiquarianism; now it denotes nurturance and stewardship (Lowenthal 1997: 1).

**Tangible and Intangible Components**

Maritime heritage defined in this thesis includes both fresh and salt water resources together with related sites, activities and traditions on land. Culture is defined as traditions and customs that govern behaviour and beliefs which are transmitted through learning. Elements of maritime culture used in this definition consist of both tangible and intangible components, the former composed of objects or material elements including archaeological heritage (on land and underwater) and the latter including cultural representations and manifestations such as festivals and other activities (Westerdahl 1980: 311-329; Baron 2008: 3; Westerdahl 2011: 745).

Maritime culture as defined relates to a diverse range of practices including fishing, the construction of vessels, boat racing, and beliefs about good and bad luck when navigating (Taylor 1992: LOC Website). The definition of the concept of maritime culture is used here within the framework of interaction between societies and the sea and land, and not just between societies and the sea. With this premise, communities that relate with the sea are not only coastal but also have a relationship with the surrounding land. Thus
 [...] the hinterland population that supplied the port’s subsistence requirements and the distant centralized authority [...] which controlled both the nature of the industry and the maritime trade itself. These too and more, have to be considered within the overall maritime framework (Hunter 1994: 261).

**Sea as a Social Space**

By this definition, maritime culture consists of many discourses between different associated practices (i.e. fishing, boat building) and the levels of interaction they have with the sea and land. These discourses are built around the sea as a social space, a maritime space which is not only conceived as a natural and physical space, and as a source of resources; it is also a social space, hence cultural, political, economic, and historical and as a means of communication or as a scenario of battles, etc. (Steinberg 2004: 88).

**Maritime Landscape**

These discourses are a result of interactions between societies and maritime environments including the coast, islands, and the sea itself. The term maritime cultural landscape is used to unify aspects of maritime heritage that are on land and/or underwater and which are part of the same economic system (Westerdahl 1992: 5-14, 2011: 733-62). Therefore, the maritime landscape includes a natural substratum of land and water and is not limited to what is submerged and tangible, but includes intangible social components, such as sailing routes, ports, shipbuilding, and paleoenvironmental features. These are a result of the relationship of the social groups, in diverse degrees and perspectives (political, economic, social, and cultural) with these bases and which assist in understanding the maritime cultural goods within a cultural context and not as separate entities (Firth 1995b: 1-7).

Maritime cultural heritage includes defunct dock and harbour installations, coastal defences such as estuary forts, lighthouses, dykes and tidal mills, fish traps and fishing stations, salt ponds, anchorages, careening places, ports, vessels, coastal settlements, shipbuilding sites, shipwrecks or salvage camps. The maritime heritage extends to associated traditions, be they technical, such as techniques of boat building or of handling vessels and their cargoes, or artistic, such as decorative features of ships or equipment, maritime lore or folk music, festivals celebrating the sea, as well as the underwater cultural heritage, paleontological remains and historic landscapes.

This broad definition of a unified maritime cultural heritage including terrestrial as well as submerged resources that may be tangible or intangible, and which consists of present and
past behaviour (living culture and historical/archaeological) is used throughout this thesis. Aspects of living maritime culture including boat races, boat building, fishing (with fish pots, spear guns) and social activities connected with maritime activity including festivals (Festival del Mar, Anguilla Day, Carnival) are used to illustrate the continuity and adapting relationship with the maritime environment, putting maritime cultural heritage in a social space.

**Legislative Framework for Maritime Heritage Management**

Relevant maritime cultural heritage legislation happens on a local, regional, and international level (Leshikar-Denton and Luna Erreguerena 2008). On an international level frameworks are laid out by international organizations including the United Nations (UN), the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the International Maritime Organization (IMO), the International Labour Organization (ILO), and the Organization of American States (OAS) through global conventions, declarations, and recommendations offer widely accepted international guidelines. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) which was founded following WWII with the purpose of building peace in the minds of Men, through international cooperation ([www.unesco.org](http://www.unesco.org)) has drafted several international conventions and declarations with the aim of protecting cultural heritage and property. International Conventions include:

- **1954 Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the event of Armed Conflict,**
- **1970 Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Cultural Property,**
- **1972 Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage,**
- **1976 Recommendation Concerning the Safeguarding and Contemporary Role of Historic Areas,**
- **1999 Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the event of Armed Conflict Second Protocol,**
- **2001 Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage,** and
- **2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage.**
Of these instruments, the 2001 Convention for the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage is the most significant to this research and indeed for maritime heritage management in Caribbean. In a 2010 special edition (Volume 5:2), international contributors to the Journal of Maritime Archaeology emphasized the importance of capacity building and shared responsibility (Manders 2010: 117-127) together with cooperation (Leshikar-Denton 2010: 85-95), and professionalism (Guérin and Egger 2010: 97-103) in protecting the underwater cultural heritage. These key points were raised again locally in St. Kitts during a 2013 Sub-Regional Workshop to draft legislation (conference attended June 26-28, 2013).

Regional Instruments

The Caribbean region is also covered by a number of international instruments which are applicable to maritime culture. While these international agreements are widely applicable, they have not necessarily developed on a regional level and their relevance to managing maritime heritage on a local level varies from slightly significant to less than relevant. Regional instruments include:

- 1976 Convention for the Protection of the Archaeological, Historical, and Artistic Heritage of the American Nations adopted in the framework of the Organization of American States (OAS),
- 1985 European Convention on Offences Related to Cultural Property adopted in the framework of the Council of Europe (relevant to the Caribbean as many islands’ legislation is based on that of ‘home countries’), and

Law of the Sea Convention

Other policy and legal instruments developed at an international level relate to the marine environment. The Law of the Sea Convention (LOSC) adopted in 1982 and ratified by 149 countries focuses mainly on trade, fishing rights, commercial exploitation and environmental protection; it does, however address underwater cultural heritage in two articles: Article 149, found in Part XI of the LOSC, deals with the archaeological and historical objects on the seabed and ocean floor beyond the limits of national jurisdiction, in international waters. It provides:
All objects of an archaeological and historical nature found in the area shall be preserved or disposed of for benefit of mankind as a whole, particular regard being paid to the preferential rights of the State or country of origin, or the State of cultural origin, or the State of historical and archaeological origin (United Nations 2001)

Article 303 is found in Part XVI of the LOSC, and stipulates:

States have the duty to protect objects of an archaeological and historical nature found at sea and shall co-operate for this purpose. In order to control traffic in such objects, the coastal State may, in applying article 33 presume that their removal from the sea bed in the zone referred to in that article without its approval would result in an infringement within its territory or territorial sea of the laws and regulations referred to in that article. Nothing in this article affects the rights of identifiable owners, the law of salvage or other rules of admiralty, or laws and practices with respect to cultural exchanges. This article is without prejudice to other international agreements and rules of international law regarding the protection of objects of an archaeological and historical nature (United Nations 2001).

While of sound principle, these clauses were added at a late stage; they are overruled by issues where admiralty law is concerned. In practice they sound good but have no teeth (Jon Adams, pers. correspondence). The 1996 ICOMOS Charter and UNESCO 2001 Convention were developed in part to address these shortcomings. In addition, the LOSC only considers underwater resources (artefacts) and does not recognize intangible elements or cultural expressions of heritage.

Valletta Convention

Coming after the LOSC, the Valletta Convention in 1992 emphasized the need to integrate archaeological heritage management and its protection with planning programs at a local, regional, and national level to prevent their destruction (Council of Europe 1992). Article 2 of the Convention prescribes ‘the creation of archaeological reserves, even where there are no visible remains on the ground or under water, for the preservation of material evidence to be studied by later generations’ (ibid). The Convention represents an important step towards in-situ preservation. However, like the LOSC and the earlier Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, it does not distinguish between tangible and intangible heritage. Following the classical European conception of drawing a clear distinction between spirit and matter, tangible (material)
heritage as represented by museum artefacts and church buildings was distinguished from the spiritual heritage as connoted in hymns and poetry. The two dimensions were perceived as parallel lines that would never meet. While the former belonged to the realm of science, the latter fell within the ambit of superstition or at best religion (Eboreime 2009: 3).

Early conventions therefore reflected the historical-theoretical context when they were drafted when intangible heritage was not considered an integral component of heritage resources. This is reflected in the inclusion of properties into the World Heritage List of which monumental European buildings, churches and cathedrals formed the lion’s share while intangible and non-monumental properties were neglected. This imbalance was addressed from 1994 when the World Heritage Committee adopted a global strategy by identifying categories of properties and regions that had been neglected to date.

**ICOMOS Charter for the Protection and Management of the UCH**

In 1996, the ICOMOS general council ratified the Charter for the Protection and Management of the Underwater Cultural Heritage (a supplement to the 1990 Charter for the Protection and Management of Cultural Heritage). The charter was written by an international scientific committee on underwater cultural heritage. In the charter, underwater cultural heritage is conceived of as a non-renewable resource, a way to strengthen national identity, and as fundamental for the promotion of recreation and tourism (ICOMOS 1996). High archaeological standards are considered as a solution to mitigate the impacts and avoid the over commercialization and destruction of the resource (Hoffman 2006: 47-52).

In 2000 the Parliamentary Assembly in the Council of Europe recognized that underwater heritage may be present in all aquatic environments (including those inland) from diverse historical and prehistoric periods and might consist of tangible as well as intangible elements (Parliamentary Council Recommendation 1486).

*Maritime and fluvial heritage comprises much more than submerged sites, be they fixed or movable. The maritime and fluvial heritage is not confined to that which existed in the past, was lost and can be recovered. It extends to artifacts which are neither submerged nor lost in any other way, but which are in danger of being lost unless active steps are taken to preserve them...The maritime and fluvial heritage extends to associated traditions, be they technical, such as techniques of boat building or of handling vessels and their cargoes, or artistic,*
such as decorative features of ships or equipment, maritime lore or folk music, including, but not confined to, sea shanties (Parliamentary Assembly 2000).

One of the Assembly’s recommendations was the creation by UNESCO of an international convention for this heritage. This suggestion was realized in the 2001 UNESCO Convention while the ICOMOS Charter for the Protection and Management of the Underwater Cultural Heritage provided the basis for developing the Annex to the Convention.

**UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the UCH**

In 2001, the *UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage* was adopted and in 2009 came into force following its ratification by 20 countries (at time of printing the number was 43). The Convention which is at present the sole international tool directed at underwater cultural heritage seeks to prohibit the exploitation of all underwater cultural heritage regardless of its location. The Convention aims to protect UCH through human resource development, including education programs and international cooperation between member states. However, the Convention addresses underwater heritage and not maritime heritage in the broader sense. The Convention thereby limits the relationship of heritage to what is submerged in and does not consider the social space and greater maritime cultural landscape (Baron 2008: 69).

Despite this limitation the Convention is extremely important as an international instrument which lays down rules concerning activities directed at underwater cultural heritage, which are annexed within the convention. Anguilla and other countries in the region can observe recommendations and guidelines for in-situ preservation, the application of scientific techniques and survey methods, the stopping of heritage commerce (selling, trading, bartering of artefacts), and the development of academic projects to document and protect the resource.

**UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage**

UNESCO’s 2003 *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage* further recognized that much of the world’s cultural heritage was intangible. Cultural traditions, landscapes, and other non-physical elements are especially threatened by the processes of globalization. Theory on managing these kinds of resources is young; in the 1980s, “non-physical” heritage was first incorporated into international definitions of culture and cultural heritage and in 1997 intangible heritage was first recognized as an integral part of heritage worthy of protection (Prott 2000, Deacon 2004: 1-9). The
UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage in 2003 recognized that a lack of means, appreciation and understanding, especially among the younger generations, has accelerated the destruction of these resources (UNESCO 2003).

Regional Context

Underwater Cultural Heritage in the Caribbean

The Caribbean region has significant cultural resources. Geographically situated between Europe and the Americas, the islands sit on a geographic cross-road between Europe’s old empire and the riches of the New World (Hubbard 2002: 61). In a post-colonial context, the islands’ historical resources and particularly shipwrecks, have been valued less for the archaeological significance than for their economic value by treasure hunters. The lasting memory of colonization and trade, slavery and emancipation, poverty and inequality has left a permanent legacy on the Islands and continues to play a role in how heritage and history is perceived by the public and managed by the government (Chapter 4: Heritage as a low priority and little pride in local heritage, Exclusion from government).

Regional Cultural Resources

Many features including coastal fortifications, port towns, lighthouses, anchorages, harbours, shipbuilding sites, careening places, fishing villages and survivor camps testify to a rich maritime heritage of international significance (Leshikar-Denton and Luna Erreguerena 2008: 25) but these resources are dangerously threatened by a lack of awareness and adequate protection (Wilson and Loyola: 1982).

The Caribbean’s maritime heritage is unique in the world, deserving of UNESCO status, but its preservation is of course desirable for the islanders themselves and their descendants. Investigations into the possibility of regional management of UCH in the Caribbean (author, 2006 unpublished MA thesis) were initially negative. Factors including limited communication, political and geographical separation, diverse languages and legal traditions were considered too great an obstacle (Conrich 2005, pers. correspondence). While daunting, these challenges have been the focus of growing attention from managers working in the Caribbean who are utilizing new technology and communication systems to increase collaboration and cooperation (Leshikar-Denton and Luna Erreguerena 2008: 26).
Foundations for communication between islands

At the 1997 Conference for the Society of Historical Archaeology, the foundations for organized communication among professionals in the Caribbean was laid between individuals from the islands of Anguilla, Jamaica, Puerto Rico, the Turks and Caicos, the Cayman Islands and St Eustatius (Leshikar-Denton and Luna Erreguerena 2008: 28). This collaboration came from several decades of individual survey and excavation projects in the Caribbean by professional underwater and maritime archaeologists. Surveys and excavations on Anguilla, St. Maarten, Jamaica, Puerto Rico, the Dominican Republic, Curacao and the Cayman Islands from the late 1970s onward confirmed a rich resource (Bequette 1996; Beeker 2002; Cook 1997; Fontánez Aldea 1997; Foster and Beeker 1997; Geddes 1992; Hall 1991; Hamilton 1991; Haviser 1997; Keith 1987, 2006; Keith and Simmons 1985; Leshikar 1993; Leshikar-Denton 1997; Luna Erreguerena 1997; Nagelkerken 1985, 1998; Smith 1993, 2000).

In fact, from the time the resource was first identified until the present most of the more than two dozen Caribbean island states were left to individually find a solution. While a few islands have risen to the challenge, many others have struggled. The islands present a unique case for heritage management. Aspects of island-life that appeal to outsiders as a vacation destination have created an obstacle for managers. The laid-back lifestyle, relaxed pace, and colourful local character together with limited funding, a low GDP and a fast turnover of government officials make sustainable heritage management an uphill struggle. Large areas of these small islands, both on land and underwater have never been surveyed. Mostly undocumented, the exploitation of these resources has gone unchecked so that by the turn of the 21st century an unknown but significant portion of the resource had disappeared forever.

An attempt to examine all maritime cultural heritage in the Caribbean region is outside the limits of this thesis. Instead, this work focuses on Anguilla, using the island as a case study to explore challenges and potential solutions for managing cultural heritage in the region.

Examples of Regional Legislation from English Speaking Islands

A legacy of inherited legal systems and languages resulted in patchwork legal protection for the Caribbean’s maritime heritage. The many independent governments each have their own set of laws and regulations (Leshikar-Denton and Luna Erreguerena 2008). On many islands, no legislation governs the maritime heritage and where legislation exists there is often an inability to enforce the law (Leshikar –Denton and Luna Erreguerena
2008: 26). This is true on many islands with extensive territorial waters and little devoted infrastructure to monitor maritime activity. This absence means that despite having extensive parks, the majority of these protected areas are ‘paper parks’ where enforcement is non-existent. Compounding this is a lack of institutional memory, in an area where governments may change several times over a single decade and advocate diverse agendas. For these reasons legislation in the region has often developed on a case by case basis in response to internal and external pressures. Thus some islands have developed maritime cultural heritage much earlier than others. A notable example is Bermuda.

**Bermuda**

Although it is located approximately seven hundred miles east of the Carolinas, between the USA and UK in the Atlantic Ocean and not in the Caribbean, the island has always been a recognized part of the West Indies. During the eighteenth to twentieth centuries the British Fleet in the West Indies was headquartered in Bermuda, and after WWII the island served as a base for the United States Air Force. NATO also recognized the island’s strategic importance and brought large numbers of service personnel and expatriate workers to the island. As a result the island’s wealth grew rapidly compared with other island communities. With the development of the lucrative offshore banking industry, the island became even wealthier. Perhaps this was one reason why leisure activities including SCUBA became popular on Bermuda much earlier than most other places in the region. As a consequence, Bermuda was forced to deal with the challenge of managing its underwater heritage sooner than other islands.

By the mid-1950s a group of Bermudians were using newly developed SCUBA equipment to search for underwater treasure. One of these explorers, Teddy Tucker, famously discovered a 3-inch gold cross set with seven emeralds in 1955 (a reliquary from a 17th-century Spanish vessel). The discovery sparked the imagination of the world and led Smithsonian’s curator Dr Mendel Peterson to travel to Bermuda to inspect the find. The resulting excitement and treasure furore helps explains why Bermuda included provisions for the salvage of historic wrecks as early as 1959 to prevent a free-for-all. Bermuda’s 1959 Historic Wrecks Act is a landmark in that it distinguishes between recent and historic wrecks and lists criteria, albeit vaguely for the difference between the two types of wreck. A historic wreck is, according to the legislation, not less than fifty years old and ‘of historic interest or value’ (1959 Act Part II: 28.1). The act does not specify what requirements a ship must meet to have historic value and thus ‘historic interest’ was based purely on a committee’s evaluation. The Act sought to regulate diving activities by forbidding diving in the vicinity of ‘historic wreck’ and the ‘marking, mutilating, destroying, removing, or
otherwise interfering with the wreck UNLESS AUTHORIZED BY LICENCE’. For the management of these and other wrecks, an advisory committee of three to seven persons was appointed. As a concession to treasure hunting Bermuda’s 1959 Historic Wrecks Act classified several wrecks as ‘unprotected’. These wrecks which include about twenty mostly iron-hulled wrecks including the Blanche King, Caraquet, Constellation, Frenchman, and North Carolina remain frequently visited by tourists and date from 1838 (L’Hermione) to 1943 (Constellation). The committee, or Wrecks Authority, issued licenses to applicants for the survey or excavation of sites not listed as unprotected. Under salvage law, artefacts recovered would be reported to the Receiver who, under the 1959 Act, might release some or all of the finds to the licensee. The licensee would be compensated for any retained finds with ‘an unspecified agreed upon or arbitrated amount’. The Wrecks Authority operated a Bermuda-first policy. In practice permits were only granted to a few Bermudians, many of whom were members of the Authority.

Although the government might retain finds, they were required under the 1959 Act to compensate the salvor. In practice, very few artefacts were retained and the salvors were rewarded for their efforts by being allowed to keep and/or dispose of the recovered artefacts. As conservation was often sporadic and successful methods only developed through unsuccessful trial and error, it is little wonder that only a fraction of items recovered under this law survive today. In trying to understand shipwrecks worked under this system, archaeologists have often had to rely on newspaper pictures depicting artefact assemblages (Informant43: 2005).

The Bermuda Historic Wrecks Act 2001, amended 2004 was the first national statute in-line with the 2001 UNESCO Convention. ‘One of the strongest pieces of national preservation literature written to date’ (Johnston 2002), Bermuda’s legislation follows that of Portugal and Australia, by establishing government bodies with explicit membership and responsibilities for licensing, oversight and public outreach (Andrews 2005: 12).

**Jamaica**

Another island to implement early legislation related to archaeology is Jamaica. The port city of Port Royal, lost in 1692 during an Earthquake, has been the site of excavation and research from the late 1950s. Fieldwork by Edwin Link and the National Geographic Society (late 50s), Robert Marx (1966-1968), Philip Mayes (1969), Texas A&M and the Institute of Nautical Archaeology (1981-1990) have resulted in a body of data on all aspects of life in 17th century Jamaica (Leshikar-Denton 2004). The island enacted the Jamaican National Trust Commission Act in 1958. Over time, the island has worked with
both archaeologists and treasure hunters. In 2011 the state ratified the Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage.

**The Cayman Islands**

Similar to Bermuda, the Cayman Islands 1966 Abandoned Wreck Law ensured that the government received a portion of the value of the wreck and guaranteed the salvor at least one half its value (Abandoned Wreck Law 66: 5). Early UCH legislation was thus designed to safeguard the interest of treasure hunters and the government and ensure they each received their portion of the ‘goodies’. Under early legislation, commercial interests were encouraged to remove an unknown but significant amount of underwater heritage from the region.

By 1980 a movement by a few professional archaeologists to safeguard UCH gained momentum when the Institute of Nautical Archaeology (INA) led a project to document the UCH of the Cayman Islands. Roger Smith said that INA initiated the project because,

*They [INA] believed the survey might provide an example to other West Indian nations how scientific scrutiny, rather than the hunt for treasure, can bring aspects of national heritage to light (Leshikar-Denton 2002).*

Meanwhile legalized treasure hunting continued to operate in the region on an increasingly larger scale.

**Turks and Caicos**

Caribbean Ventures, a treasure hunting firm operating in the Turks and Caicos Islands in about 1980 discovered an early 16th century vessel on Molasses Reef and predicted they would make US$100 million salvaging it and other treasure bearing ships nearby. The local government became duly concerned and encouraged INA to run a five-year research project from 1982 which resulted in the creation of the Turks and Caicos’ National Museum’s main attraction (Keith 2006: 82-84). It was the beginning of a program which would eventually see protective legislation passed; in 1998 two older ordinances from 1974 were revised: the Wreck and Salvage Ordinance and the Protection of Historic Wrecks Ordinance were redrafted to afford the Molasses Reef Wreck and other shipwrecks protection (Protection of Historic Wrecks Ordinance 1998).

The Turks and Caicos Islands are a British Overseas Territory (as are Bermuda, the Cayman Islands and Anguilla) and although the legislation is based on the UK’s Protection of Wrecks Act, there are several notable exceptions. The Historic Wrecks Ordinance
protects any wreck site more than fifty years old located on the shores or in the territorial waters of the Islands. The Governor (as opposed to the Secretary of State in the UK) may further restrict access to an area surrounding the site; any person committing an offence in the area (including the use of a vacuum hose or explosives) is liable to a summary conviction including a fine of US$10,000, a two year imprisonment, or both. Any vessel used is also liable for forfeiture to the Crown (Wreck and Salvage Ordinance Chapter 60 1998; Protection of Historic Wrecks Ordinance, Chapter 82 1998). Hefty penalties are meant to deter individuals who would not be swerved by smaller fines and to demonstrate to treasure hunters how important these resources are to the island.

**Dominican Republic and Trinidad and Tobago**

Challenges for cultural heritage managers in the region are not confined to English-speaking islands. The *Comision de Rescate Arqueologico Submarino* in 1979 (Report: 1998) identified maritime heritage in the Dominican Republic and established a lab to conserve artefacts from several sites including the *Nuestra Senora de la Pera y Limpia Concepcion* (1641), the *Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe and Conde de Tolosa* (1724), *Diomedes* and *Imperial* (1806). The island has a history working with salvage interests but shifted their position in the 1990s. In 1999, the state created the National Office for the Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage which is in line with UNESCO and ICOMOS initiatives. However, to date, the state has not ratified the 2001 Convention on the Protection of UCH (Leshikar-Denton 2004).

The twin-island state introduced the *Protection of Wrecks Act* in 1994 following the discovery of several French Louis XIV period shipwrecks (Leshikar-Denton 2004: 84). In 2010, the islands ratified the UNESCO Convention.

**Opposition to Legislation**

The creation of protective legislation in the region has most often met opposition from commercial interests invested in maintaining the status quo. On Bermuda efforts to revise the 1959 Historic Wrecks Act in 1989 and 1997 were scuttled by local treasure hunters. Finally, in 2001 the Historic Wrecks Act was passed. The thirteen-page Bill based partly on British legislation, declares all Bermuda wrecks and historic artefacts to be ‘Crown property’. It divides wrecks into two categories: open and restricted and activity on the sites in three: non-invasive surveys, recovery of restricted wreck remains, and recovery of open wreck materials. No mention is afforded to treasure salvage or salvors, although a ‘good faith honorarium’ is offered to individuals who report the discovery of unknown wrecks to the proper authorities (Historic Wrecks Act 2001).
Blanket Legislation

As of 2013, blanket regional legislation for maritime heritage within the Caribbean does not exist. In 2007, international collaboration seemed unlikely given the challenges described above. However, this research is timely. In 2013, the Caribbean countries collectively asked UNESCO for assistance drafting local legislation. In June 2013, the government of Spain sponsored a sub-regional workshop for representatives from Anguilla, Antigua and Barbuda, Aruba, the BVI, St Lucia, St Maarten and St Kitts and Nevis. Representatives met on St Kitts to draft model legislation and discuss regional protection of UCH.

Collaboration and Cooperation

Meanwhile, working in the absence of comprehensive legislation, heritage managers have found a voice through many smaller organizations. The Museums Association of the Caribbean (MAC), the International Congress of Maritime Museums (ICMM), the International Association for Caribbean Archaeology (IACA), the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), the Dominica UNESCO Heritage Organization (DUHO), and the Caribbean Conservation Association (CCA) are among the most prominent groups. These groups provide a discussion area for protection and management and are a vehicle for disseminating research.

MAC provides a forum for discussion between individuals, tourist boards, and historical societies interested in the history of the Caribbean. Islands with a shared socio-economic history including the Turks and Caicos, Bermuda, and the Bahamas are also included despite their geographic location outside the Caribbean basin. Each year MAC brings together professionals from throughout the region and hosts a conference. In 1995, the Cayman Islands National museum spearheaded an effort to increase regional awareness in protecting the Caribbean’s underwater heritage sites. At the 1995 MAC meeting, each participant in a workshop, “Protecting Archaeological Sites Underwater: Tools for the Caribbean” received a reference notebook on the current state of underwater heritage around the world. A network of information exchange was established among IACA, MAC, and the Caribbean Conservation Association (Leshikar-Denton 2002: 278-98) which continues today. Such efforts may be the basis for greater integration, communication, and co-operation in the future. In 2004, in collaboration with IACA, an annual conference was held on St Lucia and papers were presented on the theme “Our Heritage, Preserve and Present It.” Currently the IACA holds conferences and publishes both a biannual newsletter and a directory of Caribbean Archaeologists.
ICMM (International Congress of Maritime Museums) is an international professional association that many Caribbean museums belong to. The organization is “a guild of colleagues and friends dedicated to maintaining world-wide professional contacts, providing a forum for the free exchange of ideas, improving the quality and standards of maritime preservation and nautical archaeology, and fostering a network of friendship and mutual support” (ICMM statement). Its conferences range in venue from New Zealand to Malta.

Cooperation and collaboration are important themes for the region. Dr Leshikar-Denton writes that a unified approach empowers countries to gain long-term academic, educational, cultural, and economic profit through protecting and managing their heritage (Leshikar-Denton and Erreguerena 2008: 26).

**Heritage Management in the Caribbean**

If underwater archaeology is a young discipline in the region, then heritage management is younger (Leshikar-Denton and Erreguerena 2008: 34). To date literature on the theory of maritime cultural heritage has been primarily written for and dominated by larger, wealthier states. Countries including the United States, Australia, and United Kingdom have developed theoretical frameworks for studying the cultural context of shipwrecks (Gould 1983, 2000, Adams 2007) and maritime landscapes (Staniforth and Hyde 2001, Westerdahl 1992, Babits-Tilburg 1998, and Staniforth 2006). While applicable in many ways to underwater heritage management in the Caribbean, these studies are limited in that they rarely address the unique concerns faced by small islands or developing countries.

**Focus on monumental sites**

**Missing literature on how to develop infrastructure and HERs**

In addition, there is some literature on legal debates and legislation. This literature consists mostly of state contracts between governments and professional treasure salvors. The body of available material is predominantly descriptive. Gaps include recommendations for developing the infrastructure necessary to manage maritime cultural heritage and comprehensive Historic Environment Records (HERs). A few islands including Trinidad and Tobago, the Cayman Islands and Bermuda have made progress creating HERs but many other islands have insufficient archives or have yet to begin (Nevis, St Kitts, Montserrat, St Maarten, Anguilla).

**Intangible Heritage**

The region’s cultural heritage includes intangible heritage. This heritage, as explained by UNESCO consists partly of ‘living heritage’ including modern cultural behaviours and practices and partly of ahistorical traditions which may or may not be part of the material culture record. Like all culture, this heritage is constantly changing and adapting, being redefined and reinvented. Since the 2003 UNESCO *Convention on the Protection of Intangible Heritage* came into force in 2006, there have been several studies in sub-Saharan Africa on that region’s intangible heritage (School of African Heritage (EPA), UNESCO office to Angola, Lesotho, Namibia, South Africa and Swaziland). While that region shares some similar challenges to the Caribbean in managing heritage including pressures from development, poverty, and a post-colonial legacy, much of this literature has focused on indigenous traditions which are outside a maritime scope.

**Examples of intangible heritage in the Caribbean**

Intangible heritages present in the Caribbean which have not been the focus for study include aspects of maritime heritage including oral history, non-monumental architecture, place names, festivals and traditions associated with the sea (
Many of the Caribbean’s historic sites are also intangible (historic landscapes where events took place, activities including boat building and boat racing) where little physical evidence remains of past traditions. Intangible heritage including oral traditions and expressions, performing arts, social practices, rituals and festive events and traditional craftsmanship are more difficult to quantify than built heritage and are often neglected by scholars.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tangible Heritage</th>
<th>Built Heritage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immovable</td>
<td>Monuments: buildings, sculptures, inscriptions, cave dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Groups of buildings: city centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sites (also underwater): archaeological, historical, ethnological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movable</td>
<td>Cultural landscapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paintings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sculptures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audiovisual media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consumer and industrial goods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intangible Heritage</th>
<th>Art expressions: music, dance, literature, theatre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martial arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Living cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Oral) traditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Narratives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revolutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Folklore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional Challenges

There are a number of challenges related to an absence of education programs and/or practical constraints faced by small islands in the Caribbean. Importantly, these challenges are not unique and are found throughout the world. Based on observations on the Islands between 2005 and 2007, they are listed here and later described in more detail in Chapter 4. They include:

1. How an island’s size and wealth affects resources available for heritage activities.
2. How the public ‘sees’ archaeology and how media-portrayals of India-Jones figures and treasure hunting shapes the public’s perception of archaeology, and
3. How attitudes toward collecting and the salvaging of historic wreck sites for souvenirs have affected the ability to enforce anti-treasure hunting policies.
4. How exclusion from the governing process of historic sites has alienated locals from sites and discouraged them from participating in their future management and,
5. How differences between expatriate and local attitudes towards heritage have shaped the management objectives and success of historic preservationist groups.
6. How little pride in local heritage and heritage as a low political priority has affected the management and funding of heritage initiatives, and determined which heritage is celebrated or ignored by the public at large.
7. How missing information and a base knowledge of heritage resources (as would be found in an historic environment record [HER]) leaves an open door for the exploitation of heritage resources.
8. How in an effort to increase visitor numbers, local infrastructure and/or in response to population pressures, over-development has destroyed land and coastal areas along with historic environments (salt ponds, defence sites, or Amerindian habitation areas).
9. How an apparent lack of foresight by politicians and decision makers (who appear to plan for the immediate gain and entrenchment of their political party without considering the long-term consequences for the Island) has not helped.
10. When efforts have been made to protect and manage the historic environment, a lack of institutional memory following the work has led to an absence of permanent policy which would protect sites in the future.
11. How insufficient legislation and a lack of knowledge of existing legislation fail to protect archaeological and historical sites and this vacuum has facilitated the plunder and destruction of cultural resources.

12. How problems are not brought to the attention of authorities as there are few dedicated professionals with training to manage heritage resources locally.

13. How a lack of funding limits the resources and personnel which can be allocated by the government, the presence of paid professionals, and the ability to conduct on-going research and projects.

14. How double standards may be reinforced by legislation which gives some individuals and groups privileges including access or excavation rights over others. This in turn helps to alienate the general public from heritage sites.

15. How misdirected enthusiasm by people can lead to the removal of artefacts from the beach or underwater in an effort to ‘save them’. By the same measure, artefacts can be removed from sites on land without a record of original position made.

16. Finally, how the systematic removal of artefacts by treasure hunters (avocational and professional) with disregard to local legislation not only results in a permanent loss of data but also sets a bad example when they go unpunished.

Finally, neither theory on the methods for developing sustainable heritage tourism, which has been identified as a key component in managing the region’s maritime cultural heritage (Baron 2008: 77) nor the role of education in fostering grass-roots protection on small islands has been adequately developed when this research began.

That culture has become a marketable commodity to draw tourists and money to the islands is apparent. This is demonstrated by the relatively recent introduction of Carnival at culturally insignificant times to attract visitors to the Islands (Don Mitchell, personal communication).

Heritage management in the Caribbean is based on real-world limits and expectations. Public awareness, the dissemination of information and public involvement in the protection of heritage are important everywhere, but crucial in the developing world. Treasure hunting is a global problem but is especially acute in developing countries. There is a small but growing body of literature addressing these unique concerns (Leshikar Denton and Pilar 2008: Chapter 1). Leading the way are heritage managers in Mexico, Argentina (Elkin 2008: 155), Uruguay, Bermuda, Turks and Caicos, the Cayman Islands,
and Jamaica who increasingly emphasize the importance of community involvement that is above and beyond outreach, local stakeholders and public ownership, comprehensive legislation, and professional leadership (Leshikar Denton and Pilar 2008: 34-8).

**Selecting Anguilla**

Of more than a dozen islands, Bermuda, Nevis, St Kitts and Anguilla were short-listed for additional study. Each offered a perspective on different stages of maritime cultural heritage management. For example, Bermuda offered a well-defined heritage management program, where active legislation and a successful maritime museum worked to manage, preserve, and promote local maritime archaeology and where paid professionals worked to ensure the growth and sustainability of heritage initiatives (Azevedo 2006).

Nevis offered an example of an island developing maritime heritage in many areas. Initiatives which had been successfully developed by the start of this research in 2007 included an active heritage society, the creation of two small museums, an extensive heritage trail and on-going relationships with institutions in the USA and UK. With an extensive underwater resource including more than 300 estimated shipwrecks, fortifications, and a sunken city which had received scant study, the island offered the potential to observe how maritime heritage management practically develops.

Nevis’ sister isle St Kitts likewise offered a rich maritime heritage including impressive colonial fortifications at Brimstone Hill Fortress (a World Heritage Site) and two island museums. Initial impressions during fieldwork in 2007 and 2008 suggested however, that despite efforts to initiate maritime heritage programs on St Kitts, (Spooner 2003; 2005) such efforts were temporarily in limbo. Development projects during the 1990s and 2000s including the construction of Port Zante in Basseterre and the reclamation of the salt ponds on the South-Eastern portion of the Island to create a marina (2008) demonstrated an on-going tradition of strong pressures from developers and additional observations made it clear that looting of sites was unfortunately common. For instance, when an 18th century British troopship was discovered in an isolated bay on St Kitts in 1995, 13 cannon were initially reported but in 2003 a survey by the Anglo-Danish Maritime Archaeology Team (ADMAT) were only able to find and record five. In 2008 three were reported and by August 12, 2009 the remaining cannon had disappeared (personal correspondence Boon 2009). The island’s heritage management may, however, have turned a corner. In early 2009, the St Kitts Historical Society endorsed the 2001 UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage and later that year on December 3, 2009 the Federation of St Kitts and Nevis submitted the
government’s ratification instrument at the UNESCO headquarters in Paris and joined the Convention. In 2013, St. Kitts and Nevis hosted a regional workshop to draft local legislation for the 2001 UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage. This decision sets an important precedent as earlier legislation barely addressed the underwater heritage (National Conservation and Environment Protection Act, 1987).

In comparison, Anguilla which is located sixty miles from St Kitts and Nevis and six miles from the dual Dutch/French nation St Maarten/St Martin offered a less-developed case.

**Discovery**

On their way to and fro the New World, Spaniards invariably passed the Leeward Islands. Anguilla was sighted sometime after 1500 but remained un-colonized by Europeans until the mid-1600s (see Chapter 2). Then, as now Ibis (*plegadis falcinellus*) and spoonbill (*platalea ajaja*) patrolled the shallow salt ponds while frigatebirds (*fregata magnificens*) soared above. Pelican (*pelecanus occidentalis*) and boobies (*sula sula*) plunge-dived for fish while on shore, soldier crab (*coenobite clypeatus*) patrolled and iguanas (*iguana delicatissima* and *iguana iguana*) took their rest. Within 50 years of its colonization by Europeans, however, the Island’s environment was disturbed, deforested, and accosted by introduced livestock and bad farming methods (Mitchell 2009 First Generation).

**Environment**

Today, Anguilla’s environment bears the scars of an agricultural system that never produced enough to make its planters rich. Historically, cotton (*gossypium babadense*), sugarcane (*saccharum*), and tobacco (*nicotiana tabacum*) were grown commercially. At present, less than 10% of the island’s 34 mi² are arable. A few ‘pea trees’ (*cajanus cajan*) are grown in rocky gardens and a part of ‘the Valley’ is converted to subsidized crops. Earthy red bottoms in the centre of the island provide pockets of rich soil while the majority of the Island is covered in scrub forest. Cacti, white ceder (*tabebuia heterophylla*) frangipani (*plumeria*), loblolly (*pisonia subcordata*), tamarind (*leguminosae fabaceae*) and a tangle of introduced species vie with each other for space. On the north and east side of the island population is sparse. Jagged limestone rocks and frangipani bake in the sun without shade. On the beaches up and down both coasts, tangled trunks of sea grape (*coccoloba uvifera*) give patchy shade and palm trees (*cocos nucifera*) extend at impossible angles from sand dunes. The ground is not flat. Rolling hills fall down steep cliffs to beaches below- some narrow and sandy, others wide and rocky. Winding trails crisscross salt ponds and occasionally end abruptly at new roads and condominiums.
According to local historian and boatbuilding David Carty (1998: 40-56), Anguillians turned to the sea from necessity; ships and the sea were the only ways in which the tiny society could survive. The opportunity offered by the sea is partially explained by the island’s geography.

**Geography and Climate**

The island of Anguilla (18 degrees north, 63 degrees west) is the northernmost of the Leewards, lying on part of the aptly named 4,661km$^2$ Anguilla Bank. The bank includes the islands of Anguilla, St Maarten/St Martin (hereafter referred to as St Martin), St Bartholomew (St Barths), Tintamarre and numerous small cays. Sombrero Cay belongs to Anguilla although it is located 36 miles north of Anguilla in the middle of the Anegada Passage (not part of the Anguilla bank).

Throughout the Caribbean the (mostly) reliable trade winds blow from the northeast between 15 and 25 knots year round. Along Anguilla’s coast two dominant currents (the Antilles and Atlantic) flow west. The combination of wind and currents make communication by sail difficult with islands located to the east and south. In the 18th century it could take weeks to get a message to the nearest English colony (St. Kitts) 60 miles to the southeast. By the same fortune, sailing to Santo Domingo in the Dominican Republic (see Chapter 2 1730-1900 Going Down to the Sea) might only take a few days but the return (to windward) could take weeks or months. It is likely that Anguillian’s early preference for sloops and schooners resulted from their superior ability (over square-rigged vessels) to sail into the wind (Carty 1997).

Geologically, the island is entirely limestone except for two small outcrops of tilted andesitic tuff and basalt (Christman 1951: 65). The relief is relatively flat with rolling hills; the highest point being Crocus Hill 165 metres above sea level. The landscape is dotted with salt ponds and brilliant white beaches. There are numerous bays for anchoring although none with true protection from hurricanes. There are no running streams on the surface although fresh water can be found by digging or drilling. Salt is produced naturally in salt ponds from West End on the southwest coast to Sandy Ground on the south side of the Island.

The island suffers from periodic droughts and irregular rainfall. Tobacco was grown on the island from 1650 until around 1730 and sugar from 1730 until 1790. The sale of both amounted to less than 1% of the British Island colonies (Colonial Office Records CO 153/2/139) and by the 1800s the Island was reduced to a subsistence economy.
Trade with Other Islands

The northernmost of the Leeward Islands, Anguilla was off the path of most traffic. Still, poor navigation and misjudged latitude could put ships on a direct course for Anguilla with disastrous results. In 1856, pilots were warned,

‘In approaching the islands we have described [Anguilla], from the northward, from their being backed by the high land of St Martin, navigators are very apt to make a wrong estimate of their distance from the shore, and which has led to fatal mistakes on the north-east side of Anguilla’ (Imray and Son 1856: 20).

Most British ships sailing from Europe or Africa put into Barbados, Antigua or St Kitts and Nevis. Anguilla was occasionally used as a last stop, and was popular with some American and Canadian schooners who would take on salt at Road Bay before returning to Nova Scotia (Carty 1997: 14). As Anguilla did not receive regular shipments nor did its inhabitants have the means to afford European luxuries, its inhabitants looked elsewhere for sustenance. The nearest neighbouring Island (French/Dutch) St Martin lies five miles south and offers goods and services not available on Anguilla. Anguilla has had a long relationship with St Martin. Punctuated occasionally with strife (during the 1744 War of Austrian Succession, Anguillians captured French St. Martin and several families continued to live there following the end of hostilities) travel and trade between the two islands has been fluid and largely beneficial.

Trade with islands farther afield (St Barths 20nm, St Eustatius 40nm, St Kitts 48nm, and Tortola (90nm) was regular. British ship registries show Anguilla-built trading vessels were trading by 1810 (British Ship Registries 1819-1820: BT107/464). This small but vital inter-island traffic continued until the mid-1970s, when container shipping replaced the last inter-island schooners (Pyle 1998:2).

Population and Industries

Approximately 16,000 residents currently live on the Island, with another 120,000 annual visitors. Like many of the Caribbean Islands, this population has grown dramatically, tripling since the 1950s.

The island’s capital and only town is The Valley, a centrally-located administrative centre where the country’s court, prison, post office and high schools are located. The population is spread through small villages; from West End on the Southwest end and Little Harbour on the South Coast, to East End, Shoal Bay and Island Harbour in the Northeast. Current industries include tourism, boatbuilding and offshore financial services although of these,
tourism accounts for approximately 75% of the total GDP. Tourism is seasonal and may be impacted heavily by off-island economic conditions. For example, between 2003 and 2008 tourism boomed but in 2008, the country’s real GDP fell by 17% during the global economic downturn (International Monetary Fund 2012: 4).

While boat builders are found throughout the island, the villages of Sandy Ground, South Hill and Island Harbour are the main centres where most of the dozen or so full-time local boat builders can be found. Most boatyards are small with a single boat builder or a few assistants (Figure 2-7 Anguillian Boat builder 'Beggar' inspects the hull of a fishing boat built upside down). The largest boatyard, Rebel Marine is operated by David Carty’s family in Rockfield near North Hill. The family used to build schooners but David and his family now build modern boats using the latest available technology. Compared to other islands in the region, Anguilla does not boast impressive forts or urban centres. Boat building was historically a way to survive during lean years and remains an integral part of Anguillians’ cultural identity (Carty 1997: 2).

Current Heritage Management and Dive Tourism

Heritage tourism is undeveloped on Anguilla. In 2003 less than 3% of Anguilla’s visitors went to a museum or participated in heritage-related activities and only 5% of visitors were active scuba divers. In 2007, with the exception of a private heritage collection, cultural heritage was outside the public domain. Visible resources lacked both interpretation and protection. During an initial visit, the situation was described by several residents as: a lack of heritage legislation, no national museum, active treasure hunting, little institutional memory, and the absence of a professional archaeologist and heritage-based initiatives. Individuals also expressed their opinion that the Island had no history or shipwrecks of note (Informant05, Informant 06).

Following a second visit in March 2008, Anguilla was chosen as the site for further research. Unfortunate though they are, the lack of heritage and dive tourism created a unique climate and an opportunity to explore problems and develop a series of heritage management initiatives in the absence of any existing framework.

Anguilla: Legal and Non-legal Context

As a study location, Anguilla proved an interesting choice. The Island is a small British Overseas Territory in the Eastern Caribbean with 15,000 permanent residents.

As legal background, Anguilla as a British Overseas Territory is included in the UK’s ratification of the following international conventions:


- 1946 *International Convention on the Regulation of Whaling*
- 1970 *Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property*
- 1971 *Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat* (Ramsar Convention) in 1971
- 1972 *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage* (World Heritage Convention)

**Marine Parks Ordinance**

On a local level the need for legislation which addressed the marine environment was recognized in 1980 when the Government of Anguilla requested assistance from the Eastern Caribbean Natural Areas Management Program (ECNAMP) to form a management plan for marine resources. In 1982, the Marine Parks Ordinance was passed enabling the Governor of Anguilla ‘by order or regulations published in the Gazette’ to designate areas as marine parks and to make regulations covering a wide range of areas. Marine Parks at Prickly Pear Cays, Shoal Bay, Little Bay, Sandy Island, Scilly Cay, Dog Island, and Sombrero Island were subsequently established (
Figure 1-2). In 1996, under the Marine Parks Ordinance, an Underwater Archaeological Preserve was established near Junks Hole to protect the site of El Buen Consejo, an 18th century shipwreck, following reports of looting.

**Antiquities Act**

Aside from the Marine Parks Ordinance, Anguilla has no protective legislation specific to maritime heritage. The Antiquities Act revised in 2000 outlines stiff penalties for exporting antiquities off-island. Antiquities in the Act are defined as any object, other than an historic building, the preservation of which is desirably by reason of its traditional, archaeological, paleontological, or historic interest. Underwater antiquities within the island’s territorial waters are included in section 4(1) which states

> 4(1) The export of any antiquity found or excavated in Anguilla or in the territorial water thereof is hereby prohibited except under and in concordance with the terms of a licence granted for that purpose by and at the discretion of the Governor.

> 4(2) The exporter, or his agent, of any antiquity exported in contravention of subsection (1) or of the terms of a licence granted under that subsection is guilty of an offence and is liable on summary conviction to a fine of $10,000 or to imprisonment for six months.

Significantly, Anguilla’s Antiquity Act does not forbid the excavation of antiquities except when they are taken from areas which have been designated ‘areas of historic interest’. Of course the legislation is limited as once an artefact (i.e. antiquity) has been removed it becomes impossible to prove that it was in fact taken from a designated area.

**Anguilla National Trust**

In 1988, following the Antiquities Act (Antiquities Act 1982 revised 2000), the Government of Anguilla established the Anguilla National Trust (ANT) to manage the Island’s cultural and natural resources. As a statutory body, the Trust acts as the custodian of Anguilla’s natural, cultural, and historic heritage.

In the past the government has taken steps to try and protect sites from foreign exploitation in the absence of protective legislation. In 1985, the Government of Anguilla denied the infamous treasure hunter Mel Fisher a permit to search for shipwrecks around the Island (Informant29, Informant30) and in 1985 the Fountain, an Amerindian ceremonial site and freshwater source for many generations was barred to prevent
unmonitored access (see Chapter 4 Case Studies). The fact that there is little monumental architecture on Anguilla means that most of the island’s heritage is intangible and there are few large ruins. For many, heritage is out of sight and therefore out of mind.

**Generation Gap**

Today, Anguilla is characterized by radical cultural change which has occurred over less than two generations. The introduction of public electricity, mass media, and tourism since the 1970s created a generation gap where many of the younger generation lead lives radically different from that lived by their parents and grandparents at a similar age.
Figure 1-2 Marine Park areas from NOAA Coral Health and Monitoring Program accessed 2013
Methodology

This section summarizes the methodology used for Anguilla. Having chosen Anguilla based on the reasons described above as an ideal laboratory for heritage management and having identified what needed to be done in order to systematically address these questions, the following steps were outlined:

Research Schedule

1. Desk-based assessment to compile a list of known archaeological resources, stakeholders, and previous archaeological research

No previous literature review existed so it would be necessary to explore archives (St Kitts, Anguilla, UK National Archives, UK Hydrographic Office, Merseyside Maritime Museum, National Maritime Museum in Greenwich), contact regional historians (Vincent Hubbard, Don Mitchell, Colville Petty, Jacqueline Armony, Peggy Leshikar-Denton), and speak with local informants (fishermen, public officials, divers).

2. Interviews with key stakeholders

Interviews with youth (Anguilla Youth Ambassadors), teachers (Primary and Secondary Schools), officials (David Carty, Foster Rogers, Karim Hodge), residents (Bob Conrich, Steve Haines, Steve Donahue), business owners (hotels, restaurants), fishermen (Ed Carty, Dougie Carty), and members of the general public would provide a cross-section of island residents that could be used to assess knowledge of and attitudes towards local history. These discussions would enable deeper understanding of community issues and concerns important to but not directly related to heritage management.

3. Archaeological Survey to record sites and establish a sites and monuments record

A three-week archaeological survey would provide data for future management and determine the type and nature of visible underwater cultural heritage around the island. It would also be used to establish a sites and monuments record and a set of data for future heritage management, because, as the T-shirt for the survey stated, “It is impossible to manage what you don’t know exists.”

4. Community outreach to disseminate results and bridge research with community concerns

Community outreach using available media (newspaper, local TV, internet, public lectures at Soroptimist and Rotary Club meetings) would disseminate information about the
survey and provide an entry point to discuss larger issues surrounding the use and meaning of heritage resources.

5. **Public archaeology project to promote heritage resources as a finite but economically sustainable resource**

Having laid a foundation, established relationships and demonstrated the presence of unique, valuable and finite resources, a public archaeology project in the form of a Heritage Trail would be a permanent tool to place heritage in the public domain and encourage active stewardship and ownership of heritage resources that might continue after the duration of this research.

6. **Final project results and report**

The final project results would be compiled in this thesis and made available locally. In addition, a popular illustrated history of the island’s heritage (64pgs) would be available online and submitted to local schools as a teaching aid and resource for tourists.

**Strategy**

The methodology chosen for this research is best explained in terms of what had not been done and developed on Anguilla. Because there was no HER on Anguilla it was necessary to start one. Likewise, there was little knowledge and no public interpretation of heritage resources on Anguilla, it was important to create interest. This was done on Anguilla through well-established methods including education programs and public outreach. From 2007 to 2010, more than 30 public education sessions and outreach sessions were conducted including sessions with the media, schools, and public at large. The 2010 Anguilla Heritage Trail was an especially important initiative to increase long-term visibility of heritage resources. The initiative which was unparalleled on Anguilla in 2009 drew from successful regional examples including trails which had been developed in Nevis, the Cayman Islands and Florida. These methods were chosen based on preliminary research into regional heritage management and observations of what had worked elsewhere, considering how these methods might be applied to Anguilla, taking into consideration that a single solution does not fit all and the best solution is multi-pronged and tailored to fit an individual island’s circumstance. Through this approach maritime heritage management is placed in a broad context and grounded in the ‘real world’. As a contribution to maritime heritage management in the region, this thesis explores problems with developing maritime heritage management in the Caribbean and presents a sustainable way forward on Anguilla managing its cultural resources.
For a fuller understanding of the issues affecting maritime cultural heritage management, this thesis combines documentary, archaeological, and ethnographic data. The holistic nature of maritime cultural heritage which is defined here as cultural, historical, and archaeological lends itself to an anthropological approach that pulls from various disciplines and puts the subject matter in a broader context. While some aspects of this research including the analysis of the 2009 Shipwreck Survey are predominately archaeological, other aspects are ethnographical or archival-based. For example, the creation of a Heritage Trail took into account the ideas and attitudes of the public including the type of heritage resources they considered to be important and the areas they wanted protected. Anthropological methods including participant observation were a vital component to understand not only how the public would like to see an initiative developed but also to create a final product which the public accepts as a part of their heritage and not an idea which has been imposed on them from an outside ‘expert’. Likewise, an analysis of the historic factors which have created modern maritime traditions needed to be looked at not only from an historical perspective but also through observations how those traditions are interpreted and reinvented in the present.

In order to set strategies for maritime cultural heritage management, one has to understand Anguilla as a maritime culture today. While histories of Anguilla boat building have been published (Pyle 1998, Carty 2007), and Anguilla’s relationship with the sea firmly espoused, in my research I was unable to find additional published support of Anguilla’s maritimity (see Tuddenham 2010). The following chapter therefore pulls from archaeological, historical, and ethnographic accounts. It examines maritime culture on Anguilla through time and attempts to synthesize more than three millennia of islanders’ relationship with the sea. It is necessary here, as an understanding of Anguilla as a maritime community has helped to develop case-specific heritage management strategy on Anguilla.
Chapter 2 Through a Maritime Lens: Picturing Anguilla as a Maritime Community

Underneath the calm or blistering sea
You find a part of life, forgotten and unsold
What hidden gems lie peacefully?
A graveyard and a treasure trove, the history lies untold
So powerful the drive, for generations grabbed
Treasures taken, traded, sold
History salvaged and passed out

What’s left to tell our children
For them to dive and find?
The past will always be but history is forgot

Some things we leave behind
A choice it’s ours to make
Forgetting with our kind,
We choose to stand and tell
The trees we fell and boats we build
The ships we sail with natural skill

Today we live and celebrate
Our passion with the wind
Our history is our past,
not for others but ourselves
Our past, our heritage
Our dream to find and hold
A treasure for this people forever ours to share (Azevedo 2009)

Looking at the history of Anguilla through the lens of maritime culture and specifically how the people living here have orientated themselves to the sea offers a window into the island’s culture both past and present. Although cricket is the national sport of the English-speaking Caribbean, boat racing is Anguilla’s national sport. Anguillian historian and boat builder David Carty writes that this fact is

...a telling pointer not only to Anguilla’s uniqueness but also to the fact that this national obsession is an expression of a tiny culture’s roots in a particularly important maritime past (Carty 1997: 2). One reason the author chose Anguilla was the Island’s living maritime culture. Although there are few timber resources on the island and not a single well-protected harbour, the Island has had a well-founded and continuous maritime industry from early times. In comparison, the nearby islands of St Martin, St Barthelemy, and St Eustatius all have better resources, be they timber or harbours or both yet these islands have seen only sporadic maritime activity (Pyle 1998: 57).
While some argue that there is no such thing as a purely maritime culture (Hunter 1994: 261), the role of the sea in Anguilla’s development cannot be overstated. Maritime culture defined in Chapter 1 is distinguished by a series of customs and behaviours related specifically to the sea. Westerdahl lists a series of these maritime traits, suggesting that the more traits expressed in a society, the more maritime it can be considered. These traits include nautical similes in colloquial use, spending leisure hours near the waterfront, children playing with boats, and attitudes towards things maritime (Westerdahl 1994, Tuddenham 2010, Westerdahl 2011).

While these and other maritime traits are present on Anguilla (Figure 2-1) it is important to recognize that maritimity is one component of a larger culture which has non-maritime aspects. For societies, even those well-known for their dependence of the maritime environment (including Norway and Portugal), the primary economic foundation is usually agrarian (Westerdahl 1994: 266). This is true on Anguilla, where historically tobacco, cotton, sugar, and provisions were all grown. However, agriculture has always been difficult on Anguilla where environmental constraints have made famine and drought all too common. Hunter writes that in small insular societies vulnerable to passing trade and the uncertainties of climate, particular populations may rely more on the sea. It is these societies where more can be elucidated by analysis and understanding of its maritime component (Hunter 1994: 261-264). This chapter traces Anguilla’s history from prehistoric occupation to modern day and examines how the sea has influenced its development through time.
Landscape and Sea Level Change

Changes in sea level provide important clues to understanding the paleo-environment, specifically the native ecology and subsistence strategies of early human beings. Unfortunately, there has been little research specific to sea level change for Anguilla (Brenner 1993, Peterson and Crock 2001). Research in the region suggests that as recently as 20,000 years ago as much as 11 times as much of the Anguilla Bank was above water (2,500km$^2$ opposed to 215km$^2$) (Biknevicius et al 1993).

Giant Rat

Although there is no evidence supporting the presence of humans at this early date the larger landmass did support some unusual fauna which is now extinct. In 1868 several fossilized bones were excavated from Anguilla (probably from Gavannah Cave) and discovered in a load of phosphate-bearing rock sent to New York for testing. Professor Cope of the Smithsonian Institute analysed the material and fragmented remains, naming the extinct species *Amblyrhiza inundata* which became known locally as ‘the Giant Rat’ (Cope 1883). He concluded that the Island of Anguilla, now embracing but thirty square miles, could not readily have supported a fauna of which these huge rodents formed a part. Such large animals have no doubt ranged over a more extended territory. This and other facts lend probability to the hypothesis that the submergence of the ranges connecting many of the islands of the Antilles has taken place subsequent to Pliocene times (Cope 1883).
Additional research by Nik Douglas of the Anguilla Archaeological and Historical Society and Dr Donald McFarlane of the American Museum of Natural History in New York estimate that the large rodent would have weighed between 70 and 155 kg and lived approximately 100,000 years ago (see also Biknevicius 1993). The theory that over time the rodent’s habitat was claimed by rising sea levels which eventually isolated the species on Anguilla where it became a victim of its own size is supported by evidence of changing sea levels in the region following the last ice age. The significance of this to maritime archaeology lies in the possible subsidence and inundation of coastal sites by the sea. The reverse process involving beach progression may mean that sites which are now inland may have been originally located on the coast. Until a more complete picture of changing sea levels is understood, the possibility of submerged pre-colonial sites should not be summarily dismissed.

**Sea Level Rise**

Geologically the floor of the Atlantic Ocean is being subducted beneath the Caribbean lithic plate near the Lesser Antilles. The complex nature of plate tectonics in the area makes it dangerous to generalize without additional data. Claims for 7,000 years ago (when Amerindians first migrated to the Island Caribbean from the mainland) range from 40 metres lower than present (Douglas 1985) to 2 ½ to 5 metres higher than present (Watts IN Emmer 1999). Despite these obvious discrepancies it is clear that geologically the Caribbean region is particularly active. The possibility of prehistoric cultural sites on the expansive bank surrounding Anguilla (also Barbuda, St Kitts, Saba, and the Grenadines) remains possible (Watters 1982).

Sea level change is one of several factors shaping the environment. Evidence of dynamic forces including earthquakes, hurricanes, and tsunamis is also present. The submerged ruins of Jamestown and Port Royal on Nevis and Jamaica respectively offer recent examples of destruction and inundation as a result of geological activity. The discovery of Amerindian artefacts in the sand at Shoal Bay and Katouche Bay on Anguilla offer support that some sites were either more extensive than currently known and are currently being eroded or there are additional (submerged) sites whose material is being brought to shore by storms and other high-energy events.

**First Seafarers: Amerindians**

Amerindians were not confined to single settlements but traded and travelled widely through the Lesser Antilles. During the Salodoid Period (300-900 AD) Anguilla supported as many as 3,000 Amerindians in villages around the coast (Figure 2-2).
When I began to trace the distribution of the prehistoric [pottery] styles, I was surprised to find that their main boundaries cut across the islands instead of passing between them (Rouse 1982).

Table 2-1 Archaeological Investigations on Anguilla

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TEAM LEADER/INSTITUTION</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Albright, A./ College of the Virgin Islands</td>
<td>Looked for shipwrecks for a museum, no report published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979*</td>
<td>Figueredo, A./Virgin Islands Archaeological Society</td>
<td>Recorded 19 Amerindian sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-</td>
<td>Nik Douglas/Nik Douglas [and assoc.]</td>
<td>Surface Collection at 10 known sites: Sandy Ground, Sandy Hill Bay, Shoal Bay East, Island Harbour Point, Forest North, Barnes Bay, Rendezvous Bay, Meads Bay, Lockrum Bay, Maundays Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-</td>
<td>Watters, D(?)</td>
<td>Sandy Hill Bay Surface collection of material weighing 27.5 kilos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Watters, D./Carnegie Museum of Natural History</td>
<td>Plotted, mapped, and excavated three 1 x 1 metre test pits in Anguilla’s Fountain Cavern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-</td>
<td>Peterson, J. and J.</td>
<td>Anguilla Archaeology Project funded through a grant from UNDP, report submitted to AAHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Crock/University of Vermont</td>
<td>PhD Fieldwork at five Amerindian sites (AL03-SG; AL08-SH; AL19-SE; AL14-BB; AL20-FN) Funded through a doctoral dissertation improvement grant from the National Science Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-</td>
<td>Crock, J./University of Vermont</td>
<td>Recorded Wreck Site of El Buen Consejo and Prusiano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Rodgers, B. et al./ East Carolina University</td>
<td>University of Vermont Field School in Prehistoric Archaeology at the Sandy Ground Site (AL03-SG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Crock, J. and J. Peterson/ University of Vermont</td>
<td>Field School in Prehistoric Archaeology at the Rendezvous Bay Site (AL02-RZ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Crock, J. and J. Peterson/ University of Vermont</td>
<td>Field School in Prehistoric Archaeology at the Shoal Bay East Site (AL19-SE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Peterson, J./University of Vermont</td>
<td>Field School in Prehistoric Archaeology at the Rendezvous Bay Site (AL02-RZ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Peterson, J. and J. Crock/University of Vermont</td>
<td>Field School in Prehistoric Archaeology at the Rendezvous Bay Site (AL02-RZ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Peterson, J. And J. Crock/University of Vermont</td>
<td>Field School in Prehistoric Archaeology at the Rendezvous Bay Site (AL02-RZ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>J. Crock/University of Vermont</td>
<td>Consulting Archaeology Program salvage excavations at Rendezvous Bay Site (AL02-RZ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>J. Crock/University of Vermont</td>
<td>LIDAR mapping of Fountain Cavern (AL01-FC) in partnership with EarthAnalytic, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Crock J. and Wetherbee Dorshow</td>
<td>Shipwreck Survey covering Prickley Pear Reef, Road Bay, Crocus Bay, and N. Reef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>L. Azevedo/ University of Southampton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2-2 Locations of Amerindian Sites on Anguilla from AAHS Review 1985

**Taíno Colonization**

The notion that water is a means of economic and social unity rather than separation remains a key concept in understanding Amerindian culture on Anguilla and in the Lesser Antilles. The indigenous culture, Taíno, is better defined by water passages than by land, and was characterized by fluid interconnections between its centre and peripheries (Stevens-Arroyo 2006: 28). Amerindian seafarers arrived in the Island Caribbean around 7000 years ago; they established primary settlements in Trinidad, Cuba and Española. Between 3,800 and 4,000 years ago, an initial group arrived on Anguilla and settled in at least two areas in the NE area of the Island at Whitehead’s Bluff (AL33-WB) and Flowers Avenue* (AL39-FA). These Amerindians of the Archaic period were hunter-gatherer-fishermen whose artefact assemblage included dugout canoes for travel across the sea (Peterson and Crock 2001). Some researchers believe that Anguilla may have been abandoned during the early Saladoid period when the Island was going through a particularly dry period (Crock and Peterson 1999). A second period of colonization took place during the Saladoid period (so named for a distinctive red on white pottery style) by Taíno Amerindians between c. AD 300-600.
Watercraft

These settlers may have come from a site already established on St Martin during the Early Saladoid period at Hope Estate (Haviser 1993). Ethnographic accounts by early European explorers offer abundant evidence for the maritime prowess of Amerindians. Unfortunately, however, the specific design of Caribbean watercraft is unclear due to a lack of archaeological data (Leshikar 1988). Only two pre-Columbian vessels have been excavated, one from Cuba and the other from Andros Island, Bahamas. These together with small models and a description of a craft excavated from Jamaica in the 19th century (Cundall 1894: 5) and later destroyed are all the evidence to date. With a relative absence of archaeological data, researchers have speculated widely about the design of these vessels. While historical descriptions after 1650 report native vessels with sails, most researchers believe that the Amerindians did not possess this technology until after European contact (Glazier 1991, Seidemann 2001). Researchers and historical accounts agree, however, that even without sail technology Amerindians were capable of travelling long distances over the sea (Leshikar 1988, Callaghan 1995, Johnstone 1980, McKusick 1960). Columbus’s first report of what can be construed as a large Taíno trading canoe on 27 November, 1492, off the northeast coast of Cuba reads

"... there he found a handsome dugout or canoe, made of one timber as big as a fusta of twelve rowing benches, drawn up under a shelter or shed made of wood and covered with big palm leaves, so that neither sun nor water could damage it" (Beckwith-Farina 1990 IN Peck no Date).

A European fusta large enough to accommodate twenty-four rowers plus passengers or cargo would have been about forty feet long. Other early historic accounts describe huge trading vessels capable of carrying more than 100 souls. Such vessels would have required modification from a hollowed out trunk to be seaworthy. Extending the sides by lashing on planks using fibre would have made the craft more seaworthy (McKusick 1960 and Johnstone 1980) but unfortunately there are no examples from the archaeological record.

Maritime Resources

Using their skills, Amerindians utilized the resources at hand. Evidence from excavations on Anguilla show that Amerindians adapted their subsistence strategy to rely extensively on the marine environment. Vertebrate specimens recovered and analysed from two contemporary sites on Anguilla (Barnes Bay [AL14-BB] and Sandy Ground [AL03-SG]) occupied during the Saladoid (300-600/800AD) and post-Saladoid period demonstrate a heavy reliance on fish. Out of a combined sample size of 33,257 NISP (Number of
Identified Species) 98% of the specimens are fishes and fishes make up 97% and 95% of the biomass respectively (Carder 2007: 592). Interestingly there is disproportionately little evidence for fishing gear in the archaeological record. One explanation may lie in the methods employed. In 16th-century Cuba, Spaniards observed Amerindians using nets made of cotton cord and palm-fibre with hooks made from bone and tortoise shell while in Cuba natives were observed creating fish hatcheries using reeds staked in the harbour. Cuabeo, a method where a torch was used at night near the shore to attract fishes was also observed (Martin-Fragachan 1999: 269). The variety of these methods, many of which don’t rely on material that is typically preserved and discovered during archaeological excavation may offer one explanation why more fishing tackle has not been identified in archaeological contexts. In addition it is possible that many modified shells attributed to ornamentation may have had a utilitarian function as fishing weights. A re-examination of recovered material would undoubtedly provide some answers (Watters 1982).

**Pelican Motif**

While the majority (95%) of excavated ceramics are unadorned, a small number of decorated vessels depict the pelican motif as a modelled clay ‘adorno’ on the rim (Figure 2-3). Archaic axe made from imported stone (left) and Saladoid-period pottery with pelican adorno (right) from AAHS. Animals including pelicans which could pass from one media to another (water-air or water-land) were given particular importance in Taíno mythology (Lévi-Strauss 1973). The pelican is a superb fisher and would have been an important figure, perhaps even sacred to a people who depended on fishing for 98% of their animal protein. This could also explain the absence of pelican bones from the archaeological record if they were not being utilized as a food source (Crock 2010).

**Natural Barriers and ‘Buffer Zones’**

Current theories suggest that opposed to isolating Anguilla, the sea formed a highway that provided sustenance and encouraged interaction between nearby islands (Havisier 1993,
Seidemann 2001). While some (indirect) interaction over larger distances invariably occurred and the possibility for long sea voyages has been demonstrated by several experimental projects (Grudowski 2007, Grimner 2008), natural barriers including prevailing currents and wind patterns would have made it easier for regular prehistoric interaction to occur between some islands and not others. Building on this concept, Rouse constructed a theory of frontiers, with water linking some interisland sites and dividing others (Rouse 1982: 48). In other words, the most regular exchanges invariably took place between nearby islands (i.e. St Martin and Anguilla) or those which were not isolated by ‘buffer zones’ (natural obstacles for travel).

There was also widespread trade. Analysis of 44 sherds from four of the Lesser Antilles Islands by David Watters (Carnegie Museum of Natural History) and Jack Donahue (University of Pittsburgh) in 1991 revealed volcanic temper present in all the samples, including non-volcanic Anguilla, providing evidence that either temper or pottery was being imported during the Saladoid and Post-Saladoid period to Anguilla from volcanic islands in the vicinity (Watters 1991, Crock 2000).

Archaeologist Jay Haviser theorizes that during the Early Saladoid period an initial area on St Martin was colonized at Hope Estate, and that during the Late Saladoid period the population grew and eventually fissioned. According to Haviser, some of the population remained at Hope Estate while another part established new settlements at Rendezvous Bay and Maundays Bay in SW Anguilla. Pottery styles are virtually identical on both islands and he believes the two islands should be regarded as a single population. Instead of considering the stretch of water between the islands as a barrier, he argues that it would have served as a highway between villages (Interview September 2010). He writes that during the post-Saladoid period (AD 600/800-1500) populations continued to expand exponentially and new sites throughout Anguilla and St Martin were founded along with sites on neighbouring St Barths and Dog Island. Around AD 1000 an estimated 2,000 Amerindians lived on Anguilla (roughly the same number of people who lived on the Island during the late 18th-century). During this pre-historic population explosion, approximately 72% of the St Martin-Anguilla-Dog Island cluster people lived on Anguilla while the other 28% was evenly distributed between St Martin and Dog Island (Haviser 1993: 142).

**Trade**

During the period, Anguilla may have served as a ceremonial centre for all three islands. Zemis or cemis are three pointed religious artefacts central to the worship of the Taíno’s supreme deity of cassava (a root crop) and the sea, Yócahu Bagua Maórocoti. Zemis can be
constructed from bone, ceramic or stone and can be either plain or carved to depict anthropomorphic figures including various avatars of Yócahu including frogs, manatees, serpents, and other animals beneficial or harmful to crops (Martin-Fragachan 1999: 275). On Anguilla, the majority are worked from greenstone, a volcanic stone native to St Martin. Material found on Anguilla was imported from St Martin at an estimated rate of 82 kg per year per village and worked locally (Crock 2000: 235). Finished and unfinished examples of zemis together with raw material have been found abundantly in Anguilla contexts including the Fountain Cavern near Shoal Bay. These together with finished examples excavated from Puerto Rico, Guadeloupe and as far as Trinidad, offer evidence for trade with Islands throughout the Caribbean (Haviser 2010 Presentation).

**Fountain Cavern, Shoal Bay**

Another hint to the role of the sea can be found in Fountain Cavern, a ceremonial cave site and important source of fresh water on Anguilla. Caves were ideologically important to the Taíno who believed that all mankind originated from a cave and that the spirits of their ancestors slept inside during the day and came out as bats during the night. Inside the Fountain Cavern on Anguilla, archaeologists in 1979 discovered more than a dozen petroglyphs. The largest and most impressive by far was a larger than life stalactite carved in the likeness of the Taíno supreme deity Yócahu Bagua Maórocoti. Translated from the Arawak language, the name roughly means ‘the spirit of the cassava and the sea which has no masculine forebear’ (Arrom IN Martin-Fragachan 1999). According to legend, Yócahu had a mother (who was the goddess of fresh water and fertility) but no father. He was the god of the sea and also the god of cassava. For a fisher-planter people, the combination would have been very important. Taken together, cassava and the sea provided everything necessary for Amerindians to live on Anguilla. By all evidence, the golden years’ of Amerindian (Taíno) occupation on Anguilla lasted until the 13th-15th Centuries.

**Decline and Depopulation**

Two forces contributed to the decline and depopulation of Anguilla. The traditional view of archaeologists is that from the south, a Carib-speaking group of Amerindians expanded into the region from about AD1200 and at the end of the 15th century diseases were introduced into the region by European explorers. By 1518 a smallpox epidemic which spread from Santo Domingo to Puerto Rico decimated the few remaining Amerindians in the region. Jay Haviser believes that there may have been some overlap between the arrival of Europeans and Amerindians living on Anguilla and St Martin, especially as the islands were colonized relatively late. The explorers who reached the islands in the late
15th and early 16th-centuries did not land on the islands and may have missed indigenous populations (Havisier Interview September 2010).

Figure 2-3 Archaic axe made from imported stone (left) and Saladoid-period pottery with pelican adorno (right) from AAHS
1650-1796 Europeans and Colonization

Absence of Archaeological Data

While the Amerindian occupation of Anguilla is understood solely through archaeological evidence, the island has yet to be the focus of any historical archaeological fieldwork. Such investigations would undoubtedly shed much light on the Island’s earliest period of European occupation. The remains and foundations of several early structures which are currently dated to the late-18th century could perhaps be understood in an earlier context. Until such investigations take place, however, Anguilla’s earliest historic period must be presented from the fragmentary documentary evidence available (Public Record Office, UK: Anguilla Archives, Bilton 1715, Imray 1856) and secondary sources (Dunn 1972, Berglund 1995, Carty 1997, Hubbard 2002, Mitchell 2009).

First European Settlers

The year Anguilla was settled by the English, it was written that

*It [Anguilla] was filled with alligators and other noxious animals, but the soil was good for raising tobacco and corn and the cattle imported multiplied very fast. It was not colonized under any public encouragement, each planter laboured for himself, and the island was frequently plundered by marauders (deRochefort 1666 IN Jones 1923).*

There is no evidence that alligators ever lived on Anguilla and it is likely that early European explorers were referring to the local iguana, Anguilla’s largest herbivore and reptile, *Iguana Delicatissima*. Sometime between the Amerindians’ departure and the island’s unchartered settlement by the English, livestock was introduced to Anguilla for it was reported in 1666 that the imported cattle multiplied quickly. The rapid multiplication of cattle on Anguilla would have had both immediate and long-term effects. Within a few years the introduction of large herbivores into the ecosystem would have rendered many of the tastier grass species extinct. In addition, the soil would have been seriously compacted, reducing soil infiltration, and increasing runoff, which in turn would have led to more erosion. In Española, many of the characteristic barrancas and arroyos have been traced to such trampling effects (Watts 1999). During periods of drought, Anguilla receives only about 30 inches of rain per year; however, a single storm easily leaves 5-8” (estimated prediction for Hurricane Earl in 2010). Clearing the land for farming would have aggravated the problem of erosion. Some of Anguilla’s earliest listed exports include mahogany and as late as 1856 wood could be obtained in Rendezvous Bay.
(Imray 1856). Anguilla historian Don Mitchell theorizes that deforestation combined with poor husbandry practiced by the European planters resulted in the loss of top soil everywhere but the ‘bottoms’. The impoverished soil would be a continuing problem for Anguilla, making agriculture extremely difficult and encouraging a greater reliance on maritime resources.

The first record of Europeans arriving on Anguilla comes from St Martin. The Dutch settlement on St Maarten established a small fort at Sandy Hill in 1631 on the South Coast of Anguilla to overlook the approach to the Dutch capital of Philipsburg in St Maarten. Following Spain’s destruction of the main settlement on St Martin in 1634, the Dutch disassembled their ‘Fort’ on Anguilla and used the recovered materials to rebuild Phillipsburg. The name ‘Fort Hill’ is all that remains on this early fortification (Mitchell Carib Raid 2009). By 1650, the English had established an informal colony without Royal Charter.

The value of the British Leeward Islands’ sugar exports during the period 1715-1718 was more than the value of all the North American colonies’ exports combinedviii (Hubbard 2002:61). Anguilla, however, contributed very little to this figure. From the earliest settlement by Europeans until 1825 when the Island joined St Kitts, Anguilla lacked a formal legal system. The Deputy Governor was elected by the settlers and ruled with the force of his proverbial club and the support of his fellow islanders. This local leadership led to formal condemnation. A visiting official from Britain described the island as ‘a nest of pirates and smugglers and outlaws, dangerous to every neighbouring island, and a disgrace to the British name’ (PRO, CO 230/59).

Navigational Hazards

As the northernmost of the Leeward Islands with few local resources, Anguilla was a destination for few vessels. With a low profile and off the most travelled routes, the island and more importantly its reefs were poorly charted. The danger to navigation was described as late as 1856.

In approaching the islands we have described, from the northward, from their being backed by the high land of St Martin, navigators are very apt to make a wrong estimate of their distance from the shore, and which has led to fatal mistakes on the north-east side of Anguilla (Imray 1856: 20).
Shipwrecks

The comment probably refers to two Spanish Ships which wrecked in 1772 (see Chapter 3 Site A-01) although they were by no means the only victims. The earliest evidence for shipwrecks comes from 1628. That year, one possibly two merchant ships were lost off Anguilla. The account which is partially preserved in the Spanish archives in Seville reads in part,

... they wrecked in the place of small barren islands of Anguilla ...and in this small chalupa they saved the captain and pilot of this ship and 13 or 14 of the sailors and ships' boys... (AGI Indifferente 1153: 1629).

Unfortunately the account doesn’t give any more details of the ship or its rescuers. A chalupa may be either a ship’s boat in Portuguese (the pilot of the wrecked vessel and deponent was Portuguese) or a canoe.

Aside from the 1628 Shipwreck, only one other vessel was reported lost during the 17th century. The English vessel, William and Nicholas took shelter in ‘the Road’ Road Bay after being severely damaged by a storm in 1672. The Governor-in-Chief of the Leeward Islands at the time Sir Charles Wheler seized the ship and its cargo of logwood on a misinterpreted point of law. The ship’s cargo was offloaded but the vessel sank from damage. For his misdirected zeal the Governor-in-Chief was removed from office.

Despite the absence of documentary evidence, it is likely that other vessels were lost during the period. Few documents pertaining to Anguilla survive from the 17th-century. In 1708, ten survivors were cast ashore on Anguilla after 31 days adrift when their vessel, the Pink, was lost near Bermuda. In 1715, the Captain published an account of their ordeal.

On the 19th of April, at three in the afternoon, we got our boat ashore at Long-Bay [Anguilla], where they carried us all up, and laid us by a Well that Night, with a tilt over us and got us some victuals. That night they sent to the governor, who ordered another Boat, with several men, to bring us higher up, along the island, where he himself met us, with several of the island-planters; and they dispered us into the island to their houses, carrying some of us on horses, some in hamocks, and others between two men. They were all of them very kind to us, the worst was, we could not have any news from other islands; this being an island of little Trade, and no shipping (Bilton 1715).
‘An Island of Little Trade’

‘An island of little Trade and no shipping’ is relative. In 1676, 26 years after initial colonization, the gross value of Anguilla’s plantations was worth an estimated £1000 (compared to England’s wealthiest island of Nevis whose plantations were valued at £384,660) (CO 153/2/139). Colonel Philip Warner describes Anguilla as ‘a barren, rocky island, ill settled by the English, and of small consequence either for timber’ (CO 153/2/76). The report that Anguilla was good for little and should be abandoned was regularly repeated and reflects England’s small concern for its less productive colonies. Early reports frequently emphasize that the Island is ‘fit for little but goats’ and ‘not worth keeping’ (CO 1/23/103, folio 212 Willoughby to Williamson IN Mitchell 2009 First Generation). Relegated to backwater status, Anguilla would be left to its own devices and cultivate a deep connection with the sea.

Cotton, Tobacco and Salt

From the earliest period, Anguilla utilised the resources at hand. Amerindians had introduced cotton and tobacco to the Island and the settlers cultivated it along with harvesting salt from local ponds. Passing ships could obtain stock and firewood but not water (Imray 1856: 21). At the time the survivors landed on Anguilla in 1708, the island’s ‘little trade’ would have been cotton and salt which was harvested and traded along with cattle and other livestock.

The 18th century witnessed a huge increase in ship traffic in the Caribbean. During the century increased prosperity and record keeping in Anguilla preserved details from some of the unfortunate vessels lost on Anguilla’s reefs (Appendix C: Shipwreck Database). Not surprisingly, several are associated with the sugar industry including the Castle Shallop (lost 1733), L’Angelique (lost 1755), and the Antelope (lost 1771). The first two were carrying sugar and the last was a slaver. A contemporary account of the first which was lost during a great hurricane in 1733 reads,

_The Castle-Shallop belonging to the Estate of Sir William Stapleton, had been with a Load of Sugar at Basterre [St Kitts], from whence the three Negroes, that sailed her, ventur’d out in the Storm, and to the wonder of many, kept the Sea, till they reach’d Anguilla, where they were glad to run her ashore to save themselves, and are now return’d safe in another Vessel with the Riggin, etc. (Letter to a Gentleman in London 1733 in Millás, no date)._
Most of the information found regarding specific wrecks is frustratingly brief. For example, all that is known of the *Angelique* is that she was under Captain Brunel duHavre’s command and left Martinique on May 6, 1755. The ship wrecked on the coast of “Petite-Anguille” [probably Anguillita] before dawn and while the ship’s equipment was saved, the cargo and ship were both lost.

More information is known about the *Antelope*. The ship was first registered in Lancaster on October 28, 1763 and was probably purpose-built for the slave trade. Lancaster slavers were typically Brigs or Snows between 20 and 100 tons and 40 to 50ft in length, smaller than contemporary slavers operating from Liverpool or London. Their smaller size enabled them to navigate the Windward Coast, the River Gambia and African estuaries. It also allowed them to spend less time along the African coast, reducing the risk of contracting tropical diseases and allowing less time for potential slave revolts. The *Antelope* was an average Lancaster Brig, being 40 tons, carrying two guns and a crew of 20. She was owned by a group of Lancaster merchantmen including Thomas Hinde (Figure 2-4), John Watson, William Watson, Robert Dodson, Richard Millerson, Thomas Millerson, and Henry Lawrence. Multiple owners were not uncommon in Lancaster and many of the partners had been involved with the trade for a generation or more.

The *Antelope* successfully completed four previous trips. The first (Captain Thomas Paley) in 1764 carried 250 slaves from Africa to Charleston, South Carolina and returned to Lancaster in 1764. The second (Captain Paley) purchased 169 slaves from Senegambia and the Offshore Atlantic and sold 150 in Charleston before returning to Lancaster on July 29, 1765. The Antelope’s third trip (Captain Paley) collected 109 slaves from Africa and sold 97 in Savannah, Georgia. The Brig’s fourth trip (Captain John Read) left Lancaster on July 12, 1768, purchased an unknown number of slaves in Africa and sold them in St Kitts, returning to Lancaster in September 1769. On August 5, 1770 the *Antelope* left Lancaster for the Windward Coast for the final time. The ship and Captain (John Read) were spotted in February 1771 “with a cargo of 100 slaves well betwixt the Capes” (Lloyds List). The Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade Database reports the vessel’s subsequent fate as ‘unknown’ (Trans-Atlantic Slave Database 2009).

Documents from Anguilla’s Court of King’s Bench pick up the trail and reveal that the *Antelope* left Grenada July 9, 1771 and

*On Monday night the 15th instant about eight o’clock runs on the reef of Anguilla adjoining a key called Scrub Island and on the 16th instant early in the morning several boats with people [from] Anguilla came to our assistance but no possibility of [ ] saw Brigantine off as she was then bilg’d but saved [ ] cases of*
the goods tackle apparel and furniture etc [ ] said Brigantine Antilope (Anguilla Treasury Records Court of Kings Bench 1771).

The fate of those on board or even whether there were slaves on board is not known. Interestingly, the ship's name Antelope, appears more than 100 years later as the name of one of Anguilla’s earliest racing vessels. The vessel’s remains have never been identified and it is tempting but dangerous to assume a connection between the two vessels’ names.

Figure 2-4 Thomas Hinde, one of the Antelope’s owners (Lancaster City and Maritime Museum)
Privateering and the Invasion of St Martin

During the 18th-century, the European nations were regularly at war. Anguilla, along with the rest of the Caribbean was invariably caught up in the action. The constant conflict between Europe’s superpowers created an opportunity for Anguilla’s mariners. Privateering, or the licensed capturing of enemy ships, peaked during the latter half of the century and the Court of Vice Admiralty was kept busy listening to reports from outraged traders whose ships and cargoes had been captured by Anguillian Privateers (Mitchell 2009 The French Wars).

War between the French and English broke out in 1740 in the War of the Austrian Succession (also known as the War of Jenkins Ear or King George’s War). It was in 1744 while France and England were at war that the Anguillians decided to invade neighbouring French St Martin. Anguilla’s Deputy Governor Arthur Hodge, assisted by 300 Anguilla volunteers and two privateers from St Kitts, succeeded in pushing the French off their land and claiming French St Martin for Anguilla. The invasion, sometimes described as a ‘marauding expedition’ was successful. The following year, however, the French retaliated, sending 650 men under the command of Monsieur de LaTouche to invade Anguilla. Landing at Crocus Bay the invaders were routed as they attempted to scale up the steep hill towards the capital. An Anguillian reported,

They had landed several hand grenade shells, swivel guns fixed on triangles, beef, cheese, bread and wine...We had not one man hurt and have got by this expedition, besides two of their colours, a great many fine buccaneer guns, cartouche boxes, etc. which they left behind, and with which we intend to arm our most trusty and sensible Negroes to strengthen our island (Letter from an unnamed Anguillian to a friend on St Kitts printed in the Boston Post August 5, 1745).

Having captured St Martin and repelled the retaliating invasion, Anguilla worked to keep St Martin as a dependency of Anguilla. In 1747 Anguilla’s Deputy Governor Arthur Hodge was sent to England to petition the English Government. His efforts were in vain as the Treaty of Aix-la-Chappelle returned St Martin to the French. Several Anguillians who had already settled in St Martin remained, eventually becoming French citizens while maintaining their connections with Anguilla.

A second invasion by the French took place in November 1796 following a declaration of war on England by the revolutionary government in France in 1793. Approximately 400 French landed in Rendezvous Bay, Anguilla from the warships *Le Desius* and *La Vaillante.*
The French advanced East towards the Valley and Sandy Hill; in the Valley they ‘burnt the little town, pulled down the church, stabbed men in their houses and stripped women of their clothes’ (Southey 1824). Finally, during a desperate stand in Sandy Hill, the Anguillians dispatched the Margaret, a fast sailing schooner, to St Kitts for help. The HMS Lapwing, a British Frigate under Captain Barton proceeded immediately to Anguilla. On sighting the frigate, the French abandoned their siege and took to their ships. The resulting naval battle destroyed both French vessels. La Vaillante was forced aground on St Martin and Le Desius captured and later burned (Petty 2008: 9).

1730-1900 Going Down to the Sea: Maritime Heritage in Anguilla: Trade, Smuggling, Salt and Migrations

Where you have both water and people, there you will find boats; and these boats do not occur by accident. They are built deliberately, of specific materials and to a design that is very uniform for the area and the culture of the builders (Pyle 191: 1998).

Trade and Smuggling

In the 18th century, ships formed a life-line connecting Anguilla with the rest of the Caribbean. In 1736, an Anguillian vessel was seized by the Spanish near the Rocas, a series of small rocky islands more than 700km from Anguilla off the coast of Venezuela where they claimed to be hunting turtle. The report demonstrates how widely Anguillians were travelling, trading, and fishing in the early 18th century. That they claimed to be fishing so far from Anguilla is also suggestive. The Spaniards believed the Anguillians were engaged in smuggling and it is quite possible they were correct. Smuggling on Anguilla has a long tradition and if the Spaniards were correct, it would prove an even greater lineage. Unfortunately, the name of the Anguillian sloop and its fate along with its crew has not survived so we cannot be certain. Historian Don Mitchell writes that

‘it was this profession [smuggling] that was responsible for having provided valuable training and employment for generations of famous Anguillian shipwrights and sailors.’ (Mitchell 2009 The Buccaneers and Anguilla).

Trade and smuggling were important on Anguilla during periods of frequent and severe droughts. The Caribbean islands have semi-regular cycles so that Anguilla either has reasonably moist weather allowing agriculture and increased prosperity, or dry with periods of extreme drought. These cycles have helped determine when Anguilla was able to support agriculture and when the Island was forced to rely more heavily on the sea. It
was during the mid-1700s that a wetter climate enabled sugar to be cultivated and provided capital for Anguillians to make use of maritime opportunities. In addition to smuggling and privateering, the Islanders relied on ships to export crops including salt, cotton and sugar during prosperous times and its men during periods of hardship (to work cutting cane or on oil refineries on other islands). The importance of trade to 18th century Anguilla is best demonstrated by a description of the Island’s wealthiest man in 1730. Deputy Governor George Leonard is described first as ‘an honest old sloop man...and [secondly as] having the best cotton plantation there’ (Mitchell 2009 Sugar Arrives). Leonard and other Anguillian Planters prospered by owning property off-Anguilla and managing trade between Anguilla and other islands. Sloops and schooners facilitated trade between plantations as when an Anguillian planter named John Bryan immigrated to St Croix in 1717 he did not give up his Anguillian plantation but continued to own property on both islands. Using his ships to take advantage of the opportunities in each place, he used the sea as a highway to link communities and create market opportunities.

By building connections with more prosperous Islands and taking advantage of the resources available, Anguilla was able to prosper in the 1700s, if on a much smaller scale than her more productive neighbours.

**Salt Industry**

While Anguilla’s climate was ill-suited for sugar production, salt has been an enduring commodity through modern times. While the Caicos Islands were the main source for salt in the Leeward Islands any shortfall could be met by the northernmost islands, namely St Martin and Anguilla. Anguilla’s salt ponds encouraged Canadian schooners to stop in Anguilla, where they might exchange their ballast for salt. An investigation during the 2009 Shipwreck Survey around ‘The Ballast,’ an area in Road Bay revealed many of these smooth river stones (45cm in diameter and larger) which were offloaded to make room for salt (see Chapter 3: SF-02 Historic Feature Ballast Bank). Once they had jettisoned their ballast, locally built ‘lighters’ ferried the salt to waiting vessels where it was packed to replace ballast.

**Sloops and Schooners**

New England traders used sloops and schooners for their trade. These fore- and aft-rigged vessels were better suited to the region than the square-rigged brigantines and barkentines common in Europe. Technological developments in schooner building in New England and Nova Scotia together with a Canadian policy requiring Grand Bank fishing schooners to be replaced after ten years of service had a crucial impact on Anguillian boat building.
Not only did the sloops and schooners require less rig and therefore fewer crew to handle, but they were also able to point higher to the wind and were both fast and manoeuvrable (Carty 1997: 59). Many retired Canadian vessels ended up in the hands of Anguillians who studied and adapted their design. The sea was a road to greener pastures and Anguillians’ most valuable possessions became their boats (Informant33). By the end of the 18th century, Anguilla’s maritime roots were established. From necessity, trade networks had been created as maritime skills including navigation and boat building were established.

**The 19th Century**

The 1796 French Invasion was a turning point for Anguilla and the island would not regain levels of pre-invasion prosperity for more than 150 years. The destruction of the Island coincided with falling productivity through deficiencies of the soil and deflated sugar prices on the global market.

**Skilled slaves purchase freedom**

In an effort to cope, many slave owners sent their slaves off-island to work as coopers, sailors, masons and field labourers (Jones 1923). A series of preserved deeds show how, after years of labour abroad, many of these slaves returned to Anguilla where some of them purchased their freedom. By the 1820s the black to white ratio of Anguilla’s free population was nearly equal. In the 1830s, as a result of drought, the old estates were purchased by free blacks for little or nothing or inherited so that by the time slavery was abolished in the English territories in 1834, many of the white landowners had left Anguilla. August Monday became a holiday and today remains Anguilla’s most popular secular holiday.

**Drought and Migration**

Hurricanes in 1819 and 1821 coupled with deforestation of primary vegetation (to make room for plantations) had increased the severity and length of droughts. During these challenging times finding employment off-island was the only solution. It was a common situation for the region but Anguilla was better prepared than many other islands. Locally owned sloops and schooners offered a vital lifeline. While shipping and trading had been important to Anguilla in the preceding century, it now became an absolute necessity. As a local historian explains, ‘those men of the schooner day launched a veritable drawbridge across the moat that surrounded a poor and destitute homeland to enable trade and therefore life to continue’ (Carty 1997: 45).
‘Going down to the sea’ was the only alternative to depression and starvation and it was this necessity which forged Anguillians into fishermen, shipwrights, caulkers, riggers, mariners and traders. Official records including ship registers from the 1840s demonstrate that the latent craft of ‘shipwrighting’ and especially rigging were well established (Pyle 1998).

Following the end of the American Civil War in 1865, great areas of land were opened for agriculture in the United States. Phosphate discovered on Anguilla and Sombrero proved an excellent fertilizer and for the next twenty years the industry brought increased trade and prosperity to Anguilla. Americans established a phosphate mine on Sombrero, an uninhabited Island located in the middle of the Anegada Passage 38 miles north-west of Anguilla. By 1870, exports reached 3,000 tons per annum. Fuelling this short-lived industry were Anguillians who migrated to Sombrero to work the phosphate mine, living on the island for six months out of the year. This led to the foundation of a higher standard of living in many Anguillian homes. Three good meals a day, a liberal ration of rum and molasses, and seven or eight dollars a month constituted a good pay for a Sombrero labourer (Jones 1923: 24).

Working in the Phosphate mines on Sombrero and Anguilla provided employment for many of Anguilla’s men until around 1880. The work gave Anguillians the financial wherewithal to build and purchase vessels for a local merchant fleet and by 1900 the ship registers shows an impressive ownership of boats by Anguillians (Carty 1997: 14).

During a regular period of drought in the 1890s, Anguilla suffered from famine and Anguilla’s schooners saved the community from complete collapse (Carty 1997: 14). American investments in sugar plantations in the Dominican Republic in 1895 created an opportunity for employment. The fleet provided transportation not only for Anguillians to work in the sugar fields but also for ‘down islanders’ who travelled to St Martin to catch the Anguilla schooners.

Re-enactment of Intangible Heritage

The departure of the fleet from St Martin was an exodus en masse. On New Year’s Day the schooners would depart, each 60-90 ton vessel carrying as many as 200 men to work the fields. While British law limited the number of passengers at 1 per ton, the vessels avoided this law by embarking from French St Martin. The voyage to San Pedro de Macorís or La Romana would last around four days. Cramped conditions and local pride fostered competition. The voyage home after six months’ work was a direct beat to windward and could take anything from four to twenty-one days (Carty 1997: 18). As the ships embarked
as a convoy, the passengers became spectators, urging the crew and captains to greater speed. As the ships approached Anguilla, the beach was lined with women and children who anxiously awaited the return of their menfolk. This historic departure and reunion is re-enacted each year during the Anguilla boat races as spectators witness the departure and return of boats from Sandy Ground.

Dictator Rafael Trujillo’s rise to power in the Dominican Republic in 1930 and the resulting political instability led to a decline in trade that eventually ended around 1940. But as the door on the sugar industry closed, another door opened in Curaçao and Aruba. Anguillians and other Caribbean people travelled to work at the countries’ oil refineries (Petty 2008: 76).

The schooner convoy and race home were no longer necessary; however the schooners continued to find their uses. During times of good, wet weather Anguillians produced significantly large quantities of corn, pigeon-peas, sweet potatoes, guinea corn, eddoes, beans, and yams to export them. They also raised yard fowl (chickens), guinea fowl, turkey, goat, sheep, and cattle. When there was an excess, Anguillian schooners and sloops carried full cargoes of produce to neighbouring islands, trading and exchanging it for a broad range of commodities and goods.

A feature of this trade which may be unique to the Caribbean is a system called the ‘share plan’. As described, the Anguillian boats deducted running costs from their gross earnings and paid the owner and crew equally from the net earnings. The owner received 1/3 and the crew shared the remaining 2/3 equally. The captain was paid an additional share from the owner’s portion. The system which is common to fishermen is rare among traders and its use by Anguillian traders illustrates the shared need of Anguillian mariners to depend on the sea, the fleet and each other to make a living (Pyle 1998; Carty 1997: 15). Anguilla’s schooners became proud symbols of the Island. The Warspite, built in 1909 at Sandy Ground, Anguilla, was 78 feet long, with a 20 foot beam, and 72 tons, was an Island favourite. The vessel which was commemorated in 1995 in a series of postal stamps was unfortunately lost in 1984 during Hurricane Klaus.
Figure 2-5 The Warspite schooner (on stamp) is an iconic symbol of Anguilla's maritimity

Figure 2-6 Warspite at anchor in Road Bay (photo AAHS)
1900-Present ‘The Sea is in our Blood’: The Past in the Present as shown through tradition and re-enactment

**Boat building, Smuggling and Racing**

The practices of boat building, smuggling and boat racing continue to play a role in Anguillians’ self-identification. While methods and technology have changed, Anguillians continue to interact with the sea, simultaneously adapting and celebrating their maritimity in ways that reflect both traditional and new ideas. For example, boats continue to be built locally but now utilize new tools, materials and designs; smuggling, while illegal, continues to retain an aura of near-respectability, and boat racing continues while the boats themselves have become so specialized as to lack any purpose other than racing. Where maritimity is observed today, it is in a modern context on an island where tourism accounts for more than 80% of the GDP. It is significant that where the past appears in the present, it is typically in a context which can be consumed by both locals and visitors: at a festival or fair or on a plate.

The boats that are used in today’s races have not in fact evolved from the schooners but rather from a long line of fishing and smuggling boats. After the convoy of Anguilla’s schooners returned Anguilla’s ‘menfolk’ from the Santo Domingo cane fields, the schooners were stripped of their sails and rigging and put to their hurricane anchors. Sailing crews became fishermen, exchanging schooners for small fishing boats. These now obsolete commercial sailing craft 17-20’ in length were used to set traps off Anguilla. After a day fishing, the boats would race each other back to Anguilla. Speed and manoeuvrability were important not only for bragging rights but also for developing important skills as many of the boats used for fishing during the day became smugglers by night.

**Smuggling and St Martin**

According to oral tradition, smuggling has maintained a time-honoured place of respectability in Anguilla’s history. The close proximity of duty-free St Martin, the Island’s numerous bays and coves, the poverty of the inhabitants, the high rates of duty, together with the presence of so many skilled mariners and available boats, has made smuggling a natural pastime. While liquor was the main commodity, other staple foods including rice, sugar, and flour were also smuggled. Duty on a gallon of rum in the 1930s meant that the same amount of rum costing two or three shillings in St Martin could cost as much as 20 shillings to import. There was little cash on Anguilla and the high tax amounted to prohibition. The Anguillians invented ingenious ways to avoid both the officials (all two in
1930) and Anguilla’s dangerous reefs. For example, at Little Harbour, a series of fires were lit which were visible at sea but invisible from land. Smugglers would tack along the nearly reef-bound coast until the fires onshore lined up meaning the channel was straight ahead and they could enter (Carty 1997). Smugglers invented several marching songs; the most famous of which was sung to the tune ‘All Hail the Power of Jesus’ Name:

- *All hail the power of Cockpur’s rum*
- *Let drunkards prostrate fall*
- *Bring forth the royal demijohn*
- *And crack it on the wall (Carty 1997).*

Smuggling was important to boat racing as invariably the best boats for smuggling were also competitive racers. Smugglers traded capacity and stability for speed and stealth.

**Fishing**

In the 21st century fishing remains important. In 2010, approximately 50 fishing families remain on Anguilla with the majority working from Island Harbour in East End. Time and new technology has changed the industry. Since the early 1970s, diesel and petrol motors have replaced sails. Motorized winches have replaced brute force to reclaim set pots, and chicken wire replaced the local wood traditionally used to make fish pots. Despite these changes, many of the vessels are constructed locally to traditional patterns utilizing modern technology.

**Adapting Construction Strategies: Building a Racing Sail Boat**

‘Anguilla has had more than its fair share of very talented boat builders. Indeed in some families the skill almost seems to be genetically inclined (Carty 1997: 60)’. When asked how many boat builders are on Anguilla, one answered, ‘less than a dozen...but everyone can build a boat’ (Informant13). Anguilla’s boat builders have built everything from dinghies to schooners. Today wooden boats are built alongside fibreglass and concrete ones. Racing sail boats are built on the road side without plans while a handful of professional builders utilize the latest in computer design to build luxurious power boats. While boat builders 50 years ago wielded a hand-saw, plane, adze, and a pair of dividers, today’s builders use the power saw. As Carty writes, ‘They stand on the shoulders of giants and continue to make a valuable contribution to the tradition while adapting to newer technologies (Carty 1997: 62). Resin has replaced ‘mop’ to caulk the hull, and marine plywood is laminated and glued together then cut into shapes, replacing local wood for the frames. Today’s boat builders on Anguilla have adopted new methods and materials, continuing a tradition of adaptation and syncretisation. For example, ‘Beggar’ Daniels uses resin to join the hull seams of a fishing boat that he builds upside down without plans
using pine (Figure 2-7). This adaptation is fitting on an island where survival has depended on ingenuity.

**Boat Building Method**

*Location*

The modern construction of a racing boat retains several traditional elements. First, a place off the road, on the beach, or in a yard is selected for construction. Then a 3 by 4 or 3 by 6 piece of pitch pine (obtained from Nova Scotia or St Kitts) is laid out for the keel. The keel is staked to the ground to prevent it moving. While plywood is now used for the frames, traditionally the wood was found locally.

*Materials*

The first choice of local wood was the White Cedar (*Tabebuia heterphylla*). The tree is not really a cedar, being deciduous with glossy dark green leaves and a pale trumpet-shaped flower (which is also Anguilla’s national flower). The wood is like oak, tough and very rot-resistant. It is cut during the waning of the moon when it is believed sap is out of the wood (Carty 2007). In habitats with abundant rainfall, this species forms a tall, straight tree. On arid, salt-sprayed windward coasts the tree grows tougher and denser, forming the curved and twisted shapes that are ideally suited to boat building (Pyle 1998).

Where White Cedar cannot be found, other woods are utilized including Seagrape (*Coccoloba uvá*), Pomserette (*Zizyphus mauritiana*), Clamencherry (*Cordia colloccoca*) or Sherry (*Malphighia emarginata*). For the past 25 years, sheets of marine plywood have been glued together to reach the required thickness for frames. These do not have the natural properties of real wood and are a terrible material to use for nailing on edge. However the use of thickened epoxy to glue and coat the frames has made them preferable (Carty 1997:63).

The keel and stem are laid down on the ground and measured. The builders may attempt to recreate an existing (successful) boat by duplicating proportions (Figure 2-8 Building the Sonic on Anguilla Day 1). This does not always work; in the case of the Sonic, the new boat was 6” longer than the original.

*Framing and Beam to Length Ratio*

The next step is framing. The centre frame is shaped according to the builder’s discretion and its width dictated by the traditional ratio of 4:1. Today, Anguilla’s A-Class racing boats are 28’ in length and have a standard beam to length ratio of 4:1. In comparison, the
Julia, a 25’3” merchant vessel built in Anguilla in 1817 which we can assume was typical for the era had a beam to length ratio of 3.5:1 (British Ship Registries, Public Record Office, England BT107/464). The Warspite, which was built in 1909 had a beam to length ratio of 3.9:1. The narrowing and lengthening of the hull has everything to do with function. A higher beam to length ratio gives greater hull speed but reduces cargo capacity. While the Julia (5 82/95 lh tons) was built to transport cargo as far as Trinidad, Anguilla’s schooners and racing boats were built with a preference for manoeuvrability and speed.

After the centre frames are raised, the transom is shaped and attached to the stern post. Long pieces of scrap wood are nailed around the boat so the shape resembles a basket and the boat is equally divided into two sections, one aft of the centre frame and the other forward of the centre frame. The builder next inserts a pair of frames in the middle of each section so the basket is divided into quarters; the bow frame, and finally the stern frame are added. The builder shapes the bow and stern frame to determine how flat or sharp the sections of the finished boat will be, thus determining how water will flow over and around the hull as she sails. Once these frames are in place, the rest of the frames are added. The shaping of the frames is dictated by the battens which help ensure the hull’s lines will be ‘fair’ (without bumps or depressions) upon completion. Where the frames meet the keel, ‘floors’ are nailed across their backs using 6-inch nails driven vertically through the floor and into the keel. These serve as foot braces, hold the frames together, and secure the frames to the keel.

**Planking**

After framing is complete, the vessel is planked. Starting from the top in order for the sheer line to be determined, the top plank on each side is nailed to the stem, each frame, and the transom. The basket of battens is removed and the rest of the planking begins. White pine continues to be the preferred material although sometimes spruce is also used. Traditionally, each plank was ‘spiled’ or marked so that the planks would fit snugly against one another and then nailed to the frames. Some builders used to dip each nail in shark oil to improve its resistance to rot and rust (Carty 1997). The hull was then caulked with ‘mop’, or strips of cotton which were driven into the cracks and then covered with putty and sanded. ‘Spiling’ has been replaced with strip planking. Planks are cut into thin 1 3/4” to 2” strips and joined with epoxy to make a single strip as long or longer than the hull. Their narrowness allows them to follow the compound curves of the hull without additional shaping and makes the process much faster. Epoxy is used to edge glue the strips together, rendering the need for caulking obsolete.
Figure 2-7 Anguillian Boat builder 'Beggar' inspects the hull of a fishing boat built upside down.
Figure 2-8 Building the Sonic on Anguilla Day 1
**False Keel**

The last feature of the hull is a false keel which is through-bolted into the keel. The piece which is made from two or three pieces of pitch pine on edge is around 16” deep and is necessary to prevent the hull from slipping sideways when sailing. It is possible to replace the false keel, as was necessary following one race when exuberant supporters hoisted the winning boat onshore and dragged it through Sandy Ground in triumphant celebration.

*Decision*, built in the 1970s by Egbert Connor (Figure 2-9), was among the last racing boats to be built using local materials and the traditional methods described above. The boat from Road Bay was a Class A racing sailboat (23’) which won the August Monday Boat Race in 1975, 1976 and 1981. For many years, the vessel’s hull remained on the beach in Sandy Ground. It was unfortunately burnt in April 2010. While many Anguillians retain the skills necessary to build and repair boats using traditional methods, the high cost of local labour means that repairs on the few remaining traditional vessels utilize imported labour from Guyana and islands with lower wages (observed during repair of Banana Boat in Sandy Ground).

**Interior, Decking and Rig**

The interior of each racing boat is remarkably bare. The removable ballast traditionally consisted of a combination of few large ballast stones each weighing around 130 pounds, lead bars, and bags of sand. Today, the solid lead (which has sometimes been mined from historic wrecks) is melted and moulded to fit. There is no decking. This is ‘simply the way it has always been done and one would like to assume the way it always will be done’ (Carty 1997:70). Like the smuggling boat, the rig cannot be hoisted or lowered except as a single unit. The sail is laced to the mast while the jib is sewn permanently to the forestay; the boom is traditionally the length of the boat.

While the racing boat is the most iconic and unique of Anguilla’s boats, there are also a number of utilitarian and pleasure craft which have been built and continue to be built on-island. They include sailing schooners, fishing boats, cargo ships, and luxury and racing power boats. The largest to date was the motor-sailboat *New London* built in the Forest, and launched in July 1971. During the mid-1900s the Forest became Anguilla’s commercial port in an effort to reduce smuggling. Located on the southern coast of Anguilla facing St Martin, the port was in a convenient location to trade with the neighbouring island. The location shifted in 1960s, returning to Road Bay where it remains today (while the main customs port of entry is Blowing Point).
Celebrating Maritimity: Boat Races and Maritime Festivals

The first organized regatta on Anguilla took place in 1940, several decades before tourism developed as an industry. ‘Off-the-cuff’ boat racing had been popular for many years but was confined to each village on the Island (Island Harbour, Sandy Ground, West End, and Blowing Point). On August Monday in 1940, the first official regatta was organized by Mac Owen and Elliot Carty (Carty 1997). The event was successful and future events built on the success, cementing boatracing as a natural pastime for many Anguillians. Today boat racing continues to be celebrated even as the boats have evolved over time.

August Monday

Since the 1970s August Monday (celebrating the emancipation of slaves in the British Caribbean) has been incorporated into Anguilla's annual carnival, a 10-day event held annually. Events include beauty and talent pageants, the crowning of a King and Queen, calypso competitions, bands, food and drink.

Figure 2-9 Decision built by Egbert Connor using local hardwood and mop for caulking
Boat racing and betting play a pre- eminent role in the festivities. As a 1970 Calypso song records,

Aya watch me tag down in me polyester pants buddy,
Dead set for August Monday,
Going Sandy Ground go see boat race
Me back pocket flush wid American money.

Lord I feel good, I done high already,
And I talking anyway I please,
Who vex, vex. I betting me money,
You don’t like it, call de police.

Three hundred dollors Kedro win,
Sandy ground boats aint got a place
West End going wid de trophy again dis year.
Man what de hell all you know bout boat race (Carty 1997).

Betting on the outcome of boat races, like smuggling, has a long illicit history. Wagers usually follow local loyalties especially as the boats are built and crewed by different villages on the Island. The beach at Sandy Ground serves as an important focal point for the races. While the majority of spectators watch the races from shore, other spectators ‘follow the race’ by boat. For August Monday, dozens of boats arrive from St Martin and the beach is covered with thousands of spectators. The boats leave Sandy Ground and sail west past Anguillita to a marker the stake boat places. The route takes them from land and out of sight, a re-enactment of the schooners’ historic voyage to Santo Domingo when the men would disappear for months.

Boats following the race shout encouragement and advice at their favourite teams. The following boats also serve as a safety net, helping ensure the safety of the crews if there is trouble. The un-decked racing boats have been known to sink, masts have broken, and rigging has failed. In 1984 the size of ‘A Class’ boats increased from 23’ to 28.’ The size increase has made it more time-consuming to prepare for racing. Impromptu racing which was common a generation ago has all but disappeared. Despite these changes, the sport continues to play an important, even dominant role in the psyche of Anguillians. As more than one explained, ‘the sea is in our blood.’ Boat races have been integrated into major festivals and celebrations including Festival del Mar (Easter weekend), Anguilla Day (May 30th) and Carnival (first week in August). They continue to be important events that bring people together.
Independence and Economic Development

On September 4, 1960, Hurricane Donna struck Anguilla as a Cat4 hurricane with 125 mph winds. The storm devastated the island, injuring more than 250 people and leaving over 1,000 people homeless. The island’s merchant fleet was destroyed and the economy severely damaged. The island took years to recover. Wooden homes were rebuilt using concrete. During the following decade, the island was characterized by a lack of development and infrastructure. Much of the island lacked public utilities including water and electricity. Roads consisted of dirt tracks and there were few vehicles. More than half the labour force was unemployed and the island relied heavily on remittances sent to Anguilla from family members living abroad. Social services were grossly inadequate:

_There was no electricity in the hospital except for the operating theatre, and this was provided by Mr Lloyd at Lloyd’s Guest House via a long cord which ran overhead from his private generator to the O.R. When we had emergencies at night, we had to wake up Mr Lloyd for him to turn on his generator (On Conditions in 1964 IN Commemorative Magazine 40th Anniversary of the Anguilla Revolution 1967-1997)._  

Secession from St Kitts and Nevis

Ever since the island was administered by the government based in St Kitts (from 1825), many Anguillians felt they were being mistreated. In 1825, 1935 and again in 1966 Anguillians had petitioned to leave St Kitts without success. During the 1960s Anguillians felt that Colonel Bradshaw’s administration in St Kitts was preventing aid from reaching Anguilla. In 1967 St Kitts’ Chief Minister Bradshaw threatened that he would turn Anguilla into a desert and that Anguillians would have to eat one another’s bones. In response, Anguilla decided to secede from St Kitts and Nevis. A British delegation including two MPs arrived on Anguilla later that year to negotiate a solution. Anguilla refused to rejoin St Kitts and, after more than a year of stalled negotiations, Britain landed 250 paratroopers on the Island. There was no resistance. Later that year the paratroopers were replaced by the Field Squadron and Royal Engineers. Finally on February 12, 1976, the Constitution of Anguilla was signed in London and Anguilla became directly administered from the United Kingdom. On April 1, 1982, a new constitution came into effect and Anguilla became an Overseas Territory of the United Kingdom.
**Improvements**

The British presence led to a number of significant changes and improvements to the island. Foreign input and expertise led to improved roads and infrastructure. The first guest house on Anguilla had been opened by David Lloyd in July 1959 on Crocus Hill. Lloyd’s Guest House was joined three years later in 1962 when the Gumbs’ family opened the first beach resort, the Rendezvous Bay Hotel on Rendezvous Bay. These pioneers in tourism foreshadowed the spread of an industry which would ignite and drive the region’s economy with profound impacts.

In 1978, Anguilla wrote its first policy for tourism at a time when observers still noted that the island produced little except Anguillians (Pyle 1998: 57). New prosperity and surplus cash on Anguilla encouraged the importation of foreign wares including Cable TV. On Anguilla where the old way of life was a vivid memory of grinding poverty, a lack of electricity and bare subsistence, tourism and American culture offered to provide for a better future. Caribbean researchers have long reasoned that exposure to tourists’ lifestyles and tastes have generated a desire for foreign goods that connote a ‘better’ quality of life, namely, American consumer goods (Palmer 1979, Pattulo 1996).

Many small Caribbean nations with few resources have turned to tourism as an economic saviour, and, in some instances, this dependence has led to a monoculture, to a lopsided reliance on a fragile industry (Strachan 2002: 9).

Locally, by the end of the 20th century, Anguilla found itself at a crossroads; changes to the island which were recorded as early as the 1980s had become a growing concern. Namely, rapid growth and the indoctrinating of Anguilla’s youth by American TV was seen and blamed for a general erosion of cultural values including a rise in crime.

**The Good and the Bad**

Tourism and development have brought good along with bad (see Chapter 6); some aspects of maritime culture including boat building have remained an integral part of Anguillian culture. Boat racing may actually have benefited through sponsorship and public exposure brought about through tourism. Maritime terms remain preserved not only in local place names but also in everyday conversations on Anguilla. However, many more aspects of heritage including unseen and intangible elements have disappeared. Uncelebrated and largely unrecognized except by a few experts this largely intangible heritage is especially at risk. For example, unrecognized as cultural sites, many underwater archaeological sites have been visited and looted by diving tourists and
treasure hunters. Terrestrial sites including Anguilla’s first port and a few surviving buildings from the sugar period are at risk from contrary forces of benign neglect and overdevelopment. A lack of interpretation means that many sites have never been presented to the public and their past is largely unknown.

**Seeing the Past in the Present**

A fundamental question in this research was if there was a place for the island’s heritage in the present lives of Anguillians? While confronted with the opinion of some foreigners that locals just didn’t care about their history, I found many Anguillians held a deep connection to their heritage. That heritage, however, is important, not for its dates and facts but rather for its role in defining Anguillians as a group. The past is internal and, because understanding it does not rely on science, Anguillians are capable of ‘remembering’ the past.

A local or emic perspective expressed by some Anguillians does not consider artefacts of significance. Instead, the past is expressed cognitively in statements like: ‘the sea is in our blood’. The past here is timeless and something all Anguillians carries with them and not necessarily something which resides in old buildings or artefacts. Culture is not history, the present celebration of traditions including foodways and festivals in the present is their heritage. For example, when Gli Gli (a reconstructed Carib canoe built on Dominica) reached Anguilla in 2007, it was met by more than a thousand Anguillians. Anguillian reggae singer Bankie Banks explained:

> What you have to understand is the passion Anguillians have for sailing. It’s our official national sport. It’s soccer and cricket and football rolled into one. Anguilla is a rocky, scrubby island hard to make a living on, so Anguillians have always turned to the sea and boats. It’s in our blood (Banki Banx in Grudowski 2007).

**Physical Remains are less important than local traditions**

The connection between the sea and Anguilla here is timeless and physical remains are less important than local traditions. Greeting the arrival of a boat is culture and part of heritage. It does not matter that modern Anguillians and Amerindians are probably unrelated.
Foreigners are interested in artefacts and old buildings

Moreover, interest in artefacts and old buildings is something that primarily foreigners are interested in and which has little bearing on Anguillians today. Thus, local fishermen have shared information about sites with treasure hunters without a sense of betrayal. History is subjective. The significance of the past lies not only in specific knowledge gained and facts but also in the ‘process of engaging with [...] the past in the present’ (Holtorf 2005: 540). Or, in other words, the past has meaning because people engage with and give meaning to it in the present. Reconstructing the past is a process and that process (and motivation) is always subjective. The past is therefore produced from a perspective which is always biased.

Stakeholders interact with the past differently

Each perspective is valid and, as a researcher, it is important to recognize that stakeholders (including myself) interact with the past differently. While collecting data is a first step in this research it is not an end in itself. This research is primarily concerned with what happens to data once the researcher leaves. Or more fundamentally; ‘whose archaeology and whose heritage it is’ (Ransley 2007). The following chapters look at examples of Anguilla’s cultural heritage including material culture underwater and intangible heritage which are typically outside the public domain and explore, through case studies implemented during this research, how to manage this heritage. Critically, chapter six looks at how this research is brought into the public domain and how people living on Anguilla in 2012 can be encouraged to engage with the past in the present. Chapter 7 develops a theory for heritage management for Anguilla and ways in which to engage the public.
Chapter 3 Case Study: The 2009 Anguilla Shipwreck Survey

Management of cultural resources, including submerged resources such as shipwrecks, involves a sequence of tasks: (1) inventory: discovery and recording; (2) evaluation: scientific and public importance; (3) planning: determining appropriate use; (4) protection: safeguarding resources; and (5) utilization: accommodating proper use (Mastone IN Ruppé 2002).

Heritage management requires accurate and up-to-date inventories. However, for many countries a comprehensive picture of heritage resources does not exist as there are few inventories of heritage sites and monuments. Effective management is therefore rendered impossible (Eboreime 2009: 2).

Lack of Inventory

The first step for heritage management to occur is to understand the extent and nature of the resource. This step is necessary where no record exists of previous underwater research and there is no baseline to argue for protection. The primary objective of the 2009 Anguilla Shipwreck Survey was therefore to survey Anguilla's underwater environment, collecting data, and taking the first step towards establishing a record of the type and extent of maritime heritage resources through the creation of an historic environment record (HER).

Up to 2009, there had been no effort to systematically record Anguilla’s underwater cultural resources. Underwater heritage and history in general has been and remains a low priority for many Anguillians. Public education includes little information on the island’s history before the island’s Revolution in 1967. This lack of interest has left the island’s underwater cultural resources vulnerable and without official protection. Unfortunately trying to educate officials to protect things that they do not believe exist is not possible. For this reason, the island’s submerged landscape needs to be surveyed and the resource identified before heritage management can be effective. On the Cayman Islands a survey by the Institute of Nautical Archaeology (INA) at Texas A&M in 1979 and 1980 proved that ‘scientific scrutiny, rather than the hunt for treasure, could bring aspects of national heritage to light’ (Roger Smith quoted in Leshikar-Denton 2002). That survey also provided a baseline which information could be added to over time. Today, the Cayman Islands have over 140 recorded sites of historic and prehistoric significance.
(Leshikar-Denton and Erreguerena 2008: 224). Like INA’s 1979 survey, the 2009 Anguilla Shipwreck Survey was designed to record a previously unknown resource, to create a baseline of data that could be built upon over time.

**Previous Surveys and Research**

Information on Anguilla’s historic shipwrecks is scant but desktop research identified at least 32 shipwrecks including ten from the 18th century or earlier. Underwater archaeological explorations around Anguilla have been negligible. As early as 1971, underwater archaeologists recognized that there was potential for research on Anguilla. That year underwater archaeologist Alan Albright from the College of the US Virgin Islands visited Anguilla to look for shipwrecks (‘Marine Archaeologist Looking for Old Ship Wrecks Around Anguilla for a Marine Museum,’ 1971). Unfortunately, he left no record whether he found anything. His work was not built upon and Anguilla’s UCH remained an unknown resource until sport divers began recovering artefacts from the *Buen Consejo*, a known 18th century Spanish Nau, in the 1980s. In 1996, in response to concerns that sport divers were looting the shipwreck, East Carolina University and the Maritime Archaeological Historical Society (MAHS) were invited to Anguilla to survey the site (Rodgers, 2006). Shortly after, the site was declared an Underwater Archaeological Preserve; however, no management plan was put in place.

**Survey Objectives**

Importantly, before management can be effective, Anguillians need to understand the extent and nature of their resource. A primary objective of this project was therefore to bring together a team of archaeologists and divers to survey identified areas of potential significance to 1) demonstrate that Anguilla’s underwater cultural heritage is a real, non-renewable resource that deserves protection. Another aim was to 2) locate the remains of Anguilla’s first recorded wreck from 1628. Members of the Anguilla Archaeological and Historical Society and I believed that if we could locate the 1628 wreck or another site of major historical significance during this survey, we would be one step closer to effective management and protection.

**Methodology**

**Documentary Research**

Archaeological surveys are characteristically set up in three phases: research, survey, and excavation (Dean 1992, Marx 1975). As a preliminary archaeological investigation, this
survey included Phase 1 documentary research combined with non-intrusive survey, namely measuring, photographing, and sketch mapping where appropriate.

**Visual Survey**

Targets identified during the desktop assessment included eight areas around the island (Figure 3-1). Each of these areas was identified by one or more known wrecking events or historical features. A dossier (Appendix B) was prepared before the survey, identifying each area on GOOGLE Earth satellite along with a description of potential targets and features. The 2009 Survey investigated three of these areas (Prickly Pear, Katouche Bay to Crocus Bay, and Road Bay), visited another two briefly (Scrub Island and Junks’ Hole), and did not have time to visit the last 3 (Corito, Lockrum, and Dog Islandxviii). While a lane-based grid survey (using 10 metre spacing between lanes) was considered and would have been the preferred method had a magnetometer been available, we soon learned that a low-tech visual ‘Mark-1 eyeball’ technique towing snorkelers achieved good results. Like any method, however, it had its limitations. It was most effective in water less than 5 metres deep. At any depth, but especially in water deeper than 5 metres, an abundance of broken Staghorn Coral often several feet thick made it difficult to distinguish between natural and cultural formations. As the survey focused most of its work on Prickly Pear and did not investigate Anguilla’s southern coast (and was effectively limited to water less than 5 metres deep), the finds reflect this bias.

A targeted survey strategy was planned in order that the time and resources available would be used as efficiently as possible- so to record as much UCH as possible in the time available. The targeted search area(s) were chosen based on how likely it seemed they would produce results. They were prioritized according to how much detail was available.

Interviews on Anguilla which led to an individual offering to show us a site personally were given first priority. Two wreck sites, A-02 and A-03 were located this way. Other targeted areas identified in interviews (David Carty, Sir Emile Gumbs and David Burglund) or in printed material (Berglund 1996) with a precise location were given next priority. One wreck site (A-05) and two spot finds were located this way. Target areas identified through desk-based research before the survey which identified areas where vessels had been lost (or of historic significance) were given third priority. Three wreck sites (A-04, A-07, and A-08) and six spot finds were located this way. However, none of the identified wrecks appear to match details from known vessels. Finally, the **Buen Consejo** site (A-01) which had been recorded by East Carolina University in 1996 was re-investigated to assess how the site had changed over 13 years.
Daily Operations

Fieldwork began on June 29 as team members began arriving from the USA and UK. While some team members stayed the entire three weeks, the majority arrived and left on a rotating basis (Figure 3-2). This was affected by the participants’ schedules and their voluntary basis. At any time, the team ranged from 3 to 10 members. The team was further divided into pairs to conduct tasks. Pairs alternated jobs, taking turns recording site details, photographing, or measuring. A typical work day lasted from 6AM until 3PM. After 3PM, members completed a daily record form of their activities. In the evening meals were prepared by team members on a rotating basis and a briefing was held to set up the next day’s schedule.

Diving and snorkelling was conducted from the Department of Anguilla Fisheries’ 38-foot (11.6m) research vessel Cobra II three days each week. Cobra II was equipped with GPS (Global Positioning System), CB and VHF radios. The team also utilized a 10’ inflatable dinghy loaned to the team by Steve Donahue of the AAHS and Curt Harris’ 40’vessel Mary Celestia. On days when a boat was unavailable, the group examined historic anchorages from shore including Crocus Bay/Katouche Bay, and Road Bay. We were fortunate to have several Anguillians show us sites. In each case, our boat’s captain would manoeuvre the boat to a point as close as safely possible; we would record the GPS location and beginning from that point, snorkel the area in pairs. If anyone found cultural material, they would signal the crew on board and everyone would return to the boat, except the discoverer who would hover over the site until it could be marked with a float and GPS coordinates taken. This method also worked well for sites where a general location was described or marked on a map. In this case, we navigated to the marked location and began our search from that point, sometimes in a circle but more often following the natural topography. For example, by circling a small islet, we found site A-05.
Figure 3-1 Targeted Search Areas for 2009 Shipwreck Survey

Figure 3-2 Anguilla Shipwreck Survey Team Members in 2009
As more sites were discovered during the course of the survey it became clear that the team would either need to focus on recording details for the sites discovered or continue the search for new sites. A compromise was reached where some time each morning was spent recording site details and afterwards, the team would continue to search for additional sites. We found that towing 2 snorkelers behind the boat while travelling between sites worked well when sea conditions allowed the boat’s captain to keep in water less than 5 metres deep. During the tow, GPS coordinates were taken at regular time intervals to reconstruct the survey path and each snorkeler was advised to let go if he/she wanted to investigate something closer. One wreck site A-04 and one spot find SF-10 was found this way. Unfortunately, the boat’s idle speed of roughly four knots stretched our ability to identify sites and a future survey at slower speed (or using a magnetometer) may reveal sites which were missed. In other areas where the sea conditions prevented the boat from getting close to the shore, snorkelers investigated in pairs while the boat kept a safe distance away. The project followed the University of Southampton’s safety policy outlined by the university.

**Funding**

Funding can be a major concern for any project. It impacts the length of the survey, the number of participants, the equipment available, and the overall strategy. The 2009 Shipwreck Survey was no exception. It was supported through volunteers and in-kind donations. Cooperation made the project possible. Participants paid for their own flights to Anguilla and contributed US$400 towards the cost of fuel and food. Accommodation was provided by local resident Don Mitchell and his wife. Kenn Banks of the Anguilla Archaeological and Historical Society arranged transportation, Anguillian Divers provided tanks at a discounted rate, and the Department of Fisheries and Marine Resources provided a boat for three days a week and the Governor of Anguilla gave $1,450 to help cover additional expenses. A final shortfall was met by the University of Southampton’s Centre for Maritime Archaeology. Cooperative projects like the 2009 Shipwreck Survey (and 1996 ECU survey) help defray some of the many expenses associated with underwater work and make work possible in many areas which do not have local funds allocated for archaeology.

**Summary of 2009 Anguilla Shipwreck Survey Results**

The 2009 Shipwreck Survey identified nine wreck sites and 11 spot finds (Table 3-1) including a total of 22 guns, 12 anchors and two windlasses.
Table 3-1 Shipwreck Sites and Spot Finds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>APPROXIMATE DATE</th>
<th>SITE NAME/DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-01</td>
<td>1772</td>
<td>El Buen Consejo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-02</td>
<td>19TH Century</td>
<td>Anchor and Windlass Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-03</td>
<td>19TH Century</td>
<td>Nine Cannon Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-04</td>
<td>19TH Century</td>
<td>Four Anchors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-05</td>
<td>19TH Century</td>
<td>Little Flirt Anchors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-06</td>
<td>19TH Century</td>
<td>Dog Island (post-survey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-07</td>
<td>20TH Century</td>
<td>Crocus Bay Barge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-08</td>
<td>20TH Century</td>
<td>Scrub Island Fishing Vessel (Chin Luen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-09</td>
<td>20TH Century</td>
<td>MV Meppel (post-survey)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPOT FIND</th>
<th>APPROXIMATE DATE</th>
<th>FIND DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SF-01</td>
<td>19TH Century</td>
<td>Stud Link Chain Road Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF-02</td>
<td>19TH Century</td>
<td>Historic Feature Ballast Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF-03</td>
<td>19TH Century</td>
<td>Shoal Bay Anchor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF-04</td>
<td>18TH or 19TH Century</td>
<td>Crocus Bay Cannon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF-05</td>
<td>18TH-20TH Century</td>
<td>Sandy Island Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF-06</td>
<td>18TH or 19TH Century</td>
<td>Prickly Pear Cannon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF-07</td>
<td>18TH or 19TH Century</td>
<td>Prickly Pear Shore Encrustations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF-08</td>
<td>18TH or 20TH Century</td>
<td>Crocus Bay Jetty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF-09</td>
<td>18TH Century</td>
<td>English Cloth Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF-10</td>
<td>19TH Century</td>
<td>Prickly Pear Anchor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF-11</td>
<td>19TH Century</td>
<td>Crocus Bay Anchor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sites

A-01 El Buen Consejo

Introduction

Two ships, the Buen Consejo and Prusiano, were travelling in 1772 as part of a flota of 16 Spanish Ships under the leadership of Jefe de Escuadra Don Luis de Cordoba from Spain to Mexico. The squadron consisted of 13 merchant ships outfitted by private individuals, 2 warships, and a merchant ship outfitted by the Crown (Buen Consejo). On the night of July 8th, 1772 two of the ships, El Buen Consejo and Prusiano, misjudged the distance to St Maarten and wrecked on the North Eastern coast of Anguilla. The relocation of the site by local divers in 1986 opened a Pandora’s Box of conflicting interests. While the following description and interpretation provides an update of the physical site 13 years after East Carolina University’s survey in 1996, the wider implications of the site in terms of Maritime Heritage Management are discussed more fully in Chapter 5. This section does not attempt a full summary of the work to date on the site or the controversy surrounding the site but hopefully adds a little more information to the ‘nuts and bolts’ of the site.
Site Description

As described in ECU’s 2006 site report (see Rodgers et al 2006) of the 1996 fieldwork, the site lies ‘near shore on the eastern extremity of the island’. Two anchors lie to the south and east of the main wreck scatter. The site ranges from 11.5 metres deep (off-shore eastern anchor) to 3-3.6 metres (portions nearest the shore). The site is located off an exposed part of the shore and is greatly affected by sea conditions (Figure 3-4, Figure 3-5). Depending on the sea state and distance from shore, divers and snorkelers can be tossed 1.5 to 3 metres with each sea surge. Many days it is unreachable. In 1996, ECU laid a steel baseline and mapped the main concentration of artefacts (Figure 3-3). No wood or organic materials were noted and ‘it appears likely that the high energy nature of the site combined with the natural biota to eliminate all wooden artefacts.’ One goal of the 2009 Survey was to assess the site to determine whether it had been impacted from natural and human activities since 1996. Unfortunately, sea conditions and time constraints prevented the 2009 Survey Team from relocating the main concentration of material mapped in 1996.

New Finds

However, on June 28, 2009, two members from the team entered the water from shore on an unusually calm day to try and relocate the site. Snorkelling along the coast, they soon located a large anchor and cannon very close to shore in three to four meters of water under a rock (Error! Reference source not found.). The finds are not included on any previous site plan or report. Searching from that area east, two guns were found at right angles (Figure 3-7) and a fourth was located very close to the cliff. Their orientations and size do not correspond with any of the 18 guns recorded by ECU in 1996. Further, they are
located in an area which was not mapped in 1996. Additional limited investigations on snorkel recorded a total of 11 guns. All of the guns’ trunnions are located below the midline. This may reflect a continental preference that continued to manufacture ship guns with a low trunnion position after 1750 or it might mean that *El Buen Consejo* was carrying guns manufactured before 1750. The latter is a possibility as the preparations for the vessel’s voyage suggest little concern for armament. The merchant guild which hired the vessel stipulated during preparations that one of the gun decks was to remain clear to make room for additional cargo (Stapells-Johnson 1995).
Figure 3-3 ECU Site Plan of Buen Consejo (Rodgers 2006)
Figure 3.4 Photograph showing the shore where the Buen Consejo impacted on a typical day when shore access is impossible (Photo by author)

Figure 3.5 An unusually calm day on the coast near the site of the Buen Consejo
Figure 3-6 Cannon and Anchor from the *Buen Consejo* (photo by author)

Figure 3-7 Two cannon discovered in 2009 from the *Buen Consejo* (photo by author)
Site Interpretation

The 1996 report made several tentative conclusions about the site about which we now have more information. ‘The war ship likely had two gun decks below the main deck for its 70 guns...Of the 70 guns, the largest would have been the thirty-two pounders located on the lower gun deck’.

While the PRO in England reports the loss of a 70-gun Man Of War, *El Buen Consejo* is listed as a 60-gun ship of the line in Spanish Sources (Santiago Gómez IN Everything Babor). We also know that one of the vessel’s three decks should have been free from artillery.

> ...the ship is to carry the artillery on the upper deck and that of the quarterdeck ("alcázar"). That of the lower deck is not to be loaded as the steerage area ("entrepuente") is to remain free due to the wishes of the Comercio de Cádiz (merchant guild)... Translated from Spanish (Stapells-Johnson 1995).

As all 18 guns recorded by ECU were 3.2metre 32 pounders, ECU surmised that ‘the lighter more accessible cannon were salvaged between the wrecking event and the total destruction of the ship’ (Rodgers et al 2006). However, we know from eyewitnesses that three days after wrecking *El Buen Consejo* was

> lying on her side and nearly completely under water. If we are hit by a strong storm, the ships will be broken up at once and we will only be able to save what the sea casts to the reefs which will immediately be torn apart and ruined. (St Eustatius, July 21, 1772).

According to accounts, this made salvaging the cargo difficult and as a result most of the salvage efforts focused on removing cargo from the *Prusiano* (alias *Concordia* or *Jesus, Maria, y Jose*), *El Buen Consejo*’s travelling companion which was lost the same night about four miles distant. We know that salvage efforts continued for almost two months until a hurricane on August 28-31, 1772 moved *El Buen Consejo* some 450+ metres (1500ft) northeast where it sunk. Research by Victoria Stapells-Johnson in Seville, Spain who was contracted in 1994-1996 to research the ships by Anguilla Maritime Research did not reveal the armament of *El Buen Consejo* and in particular whether any of the guns were salvaged.

The discovery of at least 11 additional cannon makes it clear that a) the site is larger than initially thought and b) few cannon were salvaged after the initial impact. The guns recorded by ECU were uniformly 3.2 metres long (10.5 feet). The ‘new’ guns recorded during the 2009 Survey and afterward by the author are smaller and of two sizes (2.1meters and 2.75 meters approximately).

In 1996, ECU made an arrow from the ship’s two anchors towards shore and predicted a point of impact near ‘a great deal of iron fastener scatter and other debris lining the shore’ (Rodgers et al 2006). It is near this area that the team discovered the 3rd anchor and the beginning of a cannon
trail in 2009 (Figure 3-8). The 2009-10 fieldwork adds new information which increases our understanding of the site, in particular the circumstances of wrecking and how it subsequently broke up. The alignment of the two sites suggests a single wrecking event. It is unlikely that the new finds represent a different wreck. The alignment of the anchors, together with their style and amount of concretion is consistent with those previously recorded. The guns discovered in 2009 are smaller than those recorded by ECU. This would be correct if the ship was losing cannon from her upper decks as she was pushed from an initial wrecking point during a hurricane (like the one recorded on August 31, 1772 in the Public Record Office).

Figure 3-8 Composite Plan of **Buen Consejo** Wreck Site
Another question raised during the 1996 survey was the absence of ballast at the wreck site, ‘leading credence to the theory that the vessel tore its bottom elsewhere before being driven to its present location’ (Rodgers 2006). Pointing towards the location where the 3rd anchor was later discovered, Rodgers wrote that the bottom of the ship likely broke up in this location with the prevailing winds casting the flotsam onto shore...The ship’s ballast, in the form of stone cobbles or pig iron, would have dropped through the bottom of the ship here.

To date, no ballast has been found. There are two likely possibilities. Either a) the location of the ballast lies offshore somewhere between the 2nd and 3rd anchor and has not been identified or b) the ship was carrying iron for ballast, of which a great quantity ended up on shore and which due to oxidation has virtually disappeared. The reality may be a little of both. According to the manifest, at least some of the vessel’s ballast was iron. Item No. 39 in the manifest is an order to carry 3,000 quintals (approximately 71 tons) of iron as ballast (Contratacion 1428). Even if most of the ship’s ballast was iron, there should be some evidence or material at the initial point of impact. According to an eye-witness, after ineffectively throwing out her first anchor,

_The ship was increasingly pushed shorewards with each wave and at 1:30AM her stern hit bottom for the first time. With each passing moment there was more of a crunching noise similar to a pine tree as it is splitting or tearing away from its roots (Contratacion 1426 translation by Stapells-Johnson)._  

As passengers used El Buen Consejo’s skiff to reach shore, it is not likely that the location of the third anchor represents the vessel’s location during salvage operations. Instead it may represent the point where the vessel was driven into the shore during the first part of the August 28-31st storms. Hurricanes consist of a front and back side, with winds from opposite directions. On Anguilla, a hurricane passing south of Anguilla (from east to west) begins with increasing wind from the north/northeast.

During and after a wrecking ‘event’ ships can break apart, decks can be carried away and broken pieces end up many metres or miles away. During a hurricane the wind would have pushed the wrecked vessel south/southwest until it reached the iron shore. Today, large amounts of concreted iron fastenings can be found in this area in the intertidal area. Here the ship would have beaten to pieces on the unforgiving shore by the storm’s waves. Tangled rigging, fastenings, and fittings including large quantities of iron would have been cast onshore. Broken, part of the hull structure including the upper and quarter gun decks must have remained at least nominally intact. Then, the backside of the hurricane with winds from the South and Southeast would have dragged the ship towards the north/northwest. The broken ship would have spilled its guns from the upper and quarter decks. Smaller guns from the upper deck would have been lost first, with larger guns
following. Finally, the ship would have settled on the bottom. It is this location with a ‘cargo cluster’ which was mapped in 1996.

**Recommendations**

Environment and time constraints limited the amount of work which could be done on this site. It is evident that more investigations would be invaluable. Future work should further focus on connecting the two sites and mapping the precise location and orientation of each gun (and any additional finds). In addition, it should also be noted that the 2009 Survey was not able to assess the site for human impacts. An evaluation whether designating the area as an Underwater Archaeological Preserve has helped preserve the site’s remaining artefacts or attracted unwanted attention from looters needs to be made.
A-02 Anchor and Windlass Site

Site Description

The ‘Anchor and Windlass’ site was shown to the Anguilla Shipwreck Survey team on July 3, 2009 by ‘Mumba’, a local fisherman (Informant10) who knew the area and remembered where there was an anchor. He led the team to the area and within five minutes the team had located the artefact (Figure 3-10) and other main features.

The site consists of a 19th century Admiralty anchor with a 2.65 metre-long shank and iron stock, a 19th century patent windlass (Figure 3-12), pieces of chain(s), chain locker tubes with chain in-situ, a hawse hole, framing, and scattered cuprous metal. The anchor is only just submerged and quite hazardous to navigation, as the pilot of our dive boat discovered when leaving the site. The rest of the site is located in water approximately three meters (10 feet) deep. On July 9, the survey team laid a 25-metre baseline from the anchor past the windlass and recorded the directional relationship between the main features using trilateration (recording the location of chain locker tubes, pieces of chain, a windlass, and framing pieces) (Figure 3-11; Figure 3-13). The bottom is not sandy and any non-visible material is likely incorporated into the reef. The reef itself is made up of both living and dead coral, with some new growth covering the features. All the features observed in-situ were heavily concreted which made it difficult to take precise measurements.

The site’s most obvious feature is the vessel’s anchoring assemblage. The anchor was deployed when the ship wrecked. The anchor is attached to studlink chain. Pieces of this chain remain in situ in the hawse pipe which would have originally been on the vessel’s deck. On the site, studlink chain runs from the anchor’s shackle down the shank and around the lower fluke, disappearing into the coral. Pieces of link reappear in sections from 40cm to 2.5m long across the site. The links are corroded together and completely immobile. The windlass (Figure 3-12) does not bear any marks visible through the concretion that could trace it to a particular manufacturer. The wooden barrel and whelps are long gone but the axle still passes through it. There is the remaining vestige of one of the warping heads on one end. It is unfortunate but both the number and variety of manually powered and steam-powered windlasses available in the mid to late19th-century makes them difficult to use as diagnostic artefacts (Souza 1998).

There are also two chain locker tubes visible on the site, both with broken chain in-situ. All the chain appears to be of similar gauge although a heavy concretion layer makes it difficult to be certain.

Approximately half a dozen small pieces of copper sheathing were found on the site north of the anchor. The introduction of copper sheathing dates to after 1740 when a patent for “brass latten”
sheathing was suggested as a deterrent to fouling (McCarthy 2005). In 1832 Muntz of Birmingham patented an alloy of copper (60%) and zinc (40%). The alloy was less expensive and more effective and quickly superseded copper for sheathing the bottoms of vessels. As an example of its success, fifty ships were metallized with Muntz metal in 1837, over 100 in 1838, more than 200 in 1840 and more than 400 by 1844 (McCarthy 2005: 116). It is highly likely that site A-02 is post 1832; an analysis of a sample of the copper sheathing could provide additional support (Figure 3-11).

The anchor’s orientation is NE/SW. Using a 30metre tape and five zip ties, the zero end of the baseline was secured to the anchor. The baseline was stretched over the windlass and past the hawse holes at the end of the wreck. The baseline bearing facing the anchor was measured to be 80º. The line was tightened and measurements were taken to 18 predetermined points at the site’s main features.

The anchor on site A-02 was likely set during a storm in deeper water (it couldn’t have been deployed in so shallow of water). A typical storm with N/NE winds would have driven the ship S/SW onto the shallow reef. As the ship dragged its anchor the anchor would have aligned NE/SW. Then as the wind shifted, the vessel would have over-ridden the anchor (causing the chain to wrap around the anchor).

At this point it is impossible to identify the name or origin of the vessel. The size and type of anchor and windlass suggests a 19th-century wooden sailing vessel weighing between 100 and 200 tons. The chain attached to the anchor shackle supports a date post 1820.

There are at least six recorded ships which wrecked on Anguilla between 1800 and 1900 fitting this description. These include a Spanish Brigantine (1863), a French Brig (1864), an unknown Spanish vessel (1864), an Antiguan vessel, and two English ships, the Brig George William Morris (1870) and the Concordia (1870). With the exception of some pieces of copper sheathing, no small artefacts were discovered. The environment may be one cause but it is also likely that small artefacts have been removed by visiting snorkelers and divers.

**Preliminary Recommendations**

On a calm day, the site is easy to snorkel. The water visibility is generally good and it is possible to see the entire sight without SCUBA. Once legislation protects the area and a program is in place to educate visitors to the site’s features, it would make an excellent site for visitors to observe UCH in-situ either using SCUBA or snorkel.
Figure 3-9 Site Plan of Site A-02 using trilateration
Figure 3-10 Author and Jon Adams recording anchor: The sites most distinguishing feature, the top fluke is only 50cm below the surface.

Figure 3-11 Sample of copper sheathing found on site A-02.
Figure 3-12 Author recording windlass on site A-02

Figure 3-13 2009 Survey Team members recording site A-02 using trilateration
**A-03 9 Cannon Site**

**Site Description**

Site A-03, also known as 9 Cannon site was shown to the survey team on July 2, 2009 by ‘Mumba.’ The site consists of nine guns, five of which are in a single pile; there is a nearby cluster of three guns and a single gun to one side. They range in length from 1.65 to 1.85 metres in length. At their widest diameter (first reinforcement) they range from 32cm to 40cm depending on the amount of encrustation. The water depth at the site ranges from 1-1½ meters (3-5ft) above the cluster of five guns to 1½ to 2 meters (5-6ft) above the cluster of three guns depending on sea conditions. The muzzles on guns seven and eight show slight flaring (Figure 3-14 Team members recording site A-03).

Each gun’s length and diameter was measured except in cases where it was obstructed with encrustation. The distance between each gun was recorded and the information compiled with DSM software. The site is located in a high energy shallow environment amidst spur and groove coral formations. The guns are completely encrusted and in some cases deeply embedded in the coral. Firecoral and other coral species have colonised the guns disguising many features. One team member spent half a dive with his fins inches from the main concentration of guns without ‘seeing’ it. The degree of encrustation has hidden any distinguishing features or maker’s marks. Four transects swum perpendicular to the spur and groove formation at 30 metre intervals did not identify any other cultural material which might be related to the guns.

**Site Analysis**

Labelled a ‘dump site’ by the survey team, the nine cannon would have originally been on board a single vessel. Caught in shallow water and grounded on the reef, the ship would have attempted to decrease its draft by offloading any excess weight and cargo. Unlike a wreck site where the guns are spaced evenly as they fall off a moving ship, here the guns lay in a pile where they were off-loaded from a stationary vessel. Each of the nine guns would have weighed a ton or more. After losing all non-essential weight, the ship would have run its anchor into deeper water using the ship’s skiff and tried using the ship’s windlass to winch the vessel off the reef.

As a dump site, one would expect to find shot or other iron along with the guns. None was found. It is possible that there is some material underneath the guns (you would expect less valuable material to be jettisoned first) but it is impossible to tell without major excavation. If the vessel was lost on the reef, there would be ballast or other signs of loss.
It is possible that the vessel either, a) survived and limped to Anguilla to make repairs or b) sunk in deeper water after clearing the reef. In either case, no one returned to claim the lost guns. The vessel was probably a merchant ship or privateer from the late 18th or early 19th century. The guns are similar but show some variation. The muzzles on guns 7 and 8 flare slightly (sometimes indicative of guns from the 17th or 18th centuries) and there is a 15cm difference in length between the shortest to longest guns. If the ship was a warship, the guns would more likely be of uniform size (as found on the site of A-01). While it was impossible to measure a bore diameter due to the degree of encrustation, the guns’ length would fit either 6 or 8lb shot (Blackmore 1976: 77). Armed merchant ships typically used smaller gauge shot (unlike the massive 32lb guns found on A-01) as they required smaller crews to operate. The location of the trunnions at the midline of the tube is consistent with guns produced after 1750 (Skowronek and Fischer 2009: 125). Stylistically, the guns are similar to 4-pound bronze guns built in England from the Kronprindens Lystfregat in the Tower of London which were used in 1785 on a 200 ton Frigate (Blackmore 1976: 77). Without any visible makers marks or other distinguishing features visible it is difficult to say more except a tentative hypothesis that the guns were built post 1750 and were likely used on a ship which ran aground on Anguilla’s shallow reefs.

**Preliminary Recommendations**

The site is too shallow for scuba diving. It is possible to see using snorkel equipment but only on calm days. There is no sensitive material visible and the risk from visitors impacting the site during controlled visitation is minimal. However, there is a large amount of fire coral on the site which could pose a safety concern for visitors. The site is interesting as so many guns are close together and represents a single maritime ‘event.’ Excavation at this time is not recommended.
Figure 3-14 Team members recording site A-03

Figure 3-15 The cannon are in a single pile, demonstrating that the ship was not moving when they were off-loaded
Figure 3.16 Sketch of 9 cannon site by Jon Adams 2009 (not to scale)
A-04 4 Anchors

Site Description

Site A-04 was located by team members during a snorkel survey of the outside reef near Prickly Pear East on July 1, 2010. The site consists of at least three Admiralty-style iron anchors and parts of a fourth. Approximately 40 metres south of the anchors on top of the reef are two sandy areas with a dozen or more ballast stones of igneous river rock. Each anchor shows extreme stress and signs of mechanical failure. The anchors’ shanks all face approximately south. Anchor 1, the most northerly of the anchors, is situated on a low rise in the reef in 3-4metres water. The left arm has broken approximately 20 cm from the shank. The rectangular shank is roughly 10cm by 8cm and is heavily concreted at the top. There is no stock present and the anchor rests partially proud of the coral.

Anchor 2 is south-east of Anchor 1 in a shallow gully, completely concreted and distinguished primarily as an outline. The shank is intact to approximately 1.4m and then broken. The distance from the outside tip of the fluke to the shank is less than ½ a metre (45cm). 2.25m south west from the concreted end of Anchor 1 on the same low reef is an anchor ring with an encrusted diameter of 40cm which sits approximately 30 cm proud of the reef. Less than two metres from this ring, the low reef changes to a gully (maximum depth 5 metres from the surface). Here a 30cm anchor fluke (incomplete) is embedded in the reef edge.

Continuing south from the ring and fluke pieces, the largest of the anchors can be found in a gully (Figure 3-17). The shank on Anchor 3 is broken off at 2.2 metres; the flukes are 45cm long and the two arms’ combined width is 1.3 metres. There are no stocks present on any of the anchors and the shanks are uniformly rectangular.

Site Analysis

Dating anchors by typology is a rough science. However, that all four anchors have failed mechanically suggests a date post-1810 when chain cable would have been used instead of hemp. If the cable used to secure the anchor to the ship was stronger than the anchors’ themselves, then the failure of all four anchors would be explained. That said, no traces of cable were found on the site and the anchor type is consistent with hemp. A possible explanation may lie in the amount of encrustation found at the site.
David Berglund in his 1996 pamphlet on Anguilla Shipwrecks reports that there is a large stud-link anchor chain embedded in the reef very close to the site: ‘A very long anchor chain stretches across the top of the reef north of the Prickly Pear group, beginning deep in the reef on one end and ending deep in the reef on the other end’ (Berglund 1996: 19). No such chain was found during the survey; however, it is possible that it has become indistinguishable from the reef. Of course, it may also belong to another vessel or have had its location misprinted.

**Ballast**

Another hint of the vessel’s origins may be with three samples of ballast stones which were taken from the site. After the American Revolution, in the 18th, 19th and early 20th centuries sloops and schooners would come in ballast from Nova Scotia and Canada. These ships would carry trade goods including salt fish and timber from Canada to trade with Great Britain’s colonies in the West Indies. On their return, they would sometimes exchange their ballast for salt in Anguilla or St Martin before returning to Canada. The igneous rocks recovered at A-04 are indistinguishable from SF-02, the ballast recorded in ‘Ballast Bank’ in Road Bay/Sandy Ground which is associated with the salt industry.
There are two dozen or more ballast stones visible at A-04, which is insufficient to say whether the ship was coming to or from the island, as some or none of the ballast may have been offloaded and exchanged for perishable salt. On the other hand, if the vessel was coming in-ballast, then some of the ballast may have become covered with coral and is now embedded in the reef and invisible.

The absence of more material on the site together with the relatively small size of the anchors suggests a wooden ship of around 100 tons (+/- 50 tons). The alignment of the anchors and their universal failure points to a storm event where the vessel anchored north of the reef and set four of its anchors. As the storm worsened, each anchor must have failed. As the last anchor broke, the vessel would have been driven onto the reef’s sharp coral. Broken and battered, the vessel’s small crew may have made it to Prickly Pear or Anguilla. After the storm passed, they would undoubtedly have tried to salvage what they could. The absence of any cultural material or fittings may be due to the site’s shallow, high energy environment. Or, it may be that the ship was salvaged extensively by Anguillians.

From the late 1700s, Anguillians were honing their ability to build ships. The unfortunate loss of this vessel may have provided raw materials and fittings which could be recycled and used again.

**Preliminary Recommendations**

The site is appropriate for an interpretive preserve. The anchors are located close to Prickly Pear, a popular Anguilla islet with two restaurants and a bar that is regularly visited during the tourist season. If interpretation (either with laminated placards or on-site plaques) and a permanent mooring were installed, the site would be appropriate for guided visits. There is an attractive swim-thru nearby and the area nearby is regularly visited by snorkelers. As the site is located on the outside of the reef and can sometimes be rough, controlled visitation should only be encouraged on calm days by boat. Importantly, the site should also be designated as an Underwater Preserve and any tour operators should support the principles of in-situ preservation.
A-05 Little Flirt Anchors

Site Description

In a pre-survey interview, former Chief Minister and captain of the Anguilla schooner, *Warspite*, Sir Emile Gumbs described and marked the location of two anchors near Prickly Pear reef that he remembered seeing as a child. Later, Raymond Haskins also told us about a site near Prickly Pear West that he dove in the 1970s. He described a location with two guns (SF-06) and gave us a bearing from them where we could locate the anchor.

Only after the site was found, did we realize that a) the gun and anchors are two separate sites and probably not connected and b) the anchor described by Mr Haskins is the same anchor (1 of 2) which was recorded on July 3rd.

Site A-05 is located north of Prickly Pear East in 2-4 metres of water. The bottom consists of spur and groove coral formations and is a combination of living and dead coral, broken coral and sandy gullies. Recognizable cultural material consists of two anchors, a windlass, and various pipes and iron fittings. The site was located on July 3, 2009 and revisited on July 13, 2010 when we followed Mr Haskins directions. The site’s features are roughly aligned NW-SE. Both anchors are attached to lengths of chain, one with the expected eye and shackle but the other with a ring. The first anchor (with eye and shackle) is 3.35 metres long, the arms 2.04 metres in diameter. Each arm is 1.3meters long and the flukes approximately 60cm in length. This would have been the vessel’s primary anchor as it was deployed when the ship wrecked. The right fluke has caught on a coral outcrop, held and twisted. The second anchor is slightly longer: 3.7m long with a ring 60cm in diameter and a 2 metre segment of chain attached to what remains of the ship’s windlass. The second anchor’s arms are 1.8 metres in diameter. The mangled remains of the windlass are disguised by several turns of concreted chain. Various other fittings including a section of the windlass shaft (1.2 metres long by 12cm square) are scattered around the site together with two small pieces of lead pipe. West of the first anchor there is a heavily concreted iron feature which may be a composite knee. No machinery other than a windlass was identified.

18th Century Design

The ship’s anchors appear to be 18th century in design. The angle of the flukes is quite sharp and the large anchor ring present on one of the anchors is characteristic of pre-1820 when hemp cordage was used instead of iron cable.
**Chain**

The presence of chain (due to encrustation it was not possible to see whether it was stud-link or not) however, provides a TAQ (*terminus ante quem*) of 1820. The ship was using old anchors.

The ship looks to have wrecked with only one anchor deployed. One of the flukes has twisted, likely from the weight of the vessel pulling on it. The second anchor was stored in the hold and was undoubtedly being readied when the vessel ran aground. Links of chain leading from the 2nd anchor towards and wrapped around the windlass suggests that either the anchor was being prepared when the vessel struck the reef or it was readied after the ship ran aground in an attempt to free the vessel. No wood or organic material was found on the site and it appears that the hull and other biodegradable material have been completely destroyed. As the ship deteriorated, the main iron features including the windlass, anchors, links of chain, immovable ship structures and fittings sunk into the reef while moveable objects would have been scattered and destroyed. Over time even robust features like the windlass have been broken and their parts scattered by the environment. It is possible that some small artefacts may have become incorporated into the reef during this process but invasive excavation is the only way to know for definite.

Moveable features which include twisted sections of lead pipe (part of the bilge pump?) and a 2.23 meter iron bar (part of a keel bolt?) were recorded in relatively sheltered areas under coral outcroppings or partially buried in rocky sand. As with the other sites recorded, no small artefacts were found. Again, the high energy environment and opportunistic nature of Anguillians are likely contributors.

The vessel probably weighed 100-200 tons although the paucity of material makes any estimate very rough. If the concreted structure west of the first anchor is a composite knee, then the vessel would have been constructed after 1839 and probably post 1862 when Lloyds gave their consent for composite construction (Throckmorton 1987: 98). A sailing schooner or sloop is likely, especially as most of Anguilla’s trade was carried out in these vessels. See also SF-06 for a description of a gun discovered nearby and its possible association with the site.

Preliminary Recommendations

While it may be possible to open the site for visitation, this should only be done after the site is more fully recorded and it has been designated a protected area. The site can have adverse conditions. A small selection of artefacts including the lead pipe might be
removed as other lead artefacts have sometimes been removed from sites for use as ballast in modern racing sailboats. Also, the site is not ideally located for inexperienced snorkelers as it is close to one of Prickly Pear’s cays and there can be adverse conditions including strong currents and surge.
Figure 3-18 18th century anchor on site A-05

Figure 3-19 The battered windlass with chain recorded on site A-05
A-06 Dog Island

Site Description

Located near Dog Island, site A-06 was brought to the team’s attention during the project by Anguillian dive master and boat captain, ‘Dougie’ Carty. According to Dougie the site has been visible since around 2005 when it was partially uncovered. Unfortunately the team was unable to coordinate a trip to the site during the 3-week project due to windy conditions the final week. However, on August 1st and 15th Dougie took the author to the site along with AAHS board member Steve Donahue and a group of recreational divers. The area is a 40 minute boat ride from Sandy Ground and is adjacent to a local dive site. The dive site consists of a ledge at 50 feet which drops to approximately 80 feet. There is also a high reef within 1/3 mile of the site were Dougie has seen other fastenings. Unfortunately a cursory investigation of the area did not reveal any fastenings in this shallow location.

Copper Fastenings

At 25 metres the bottom consists of both rock and sand. Visible features include more than a dozen copper fastenings ranging from 15cm to 1.2 metres in length. The variety of cupreous fastenings visible on the site include drift bolts (some with roves), clench bolts, chisel-pointed spikes (plank nails), and clinched fastenings (in-situ and loose). At least a dozen fastenings on the site are easily portable (unattached and without concretion). The hammered heads of at least three bolts/pins protrude approximately 15cm from the sandy bottom and appear to be in their original position. While many of the copper fastenings appear to be in like-new conditions, others show chemical erosion including layers of copper sulphide up to four centimetres thick.

Wood

A congruent section of at least ten lengths of decking/planking each approximately 23cm wide is also visible (The total length of the timbers was not exposed but is at least 1 metre). It was also impossible to measure how thick they were. While this wood appeared to be in very good condition, other wood on the site shows evidence of wood-boring organisms. At least two 20cm² beams are visible. While one is partially buried the other is complete to 2.45 metres. The visible sections of both have been colonized by algae and soft corals. The end of one has a cupreous fastening in-situ which has been hammered through the timber and clenched while the other has a round hole with copper-sulphide stains.
**Iron Framing**

In addition to cupreous fastenings and wood, there are pieces of iron framing with iron fasteners. Each of the five iron fastenings protruding from what looks like a frame are spaced approximately 30cm apart. Also, there are at least two conglomerates of material not readily identified. No pottery or other cultural material is visible which might reveal the vessel’s nationality or origin. Also, no anchors are present.

**Site Analysis**

A-06 likely has at least two components. The fastenings which Dougie reported on the shallow reef may indicate an initial grounding, assuming (a big assumption) that the material is from the same vessel. The hull timbers and copper fastenings discovered in 25 metres of water are about half a mile from this area and could therefore be the remains of the hull which came off the reef and sunk at a later date. If the vessel remained on the shallow reef for an extended period, it is possible that it was extensively salvaged and all usable elements removed. If this were the case, you would expect to find the vessel’s anchors near the initial place of grounding.

The presence of cupreous fastenings and at least one iron structure suggests a composite construction which would date the wreck to the middle of the 19th-century. There were several experiments on composite construction which included iron structure with cupreous fastenings. The Sunderland-built iron barque *Amur ex Agnes Holt* built in 1862 had knees of iron plate and was fastened throughout with ‘yellow metal’ (McCarthy 2005: 119). While it is more likely that A-06 dates to the middle of the century, an early date should not be discounted as copper fastenings were used as early as 1787 on *HM Sirius*. An analysis of the different fastenings’ copper and zinc ratios and whether the remains are pure copper or Munz Metal would shed some light on the question.

Identifying the ship from such a cursory investigation is all but impossible. The clues all point to a date when copper/copper alloy was preferred for hull construction or sometime after 1787. No wreck statistics were kept for Anguilla prior to 1865 (Public Records Office CO230/114).

**Possible Candidates**

Incomplete records demonstrate that at least four vessels were lost between 1811 and 1900 that might be A-06. They include: 1) several American merchantmen wrecked on the north side of Anguilla on October 8, 1811 (one of the earliest candidates), 2) an unnamed Spanish Brig carrying 2000 bags of flour lost in 1863, or 3) an Antiguan boat en route to
the Turks and Caicos carrying salt lost in 1866. Very little information on any of these ships is known. As records are incomplete it is also possible even probable that the ship is a hitherto unrecorded loss.

**Preliminary Recommendations**

The site varies from the other sites recorded during the survey both in its features and depth. A-06 represents the only recorded historic ship discovered on Anguilla to date with organic material present. At 25 metres, the site is almost three times deeper than the other sites recorded and a ‘deep dive.’

Archaeologically, it is significant as the level of preservation is greater than on other sites recorded to date. The rocky/sandy bottom has allowed for at least part of the hull and planking structure to be preserved. The presence of at least four different types of cupreous fastenings is unique. That many of these fastenings are loose must be considered. The site is currently being dived by at least two dive operators (Special ‘D’ Divers and Anguillian Divers) who are aware that it is a wreck but do not have any additional information on the site. The removal of any material including metal fastenings should be avoided as it will impact archaeologists’ future ability to analyse the site. While current Antiquity Legislation on Anguilla prevents the removal of marine artefacts from Anguilla, the law does not currently stop them from being brought up and exhibited locally. This should be prevented as cupreous material removed from the sea will, like iron, decompose without conservation.

A conservation program should be implemented so that dive operators already visiting the area may continue to utilize the site while unguided diving and casual collecting are discouraged. The area ought to be designated and protected as an Underwater Archaeological Preserve. Parts of the site which have been naturally exposed are slowly being destroyed by wood-boring organisms. Efforts to record details of the exposed wooden features should be made as soon as possible and the controlled recovery of each type of fastener should be considered. Public conservation of this material would not only preserve a sample of the material for the non-diving public but also be used to illustrate the challenges of conservation and the importance of in-situ conservation.
Figure 3-20 Head of 1-metre long cupreous fastening

Figure 3-21 Wood and cupreous fastening in-situ, partially covered by sand
A-07 Crocus Bay Barge

Site Description

Located July 7, 2009 by the survey team during a snorkel reconnaissance of the historic anchorage at Crocus Bay, site A-07 consists of steel wreckage scattered over approximately 400 hundred metres along the western shore of Crocus Bay. The area is largely protected with waves typically less than 50 cm high. The bottom is sandy with a little coral. The cultural material noted consists of small and large pieces of steel, segments of steel framing and a Danforth anchor in water approximately 3-4 meters deep. The pieces are mostly flat or twisted. An initial swim over the site by team members confirmed a wide scattering of metal fragments which consistently appeared less than 50 years of age. Accordingly, due to time restraints the team spread out to find the outer edge of material and proceeded to record the location and perimeter of the site with GPS. The team did not map each individual artefact which ranged from less than a square metre to several square meters in size. Little to no machinery is visible and no small artefacts were found. In the approximate middle of the site 30 meters from shore is a Danforth anchor which may mark the original location of the vessel. The anchor shank is 1.9 metres long and the flukes 72 cm wide by 98 cm high. In addition to pieces discovered in the bay, there are pieces of oxidized metal onshore, many of which are caught in rocks, plant and tree roots and are probably associated with the site.

Site Analysis

The site is no more than half a century old. A local diver (Informant 35) explained that the cultural materials found on the site are the remnants of a barge used during the middle of the 20th century to move rocks and concrete. According to the witness, the barge was abandoned in Crocus Bay by its owners sometime in the late 1960s or early 1970s and probably after the Revolution began in 1967. It is not known at this time who was the original owner. For many years it was used as a fishing platform before succumbing to the elements.

Three sites, A-07 and A-08 and A-09, were recorded during the project despite their recent age. While in some countries, they may not qualify for ‘historic’ designation due to their recent age it is this author’s opinion that noting their locations and key features are important to create an accurate HER for Anguilla.
**Preliminary Recommendations**

The barge is an abandoned hulk that is easily accessed by shore and whose remains are of no great age. The only possible risk to the site would be the modern salvage of the anchor identified on the site. This is especially true as other historic features including cannon have been used locally in the past for moorings. As the anchor is the site’s most distinguishing feature, its removal would leave very few recognizable features on-site for interpretation. If the original owner and the barge’s history were traced, it might reveal an interesting chapter of Anguilla’s history. If that cultural link could be made, interpretation materials could make the area an interesting attraction for visitors.

Archaeologically, the area provides a bad-weather alternative for developing underwater skills including measuring, drawing, and recording. The material present is not sensitive and the site is easily accessed from shore. While there is little historic significance to the site, it does provide an historic case of use and abandonment. If possible, research into the cultural background of the barge should be made, as it may reveal a cultural connection which would make this otherwise uninteresting site more interesting to visit. Designation as an Underwater Archaeological Preserve is not recommended at this time due to the site’s recent age and the lack of historic information available on the vessel.

*Figure 3-22 The site's anchor is its most distinguishing feature*
A-08 Chin Luen Fishing Trawler from Taiwan

Site Description

A-08 consists of metal debris leading towards a vessel approximately 15 metres long by 3-4 metres wide, lying in 0 to 2 ½ metres of water on the northern side of Scrub Island. The shape of the hull is discernible but the vessel is badly broken up, as it lies on a high energy zone on the reef edge. At the western end of the site a capstan hub protrudes above the waterline (depending on sea conditions). Close to the capstan, pieces of railing and hatches are visible on the steel deck. At first glance, the wreckage appeared modern or no more than about 40 years old. The ship structure is wedged tightly into sharp rocks.

Towards mid-ship there is a large pump orientated along the centreline of the vessel with a horizontal turn wheel at one end. On either side is an engine, one of which has a tank next to it. The eastern end of the vessel is more broken up. While some hull structure and debris is visible, it is nearly all broken up and scattered. The site was visited a single time and the energetic sea conditions and shallow water made it too risky to measure.

Site Analysis

UK Admiralty Charts show a wreck on the north side of Scrub Island which matches the GPS location recorded in 2009 for A-08. The machinery on board and the age of the site corresponds with the loss of the Chin Luen, a fishing trawler en route to Dutch St Maarten which ran up on Graften Rocks (alias Craften Point) east of Anguilla (Berglund 1996: 8). On February 13, 1976, The Times, a weekly newspaper on Anguilla reported the loss of 'a practically new fishing trawler from the republic of Taiwan.'

According to the article, the fishing trawler which was built in 1973 was returning to St Maarten after a three-month fishing voyage when a faulty radar system caused it to run aground on the night of Thursday, February 5th, 1976. It had been based locally for just four months.

The night of the grounding the crew of 20 swam to Scrub Island where a group of Anguillian fishermen discovered them the following morning after sighting the wreck. The survivors were taken to Island Harbour (Anguilla) where they were looked after by a number of Anguillians for some days. Twelve tons of the trawler’s 140-ton cargo of frozen tuna fish was offloaded during the following week ‘with some difficulty’ and placed on cold storage at Albert’s Department Store and the ‘Iceplant’ for sale to the public. The remaining 128 tons perished when the generators and freezing units aboard the trawler stopped working. Apparently heavy seas flooded several of the inner portions of the
disabled vessel. The ‘difficult reefs, shallow water and other factors,’ made it impossible for a nearby tug boat to make a serious effort to refloat the trawler. In addition

The operators of the trawler reportedly preferred it to be left on the reefs fearing that the steel hull was damaged and they would eventually have trouble even if the bottom was repaired. The indication was that the operators would apply for a new trawler from the Insurance Company concerned (The Times February 13, 1976).

Consequently some vital pieces of equipment were removed and the trawler abandoned. The site was marked on Admiralty charts and aside from a few stories and the recollection of some excellent tuna, the incident forgotten.

**Preliminary Recommendations**

The site is in a very high energy environment and is not suitable for recreational diving or snorkelling. While many features of the site are recognizable including the pump, capstan, and engines the Trawler’s recent age and known identity means that additional traditional survey work recording the site’s main features would probably yield little new information. Though modern, the site has an interesting history.

Regarding site formation processes, however, the ship could be useful. Revisits to the site regularly every one or two years together with photographic documentation might provide excellent information on how a steel vessel breaks down in a high energy environment. This information could help with the interpretation of other steel vessels as underwater archaeological sites in the future.
Figure 3-23 Chin Luen visible during low tide

Figure 3-24 Tanks and machinery in situ
A-09 MV Meppel

Site Description

Site A-09 is a 127’6” long steel vessel with an 8’6” draft lying in 25 metres of water near Prickly Pear Reef. The site is currently visited by recreational divers. In 1990, Anguilla undertook an artificial reef program, in part to rid the island of unsightly hulks littering the beaches and in part to create a series of wreck dives for visiting SCUBA divers. The 2009 Underwater Archaeological Survey Team did not visit these nine artificial reefs as our focus was to discover and record the locations of previously unrecorded cultural heritage. MV Meppel became an exception because a) in 2009 the purposely sunk ship was ‘lost’ to all intents and purposes and b) the ship has an interesting connection to a major historical event.

In September 1995 (five years after it was scuttled) hurricanes Luis and Marilyn struck Anguilla destroying the mooring buoy marking the location of the wreck together with records and maps showing the location of the site which were housed in the Fisheries Department. Due to usually poor visibility in the area, the wreck was never relocated. Many dive operators believed the ship had either been moved or even completely broken up by the storms. In 2009 a descendent of the original captain, L/Cpl Rebekah Anderson in the UK contacted the Anguilla Archaeological and Historical Society with information on the ship’s history.

UK Troops from Dunkirk

Built in Holland in 1939, Hilda was a Dutch freighter owned by Geert Zoutman and captained by his son Hemmo Zoutman (Rebekah’s grandfather). In May 1940, the new ship was ‘loaned’ to Britain for the duration of World War II and immediately put to service. That month the ship helped evacuate 338,000 Allied troops from Dunkirk on the North coast of France. During Operation Dynamo, Hilda officially evacuated 835 troops from France to the UK. She served the remainder of the war doing barrage balloon duty and after the war went back into service with the Zoutman family. In 1970 the ship was sold, renamed the Meppel and operated as an Island freighter throughout the Caribbean before being abandoned on Anguilla in the 1980s (Rebekah Zoutman correspondence with Steve Donahue, AAHS board member 2009).

After the ship’s history became known, a concerted effort between myself, Dougie Carty and Steve Donahue was made to relocate the ship. In October 2009, the HMS Iron Duke from the UK loaned their helicopter for an aerial survey of the area. Conditions were not
ideal and the attempt unsuccessful. However Dougie continued to search with his own vessel and on March 23, 2010 successfully relocated the vessel, sitting upright in 80’ of water in excellent condition (perhaps due to a lack of visitation over the past 15 years?).

**Site Analysis and Recommendations**

In an article on the rediscovery of the vessel the site is summed up, ‘Anguilla is proud to be the final resting place for this heroic little ship, and encourages anyone interested to visit the dive site’ (Donahue 2010). Preliminary recommendations would therefore be to provide history and information on the vessel to dive operators who are currently using the site and stress the historical significance of the vessel together with PADI’s ethos of taking only pictures and leaving only bubbles.

One size does not fit all and open access is certainly not suitable for every site; in this case, however, the site was created for recreational divers and should continue to be such. However open access does not mean open destruction; the site should be designated as a Underwater Archaeological Preserve and protected for future generations of visitors to enjoy.

---

*Figure 3-25 The Meppel (aka) Hilda in 1939. Photo courtesy of AAHS*
Spot Finds and Features

SF-01 Stud-Link Chain Road Bay

Find Description

SF-01 consists of several segments of iron stud-link chain in Road Bay. There are at least four segments of chain ranging from 1.3 metres to 14.3 metres in length. The water depth is approximately 3 metres, there is a slight current (less than ½ knot) and visibility typically ranges from 3 to 10 metres. Each of the links is approximately 19cm x 9cm with a 3-4cm stud and between 2 ¼ and 3cm thick (encrusted dimensions). A total of 108 links were visible in sections of 11, 30, 53, and 14 links.

Find Analysis

Iron stud link chains were adopted by the UK and US navies in 1816, following the invention of a broad stud by Thomas Brunton of London in 1813. By 1830 all vessels in the Royal Navy were equipped with iron chains and by 1836 insurance underwriters had recognized the superiority of iron over hemp and ceased charging a higher premium. In 1846, Lloyd’s Register of Shipping began to require that all chains for classed vessels were proof-tested and stamped at each end to indicate load applied. Unfortunately, neither end of the Road Bay chain were located nor were any marks visible on the links examined. From 1924, cast steel became preferred to wrought iron and from 1928, the US Navy adopted DiLok chain made from forged alloy steel as their standard.

It is therefore likely that the chain in Road Bay was constructed sometime after 1830 and before 1928. This is further corroborated by an 80-year old Anguillian who remembers seeing the chain as a child.

Recommendations

The chain is quite robust and access from the beach is safe and convenient. The site is well suited for basic archaeological training in practical skills including underwater drawing, measuring and site recording. It would make an interesting feature on a snorkel trail.
**SF-02 Historic Feature Ballast Bank**

**Site Description and Analysis**

More an underwater landscape than a spot find, Ballast Bank located on the north side of Road Bay ranges from approximately 10cm to 2 metres in depth. Volcanic cobbles and stones each up to 60kg cover an area ½ an acre or more in size. The area which is marked on Admiralty charts as ‘The Ballast’ was so named for schooners (mostly from Canada and New England) which exchanged their ballast at the site for salt from the Sandy Ground salt pond during the 18th, 19th and early 20th centuries. The stones are covered with a layer approximately 5mm of silt and algae.

With the exception of one thin stratum visible in Crocus Bay, Anguilla is a limestone island that has no free flowing rivers. The eroded surface of these mostly basalt stones supports their foreign origin in a volcanic fluvial environment. The similarity between the stones in ‘The Ballast’ and those found at site A-04 is further evidence of their use as ballast.

**Site Recommendations**

The site, which is closely associated with at least two episodes from Anguilla’s history, picking salt and trade with New England (which in turn encouraged the development of Anguilla’s boat building tradition) should be designated and protected as an Underwater Archaeological Preserve or heritage site. Some stones from the area have been recycled: as ballast in local fishing and racing boats and as landscaping features (including pool decorations). The remaining ballast should not be arbitrarily removed.

The site would benefit from additional interpretation including published information. While there is no sensitive material visible which would be affected by visitation the shallow depth and algae growth makes the site less attractive as a snorkelling/swimming destination. The controlled excavation of a sample of stones for public exhibition is recommended, especially as the stones would not require conservation. The feature should be included in any database of archaeological features and remains for Anguilla.
**SF-03 Shoal Bay Anchor**

**Find Description**

SF-03 was initially recorded on July 6, 2009. The site whose location was described to the team by dive operator Matthew Billington of Shoal Bay Scuba consists of a very small 19th century anchor and a section of chain located near shore approximately 1 ½ miles southwest of Shoal Bay on the north coast of Anguilla in ten metres water (Figure 3-27).

The anchor’s shank is 77cm from the crown to the eye. The stock extends 42cm from the shank on one side ending with an intact bulbous end while on the other side has been broken at 30cm and the end obstructed by coral growth. The lower fluke is buried in sand while the visible arm has an encrusted diameter of 6cm. The palm edge of the visible fluke measures 14 cm. Concreted chain attached to the eye of the anchor stretches approximately 15cm before disappearing into the coral. Links appear more than a metre from the anchor before disappearing again into the coral. It is not clear whether the links have been broken or there is an intermediary section completely immersed in the coral. Visible links average 5cm long by 3.5cm wide with an average thickness of 2cm. There is no other cultural material visible in the area and it is unclear whether the damage to the artefact occurred before or after its loss.

**Find Analysis and Recommendations**

The size of the anchor and gauge of the chain suggests a small fishing (or perhaps smuggling) boat which either lost or ‘cut’ its anchor in the 19th century. The site is
regularly dove by Shoal Bay Scuba and there is a permanent mooring buoy close (within 10 metres) to the find. The artefact has been photographed and recorded and should be included in any database of archaeological features and remains on Anguilla. Access does not need to be restricted especially as the local dive operator has agreed to continue encouraging visitors to ‘take only pictures and leave only bubbles.’
The gun which is located close to shore in 1 metre of water in Crocus Bay (Figure 3-28) is, according to local fishermen visible for approximately 6 months each year. The seasonal movement of sand typically reveals the gun during the summer months as sand is carried onto the beach. When the winter ground swells remove some of the sand, the gun is reburied.

During July 2009, approximately 50% of the gun was visible. The composition of the surrounding area includes fairly large (40-60cm diameter) rounded limestone coral fragments and sand. One trunnion on the 1.4 metre-long gun faces towards the surface in the midline of the tube while the other is either missing or buried. It was impossible to measure the cascobel which if intact is buried under rock and sand. The butt end of the gun is flat and measures approximately 34 cm while the muzzle end is 20cm at its widest.

**Find Analysis**

Crocus Bay was Anguilla’s original port which provided direct access to the Valley. There are no known breastworks or permanent fortifications on the Bay which might be associated with the gun. During the French invasion of Anguilla in 1746 when St Martin invaded Anguilla and landed at Crocus Bay there is no reference to the defending Anguillians using cannon (although it may have simply been omitted from the account).
It is more likely, however, that the gun dates to sometime after 1750. After 1750, trunnions were often located on the tube’s midline although some European guns continued to position the trunnions low. For example, all of the trunnions at site A-01 which date to 1772 are located below the midline. It is also unclear whether the gun in Crocus Bay has eroded from the hillside above, came from a vessel using the harbour, or was part of an original defence. In 1775, there were two small batteries of six six-pounders at the two principal bays (Public Record Office CO 152/54). During the French Invasion in 1796, these guns were either dismantled or spiked. The guns were not replaced and in 1826 there was not a single mounted gun (Anguilla Archives 1826). As the gun corresponds in size to a typical six-pounder, it is therefore possible that SF-04 formed part of Anguilla’s defences during the sugar period and was dismantled during the 1796 French Invasion.

**Recommendations**

It is important to leave SF-04 in situ (Figure 3-28) and encourage its protection through education. In several instances on Anguilla guns have been ‘rescued’ from the sea by someone who believed they were rescuing history (Figure 3-29). As recently as January 2009, a swivel gun was recovered 1.3 km from SF-04 in Katouche Bay and given to a local historian who painted and exhibited it outside his private museum\(^{xxiv}\). SF-04 is located very close to a popular restaurant and bar and a group of fishermen typically overlook the site. In fact it was this group who initially told the team where to find SF-04! Designation and interpretative signage combined with semi-regular visits to this group of fishermen would encourage protection at a grass-roots level and would probably be as effective as any legislation (which incidentally should be amended to prevent the removal of artefacts from Anguilla’s waters regardless of whether or not they are sold or exported off Anguilla).

**SF-05 Sandy Island Site**

**Find Description and Analysis**

The find is made up of several links of chain approximately 8cm in length and two or more heavily concreted iron pieces which may include pieces of a broken anchor. The find(s) are in shallow water 1-2 metres deep near Sandy Island, 3.5km north of Sandy Ground, Anguilla. The area is more protected than sites located on the outside reef but can become rough during bad weather, especially as it is quite shallow. While several lengths of chain are visible, they are concreted to an iron piece approximately 6cm by 21cm which not identifiable. In January 2010, the author showed several archaeologists images from the site including the feature at the annual SHA Conference hoping to identify it without success.
It is possible that the structure might be part of a bowsprit/anchoring assemblage from a small vessel. If this is true then it is possible that the finds are part of a more extensive site and possibly a shipwreck. The shoals around Sandy Island have shifted considerably since hurricane Luis in 1995. If the find represents a wreck, the earliest recorded candidate is a Canadian Brig, which was lost on Sandy Island in 1769 carrying rum, coffee, cotton and salt.

**Recommendations**

Without an understanding of exactly which fitting the mystery concretion is or whether there is additional cultural material in the area it is impossible to make any conclusions. Further investigation and a more detailed recording of the feature are recommended. The find has been photographed and recorded and should be included in any database of archaeological features and remains on Anguilla. In addition, visiting the area during different times of the year may also reveal whether additional features are covered or uncovered.

![Small iron gun](image.png)

*Figure 3-29 Small iron gun removed from a marine environment and displayed for decoration without conservation*
**SF-06 Prickly Pear Cannon (Harris Cannon)**

**Find Description**

SF-06 was described to team members by Raymond Haskins who provided a detailed description of the find. More than 30 years before he had located several cannons next to Prickly Pear West together with a large piece of chain plate which he presumed were fastenings from a sailing ship. The team swam to the location provided and located a single gun 1.38 metres in length lying in a scoured pocket of sand (Figure 3-30). No other guns or features were found nearby. The muzzle end of the gun faces west from the shore is 25cm in diameter and has an approximate bore diameter of 9cm. This means that when in use, the gun would have fired either 4 or 6lb shot. The butt end of the gun including the cascobel extends 15cm beyond the gun’s tube. The trunnions are located low on the tube. While one is intact, the other has been broken.

The artefact is located very close to shore in a high energy environment. The surface of the gun appears scoured by wave action and no markings are visible. Mr Haskins said that he tried to find markings on the guns more than 30 years ago but none were visible.

**Find Analysis**

While the opportunity to discover and record a new find added to the overall success of the survey, SF-06 perhaps better demonstrates one of the biggest challenges facing UCH management in the region as a whole. In 1996, David Berglund published the location of ‘known artefacts in Anguillian Waters’ including SF-06 in Shipwrecks of Anguilla: ‘Two carronades and one chain plate lie wedged in the rocks on the west face of an outcrop of rock on the west end of the beach of the West Cay of the Prickly Pears group’ (Berglund 1996: 19). No measurements or photographs were taken of the artefacts. If the team had located both guns together with the chain plate in situ it may have been possible to make a better analysis. Haskins told us that ‘the gun didn’t float there’ but without additional artefacts, it is impossible to draw conclusions. It seems likely, however, that SF-06 was once part of a larger group of artefacts which may have represented part of a shipwreck (A-05?). The artefacts wouldn’t have floated away by themselves. Treasure hunting remains a persistent problem in the region; remote areas including outlying cays are particularly vulnerable.
SF-07 Prickly Pear Shore Encrustations

**Find Description, Analysis and Recommendations**

SF-07 is a small area located on the northwest shore of Prickly Pear East which includes approximately ½ dozen iron encrustations and impressions. The impressions of square nails and pins are visible. These ecofacts are not associated with any other cultural material. It is possible that the finds are from a ship which ran aground on the reef north of Prickly Pear and which was subsequently broken up and parts cast on shore. In at least one other case on Anguilla, material from a shipwreck (A-01, *El Buen Consejo*) was cast onshore and afterwards became embedded in the coast. Occasionally other material from the wreck is also cast onshore (see SF-09).

SF-07 has been recorded and should be included in any HER for Anguilla’s UCH. Prickly Pear is a popular day excursion from Anguilla and a survey of the reef north of the site would be useful as it might reveal material associated with the shore encrustations. The area onshore is suitable for visitors and is a short walk from the beach bar. As it is, there is very little to visually attract tourists so interpretation would be necessary.

**SF-08 Crocus Bay Jetty**

**Find Description and Analysis**

The jetty is typically visible for six months out of the year during the winter. While only 15 to 80cm of the stone foundation are usually visible, following Hurricane Earl in September
2010 more than 1.2 meters of stone and five wooden stakes were visible (they were re-
covered less than 24 hours later). During a devastating drought and famine in the 1890s,
the government in St Kitts agreed to implement a relief plan to ease unemployment and
starvation on Anguilla.

**Original Port**

Work included collecting stones ‘for the building of a pier at Crocus Bay’ (Minutes of
Executive Council meeting, St Kitts, 11 July 1894 IN Petty 2008). Crocus Bay had been
Anguilla’s original port in the 17th century as it provided a direct road to the main
settlement in the Valley. As trade increased with North America, and Anguilla began
exporting more salt in the 1700s, the main port shifted from Crocus Bay to Road Bay
where salt could be easily loaded from the nearby pond. Crocus Bay continued to be used
as a port but waned in significance as a commercial port. It is unclear whether the original
jetty was constructed with stone and the 1890s relief work restored the pier or if the
stonework was a new construction. Without better information it is impossible to say
whether the pier dates from the 17th or late 19th century.

SF-08 and SF-04 are within 15 metres of each other. Any interpretation looking at UCH in
Crocus Bay should look at both resources. The pier’s location has been recorded but
unfortunately no pictures were taken when the structure was exposed in 2010. If another
storm passes, it would be an excellent opportunity to record the find in greater detail.

**SF-09 English Cloth Seal**

**Find Description and Analysis**

SF-09 was found in June 2008 by Steve Donahue of the Anguilla Archaeological and
Historical Society during the author’s visit to Anguilla in 2008 during a shore walk near
the site of the Buen Consejo. It was recovered following heavy ground swells which
removed it from an unknown location underwater and deposited it onshore where it was
found. In January 2009, the find was identified as an English cloth seal made from lead
and at the request of the AAHS, delivered to England where it is currently being
conserved.

In an unofficial conversation with the author in 2009, two treasure hunters admitted
finding a large number of cloth seals near the site of El Buen Consejo. Until then, no other
seals had been recorded at the site. While they subsequently denied having removed
anything, the conversation suggests that the find represents a larger collection of
diagnostic artefacts which will probably never be recorded (or seen).
A Few Similar Examples

Geoff Egan, an expert on cloth seals at the London Archaeological Archive and Research Centre (IAARC) examined the Buen Consejo cloth seal in 2008. He identified two similar or perhaps duplicate seals (impossible to say due to the condition of the Anguilla seal). The first was excavated by IAARC in North London in 1987. It was the only one of its kind found during the excavation so while it is possible that it was the point of manufacture, it is not likely. The second was found at the site of the Mission San Xavier del Bac in southern Arizona in 1967 during an excavation by the University of Arizona. The Church nearby was built by Alonso Espinosa, a Spanish Jesuit priest. It was the only object found at the site which is undoubtedly of 18th/19th century English origin. The Church was Spain’s northernmost mission in southern Arizona and used from 1756-1765. In 1767 the Jesuits were expelled from New Spain but the following year they were replaced by Franciscan friars. A third example was found on the internet which was discovered in Portobello, Panama.

At this time, it is not known where the cloth seal would have been manufactured in England. There is very little information on late (18th century and later) seals. In fact Mr Egan (who is author of the only published text on cloth seals) had little information on seals after 1724. At this date, the government stopped using them as a means of quality control and they seem to disappear from the written record. This fact has led the treasure hunters who discovered the seals on the Buen Consejo site to speculate that the seals are from a different, earlier wreck. The Anguilla seal is interesting in that most cloth seals were about the size of a dime or 5p coin but some, like this one, were larger. While the type of material bound may have something to do with it (small light seals were used on delicate silks and larger ones on coarse sail cloth) it may also be the English saying ‘Look at our cloth, it's the best in the world.’ Supporting this is the fact these larger seals were often gilded with a fine layer of gold (Egan 1994).

SF-10 Prickley Pear Anchor

Find Description

An isolated anchor, SF-10 was located on July 1, 2009 during a diver tow along the outside reef near Seal Island north of Anguilla. The small anchor (less than a metre from crown to top of shank) has a round shank and the stock has been broken. It lies in water 6-8 meters deep. There is no chain or other material in the vicinity. It was probably lost by accident and there is no evidence that it is part of a larger site. The find has been photographed and its location recorded with GPS.
SF-11 Crocus Bay Anchor

*Find Description and Analysis*

Discovered by the team on July 7, 2009 in Crocus Bay SF-11 is a small iron anchor probably from the mid-19th century but possibly earlier. The iron find measures 80 cm from the end of the crown to the top of the shank which has a diameter of approximately 10 cm. The shank appears rectangular. One arm has been broken 15 cm from the shank. The anchor lies flat on the bottom. Crocus Bay has been used for centuries as a port by ships of all sizes. The anchor is probably from a small trading and fishing vessel. There is no material in the area which would suggest a larger site. SF has been sketched, its location recorded with GPS, and a few measurements recorded. There are no other recommendations at this time.

**Conclusion: The Implications of ‘Success’**

**Baseline for Future Work**

By documenting the nuts and bolts of Anguilla’s UCH we succeeded in establishing a baseline for future work and collecting a sample of the type of Anguilla’s underwater heritage for an HER. Important and successful as it was, the 2009 Survey was not in itself a solution. Documenting a resource differs from protecting a resource. While the first is a necessary step for the second to happen, the first by itself does not accomplish anything and can sometimes exacerbate the problem.

For example, published data on sensitive sites can encourage inappropriate attention. Is it a coincidence that two cannon were removed from Sandy Hill Bay after the AAHS published their location in 1980 or that the many artefacts described in Berglund’s 1996 book *Shipwrecks of Anguilla* have disappeared? Understanding the truth that archaeological investigation is considered scientific research by some and a treasure map by others, the initial research proposal for the 2009 Shipwreck Survey stated that data collected during the course of the survey would be given to the Anguilla Archaeological and Historical Society for safekeeping and the location of any material discovered would not be disclosed without a management strategy in place.

**Complex World of Heritage Management**

While this agreement fulfilled the basic requirements of my research and was necessary to prevent the survey team from being held responsible for the destruction of sites in the future, it also failed to address the real problem of what would happen after the team went
home. In situ preservation is ideal but how does an island begin to develop a management strategy where none exists? As the survey wound down, I began to wonder whether confidentiality was really a solution. How long can a ‘public resource’ be guarded and kept secret? Would non-disclosure really prevent the destruction of UCH when there was already evidence of looting on many sites? How long would vested authorities keep the ‘secret’ locations secret? Five years? Ten years? Like many islands Anguilla does not have regular fieldwork or the permanent presence of trained professionals; short periods of productive research are interspaced with long periods of inactivity where interest wanes. The absence of a national museum means that many research results are not channelled into the public domain.

The implication of the 2009 Shipwreck Survey’s success was that far from being the centre of this research, the survey opened a door to the complex world of heritage management. In fact, by taking the research results to the public and advocating the protection of underwater cultural heritage, the lack of any heritage management on Anguilla became apparent. The end result for Anguilla is that despite years of successful research and excavation the Island has little (visible) physical evidence in the public domain. This is true not only of underwater cultural heritage but also of cultural heritage on land. While research is a necessary part of heritage management (and its infrastructure) it is only one component of a larger system. The problem on Anguilla and other small islands appears to be that despite mandates and good wishes, local management systems are not in place and there is little to no infrastructure to manage cultural heritage. This problem is addressed in the following chapter.
Chapter 4: Bridging the Gap from Survey to Resource Management

Challenges Related to Local Attitudes Which Affect the Management of Cultural Heritage Resources

Once a site is discovered, management becomes unavoidable. Left for decades or centuries in peace, discovery brings both positive and negative attention. This is especially true in countries with poorly defined legislation and/or little history of underwater heritage management. Sharing discoveries with the public raises important questions: Will the sites be left in-situ? What are the risks from looters? Should part or all of the sites be excavated?

Absence of Heritage Management

Taking the 2009 Shipwreck Survey results to the public during and following the project (Public Presentation July 28, 2009, Radio Interview July 26, 2009) revealed not only the absence of a permanent mechanism to disseminate information on heritage matters but also the implications of the legal and non-legal problems described in Chapter 1, including an absence of legal protection, missing knowledge of the resource, and heritage as a low priority. This void has meant that years of successful research and excavation have not entered the public domain and many Anguillians have only a vague understanding of what archaeologists have found. Practically, management and protection do not exist. This is true not only of underwater cultural heritage but also of cultural heritage on land. While the government has issued several mandates, much heritage remains invisible and the Island has failed to develop a system to preserve its cultural heritage.

Challenges

A fuller understanding of the problems which affect heritage management is necessary before case specific heritage management strategy can be proposed. This chapter looks at challenges, placing UCH in the context of current local attitudes unsupportive of heritage management. Examples of previous heritage management are offered in the Chapter 5 together with a description of public engagement and community archaeology methods. The Anguilla Heritage Trail is presented as a case study (Chapter 7) for a community heritage management initiative. These provide a background for The Anguilla Heritage
Trail, an initiative designed to test the system developed and explore reasons why some initiatives are more successful than others.

**Problems on the Ground and Challenges Related to Local Attitudes**

The problems frustrating heritage management have often been identified by heritage managers. Problems differ from place to place, in as much as historical, cultural, and economic conditions vary. While similar in many respects, heritage managers working in each location have identified distinct problems. Consider, for example, three geographically separate countries, all located in a ‘warm’ climate in the developing world: Laos, Papua New Guinea, and the Cayman Islands where each have identified unique problems. In Laos, poor transportation and infrastructure, a dispersed population, a lack of skilled human resources and a lack of tourism facilities including international calibre accommodation have been blamed for frustrating the growth of heritage management (Aas 2005: 31) while in Papua New Guinea, cultural, social and economic change together with a lack of trained staff and limited resources are leading concerns (Bainton 2009: 49). And in the Cayman Islands, maritime heritage manager Dr. Leshikar-Denton writes that the possibility of underwater archaeology to augment our understanding of humanity remains largely unfulfilled because of ‘unresolved conflicts with treasure hunters, lack of consistent public outreach and hence a lack of public appreciation and support, and the relative youth of the discipline’ (Leshikar-Denton and Luna Erreguerena 2008: 46-48). Despite these differences, challenges faced by one country or island may resonate with another as each struggles individually to improve heritage management locally. Thus while the following challenges were identified on Anguilla they may also be found on other islands and resonate in a wider or even global context.xvi.

**Challenge 1: An Island’s Size and Wealth**

Although an island’s size does not necessarily reflect its wealth, it can reflect the amount of resources available. Challenges related to size include small populations and economies, lack of resources, remoteness, susceptibility to natural disasters and climate change, fragility of land and marine ecosystems, high cost of communication, dependence on international trade, and costly public administration and infrastructure (Mulongoy 2006: 12-15). It may also limit the amount of resources available for cultural heritage management.

Bermuda is roughly the size of the Isle of Wight. For its size and population, however, the island has one of the highest per capita incomes in the world (US$36,000 compared to
US$29,600 in England and US$12,200 in Anguilla (2009 figures). On islands with higher levels of poverty and fewer government resources, funding for cultural heritage is more limited and other government expenditures may take priority.

_One of the Cayman Islands' advantages relative the many Caribbean nations is its economic ability to foster and fund historic preservation and cultural initiatives. Because Cayman is not obliged to dedicate all its available resources to issues such as poverty and unemployment, the nation can afford to invest in preserving its past (Leshikar-Denton and Scott-Ireton 2012: 353)._}

Despite their affluent exterior and multi-million dollar estates, poverty is worldwide and continues to plague many islands including Anguilla. Rising real estate values have caused an increase in the cost of living and people living in poverty despite full-time employment. A drop in tourism revenues following the economic downturn in 2008 manifested itself with loan defaults, vehicle repossessions and home foreclosures on Anguilla (International Monetary Fund 2012: 3). The preservation of heritage on land and underwater must compete with these daily and more immediate concerns.

**Challenge 2: How the Public “Sees” Archaeology**

The public’s perceptions of collecting, treasure hunting, and archaeology have been shaped by numerous factors including but not limited to 1) media portrayals of Indiana Jones-style characters, 2) sensational finds of the King Tutankhamen’s tomb or the _Atocha_ Spanish Galleon variety and 3) glossy articles glorifying treasure hunters as underwater adventurers in popular magazines including National Geographic. In a landmark study by the Society for American Archaeology, more respondents stated that archaeologists study fossils (92%) and dinosaurs (85%) than shipwrecks (77%) (Ramos and David 2000:14).

The public’s understanding of underwater archaeology has been further shaped by media coverage of underwater adventurers like Jacques-Cousteau and professional treasure hunters like the late Mel Fisher (the finder of the _Atocha_). The difference between these modern-day adventurers and professional archaeologists is often blurred in popular portrayals. That these popular portrayals have shaped public opinion became obvious during my fieldwork.

**Heritage, Gold and Sharks**

In fieldwork on Anguilla in June 2008 prior to the 2009 Shipwreck Survey I studied local attitudes towards heritage. Anguillians were asked questions as simple as ‘Are you proud
of your heritage?’ and ‘What do you believe is your island’s greatest asset?’ They responded with their own questions asking whether I had found any gold and if I had ever been attacked by sharks. Many students and adults interviewed confused maritime archaeology with marine biology. For example, Anguilla’s Youth Ambassadors expected a marine archaeologist to study endangered species and fish populations. Of eight teenage honours students, not one understood what a maritime archaeologist does. While definitely not unique, the prevalence of these misconceptions on Anguilla and in the region demonstrates the need for appropriate education programs in archaeology.

**Challenge 3: Attitudes Towards Collecting**

Until recently, wherever you went, it was a common to collect seashells. No one thought twice about picking up a pretty cowry shell or breaking off a piece of coral for a souvenir. Now, however, as the diving community increasingly understands the impact of collecting on local ecosystems and fish populations and as divers increasingly notice the wear and tear to their favourite dive sites, shell and coral collecting has become taboo in most parts of the world.

**Bermuda**

Researching my MA Dissertation in Bermuda, I was interested to see whether the same divers who discouraged any form of shell collecting were opposed to artefact collection. I discovered an interesting split which relates to the enforcement of particular laws and policies as well as the role of local stewardship. Those diving in areas with laws protecting the underwater cultural resources and who are aware of the law generally avoid removing artefacts, especially if they are found on a coherent wreck site. Their logic is that if they remove the bits and pieces which attract others to the site, the entire diving community will suffer. An example of this is the site of the *Thistlegorm* in Egypt, a popular merchant navy ship sunk in 1941 and visited by more than half a million divers since its rediscovery in the 1990s (Kean 2009).

Where there were once boxes of boots and dozens of perfectly preserved trucks, there are now a few scattered soles and dozens of smashed windshields. In 2006, I counted five dive boats tied off to different sections of the wreck (observations on site 2006). As divers familiar with the site watched the destruction first-hand, they became increasingly adamant that no more artefacts should be removed. The year after I visited, mooring balls were installed to prevent the wreck from being torn apart. Such stewardship only became prominent, however, after divers began to realize that the vessel was a finite resource. Once the artefacts that make it an enjoyable dive are gone, they will not be replaced and
divers will go elsewhere. Unlike natural resources like sea shells which will gradually replenish themselves, shipwrecks are a unique resource that once lost, are gone forever.

**Stewardship of Finite Resources**

On the other hand, many divers who would not remove artefacts from a ship like the *Thislegorm*, will not hesitate to pick up a bottle or cannon ball as a souvenir from a holiday in the Caribbean, especially if it is not part of a coherent site. The logic behind their action is that these particular artefacts are not archaeologically or historically significant. They incorrectly believe that a bottle or cannon ball of known type cannot inform archaeology. Besides, they believe they are diving in an area where there is no protective legislature and if they do not remove the object, another diver will. By taking up the artefact and giving it to someone locally to look after, before someone else steals it and takes it off the island, many people believe they are rescuing it. This happened in January 2009, after ground swells uncovered a swivel gun in Katouche Bay, Anguilla. The tourists who discovered the site wanted to raise the gun and, with the help of a dive instructor living on Anguilla, they did. The gun was delivered to a local heritage museum and given to him to display (Informant07). A similar incident occurred in 2011 when an iron encrustation was left at my office (Articles published in 2009 following the survey explained the reasons for leaving artefacts in the sea). A more permanent campaign needs to take place if established behaviour and attitudes are to change.

**Finders Keepers**

Even in areas where protective legislation exists, many divers are unaware of its presence and continue to collect because ‘that is what people do here.’ There have always been collectors. For thousands of years the sea and its possessions were free for the taking. From the 18th century, famous wreckers in Bermuda and the Florida Keys made careers from preying on vessels trapped on the reef. The mentality of finders keepers remains a common attitude throughout the region.

Collectors and SalvorsWith the invention of scuba, collectors and salvors had a new tool. Teddy Tucker, afore mentioned wreck diver and salvor on Bermuda, commented on the modern exploitation of Bermuda’s historic shipwrecks in 1962. In 1962 he wrote,

*In a way I can compare the reefs of Bermuda to a semiprivate Fort Knox. I know the locations of 112 shipwrecks scattered among the thousands of sand holes which dot the Bermuda reefs...Little by little I am uncovering these [7] galleons,*
Submerged artefacts were, in the era’s parlance, ‘rotting away’ and ought to be rescued by people with the knowledge, ability, and skill to do so. His comments reflect a common, early view that taking artefacts and treasure from the sea was both natural and good. Thus an early attitude viewed marketable artefacts as a resource that should be mined and exploited. That Tucker compared shipwrecks to a private Fort Knox further illustrates the early treasure diver’s monetary incentive to recover gold and valuables over other artefacts. With the absence of professional archaeologists, their view remained unchallenged. The public accepted their ‘work’ and many even envied their chosen profession. Importantly, this attitude of regarding Underwater Cultural Heritage as an exploitable resource persists. From a cottage industry in the 1950s and 1960s, treasure hunting in Florida has become a big business. A finders keepers mentality is reflected in Florida legislation and still applied to artefacts found underwater (Scott-Ireton & Shefi 2008). Australia has one of the leading programs in underwater cultural heritage management but this has only developed in the past 20 years.

In 1988, divers themselves told me that I was wasting my time trying to protect shipwrecks because divers would simply keep taking things off shipwrecks because that was what divers did! As a reformed collector of bits of coral and shellfish, I knew that divers, when provided with relevant information did change habits and, as a community, recreational divers were among the most environmentally aware group in society (Jameson and Scott-Ireton, eds 2007).

While the above demonstrates that it is possible to change existing attitudes it will not happen automatically. On Anguilla, and wherever there has been a lack of information and education, attitudes will remain unchanged. While a few islands including Bermuda were forced to deal with their maritime heritage and pass legislation regulating its exploitation (Bermuda Wreck and Salvage Act 1959), many others including Anguilla and St Kitts and Nevis were not. Chapter 6 looks more closely at how Education/Outreach can help change existing attitudes to protect cultural heritage.

**Challenge 4: Exclusion from Government**

Bermudians today are generally proud of their island identity and knowledgeable about their underwater heritage (especially sensational treasure finds like the ‘Tucker Cross’). When the author was on Bermuda, Bermudians spoke to her as empowered stakeholders about their heritage. As a group, they clearly felt that they had an investment in the
management, consumption, and exploitation of the island’s underwater heritage. Even if they disagreed with some decisions by the government, they were included and aware of the decision processes affecting their island.

This was not the case on Anguilla. Anguilla does not have a freedom of information act and the Government is not legally bound to inform the public on any issue. This creates a problem when the public does not have information about an issue or a site. Decisions and agreements may be made behind closed doors and the public informed after the fact. This results in public knowledge that is limited to second-hand knowledge or gossip. Excluded from the decision-making process, people are less inclined to take an active position, especially when they believe they cannot make a difference. The answer to this challenge lies jointly with inclusion, empowerment and education.

**Challenge 5: Institutional Framework**

Many developing countries face a similar challenge managing heritage within the existing institutional system especially where little or no provisions have been made for heritage. In Sub-Saharan Africa, the responsibility for heritage management often rests with different institutions and ministries that combine culture with education, information, tourism, youths and sports, etc. Even worse, most national institutions do not have adequate financial and human resources to protect the heritage. Coordination with other heritage agencies is often poor if it exists at all. Furthermore, the Ministries of Culture are often not involved with issues of development and environmental planning (Eboreime 2009: 5).

Within a typical Caribbean State there are usually several small bureaucracies each of which is responsible for handling a single aspect of the cultural heritage. These groups’ responsibilities range from managing a single collection to granting land development rights. For example, in Trinidad and Tobago, the Tobago Trust is appointed by the Tobago House of Assembly while the Tobago Museum is an institution of the Trust. The Division of Community Development and Culture develops the arts and cultural heritage for the government, the Division of Tourism manages monuments, building and historical sites, the Regional Library is responsible for archives, and the Town and Country Planning Division is responsible for granting permission for development. In addition to these, maritime cultural heritage may also fall under the jurisdiction of the fisheries department and Department of Economy, a layover from when wrecking was a major industry (Hernandez 2001: 237-241). This compartmentalization often leaves Heritage Management without a permanent home, staff or funding, which in turn exacerbates the problem of institutional memory.
On Anguilla, the National Trust holds a mandate to protect and manage the historic environment (Anguilla Bill for the Biodiversity and Heritage Conservation Act 2008: 7-8). In practice they encourage the Anguilla Archaeological and Historical Society to take the lead. The Government of Anguilla is content to not get involved, as they do not have a heritage officer or designated employee to oversee heritage issues. This leaves heritage management to be managed by a non-governmental organization consisting of no more than ½ a dozen active volunteers.

**Challenge 6: Lack of Institutional Memory**

The problem of institutional memory was described during a joint meeting with the project’s supporters on Anguilla in September 2007. The situation, as described, was this: when the Buen Consejo site was discovered it was a ‘crisis’. Despite significant publicity, no measures were put in place for the next time a significant vessel is discovered and brought to the authority’s attention. If officials’ outlook does not extend beyond their own term of office and lessons learnt are not passed down to the next series of officials, then everything discovered during the learning process of managing a site for the first time is lost. This was the case on Anguilla.

Information and research contracted by the initial investors in the site which should have been shared with the government of Anguilla under the terms of their contract, could not be found. Doubts whether it was shared and who owned the material, if it were found, presented another problem. Also, the ‘Wrecks Committee,’ created to ensure that as many standards as possible were achieved by the site’s investigators, ceased and disbanded once the initial crisis had passed. Finally, artefacts were passed to the Government of Anguilla for safekeeping and are held in police custody, under lock and key. Their preservation, however, is not assured on an island without a conservator and more importantly, an individual with links to conservation facilities. Despite these problems the Buen Consejo represents an important step for Anguillians managing their underwater cultural heritage in that Anguillians recognized the importance of preventing a free-for-all and selling the site to the highest bidder. That a group rigorously campaigned for the Government of Anguilla to find the best maritime archaeologists to survey and record the site is significant. Both decisions demonstrate that Anguillians are ready to recognize their underwater cultural heritage. What is exasperating for current research is that despite these positive steps taken over a decade ago, there has been little follow-up. Anguillian underwater heritage has faltered not from lack of trying, but from the absence of a program to pass knowledge of the experience to the next generation of managers.
Challenge 7: Expatriate vs. Native Attitudes

Increasingly, over the past 40 years the Caribbean’s demography has changed. Islands have become ‘pleasure peripheries’ where foreigners have moved to escape the cold and permanently extend their holiday experience (Lararidis 1999: 298). This trend has been accompanied by a relatively rapid demographic shift throughout the islands. Contemporary foreign settlers have created an expatriate population of relatively wealthy retired and semi-retired immigrants (Warnes and Patterson 1998 IN Connell and King 1999: 4). The two groups, expatriate (outsider) and native (insider) come from different backgrounds and often have very different attitudes towards politics, government and history.

Forgetting or Not Caring?

This difference in attitude manifests itself in several ways. Many natives feel that the island’s colonial history is not something which should be remembered. The historic Cotton Gin in Anguilla (recently converted into a Chinese Restaurant) is one example. An older Anguillian who remembered working in ‘The Factory’ as a child, expressed his doubts whether the building should be preserved. ‘Some things,’ he said, ‘should be forgotten’. Memory establishes the meaning of the past (Ricoeur 2008: 10). By extension, actively forgetting or not remembering also establishes meaning (Ricoeur 2004: 284). For the descendants of historic have-nots, plantations and other colonial ruins can be constant reminders of historic injustices and poverty (Timothy 2011: 220). Rather than latching onto details about this past, many Anguillians have chosen to forget.

While locals chose to ignore (forget) some aspects of their heritage which are unpleasant, outsiders often see this choice as a universal disregard and disinterest in heritage as opposed to a conscious decision (Informant05). According to many expatriates, locals’ disinterest extends to a wide range of low-priority issues including the environment. A representative from the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) visiting Nevis in 2008 who had recently come from Indonesia was startled to find what she believed was a complete disregard for the natural environment. As an outsider, she postulated that because the Caribbean’s black population were previously unwilling immigrants brought to the Caribbean by force their roots lay elsewhere. While an interesting theory, I found many Anguillians were deeply connected to their island.

On several occasions, expatriates expressed their opinion that locals ‘just don’t care’ about history or the environment. On St Kitts, one resident explained that locals are usually more concerned about self-gain than with the environment or history. On Nevis, nearly
everyone in a group of expatriates expressed their opinion that [Black] Nevisians did not have the interest or motivation to participate in public-run archaeology. The best chance for management to succeed, they explained, was to rely on the community of foreigners who had moved to the island permanently. This group, they said, is eager to get involved with local events but as a group feel excluded by locals. As a group they expressed their frustration that despite living on the island for many years, they were still considered outsiders and as a result of their outsider status, many of their best-intentioned efforts were ignored. On the other side, locals shared their experiences working with expatriates, how they were regularly talked down to and treated as though they were inferior or less intelligent. The two groups’ mutual suspicions combined with heritage’s low priority for many locals has meant that historically the island’s heritage societies (at least on St Kitts, Nevis, and Anguilla) have been 95% white expatriate retirees. This make-up is unlikely to change as new residents who are eager to get involved are more likely to join the society than locals.

Before exploring the situation on Anguilla, it is necessary to clarify the differences between many historical societies’ preservation efforts and community archaeology. While both seek to protect cultural resources, community archaeology stresses giving control (decision making and management) to the public (Moser 2002: 229-235). On the other hand many (not all) historic preservation societies are organized and run by a small group of volunteers who are interested in preserving the past. In the Caribbean these individuals are often from off-island and have previous experience with historic preservation in their home countries. Their activities often reflect a bias towards built heritage, partly due to the group members’ own experiences before moving to the island. Self-appointed preservationists rarely have an anthropological background or knowledge of proven community archaeology methods and principles. The results sought by these organizations typically focus on sustainably preserving cultural heritage to encourage the public to experience heritage directly (Hannahs 2003: 5). Societies may focus initially on built or monumental heritage. For example on Anguilla the AAHS has worked to preserve small wooden homes and the Wallblake Trust has similarly worked to preserve the built heritage of the island’s last plantation Great House. Significantly, management and control of these resources typically remain with a self-appointed group (i.e. a Trust or Society) and not the general public. Unfortunately, in practice, the local public has often remained alienated from these efforts, either from their lack of interest or from a mistrust of foreign do-gooders (see also Chapter 6 Local Attitude Observations and Lessons Learned).
Historic preservationists look at how to physically curate and manage a resource so it may be preserved for the public. On Anguilla and other islands where preservation efforts have struggled (in many cases without government support), the result is that many sites have either been ignored or in the case of particularly important and well-known sites, all access barred to preserve the remaining data (at the request of archaeologists). The consequence of all this is that historical societies often work to preserve history that the membership (95% expatriate) considers important but which the general public does not necessarily consider important. One example on Anguilla is the Society’s efforts to preserve traditional Gingerbread (Chattle) houses which have been frustrated when old homes have been torn down without notice by locals.

One solution may lay in making the connection between what historical societies consider important and ideas which are important to the local community. These ideas may include current concerns about community values and other traditions which locals care about and believe are disappearing.

**Challenge 8: Little Interest: Heritage as a Low Priority and Little Pride in Local Heritage**

*Human occupants, understandably, tend to be primarily interested in their own daily lives and wellbeing. They may be unaware of their living area’s protected status or of the preservation rationale that has been applied to the lands in which they live. They may have limited motivation for honoring, much less actively engaging in, the protection of heritage material (Mabulla 2010).*

In society at large, advocates to protect heritage are a small, special interest group (Sabloff 2008: 81). Priorities and issues including education, nutrition, violence, unemployment, inadequate public services, and poverty do not allow governments to give cultural projects the required resources, attention, or qualified human capital (Cummins 2006: 47-42). Island governments and residents are both faced with a number of larger issues whose importance takes precedence over the management of cultural heritage. An island’s government is preoccupied with the day to day task of surviving in a competitive global economy. Efforts linking tourism, the environment and cultural heritage have been made but more needs to be done (Scott-Ireton 2005, Sabloff 2008: 83-87). Support and pressure from international organizations including the Nature Conservancy and the Convention of Biological Diversity (CBD) have helped Small Island Developing States (SIDS) realize that protecting their natural resources will benefit their islands economically. The same case needs to be made for archaeological resources. Making a
case for the protection of underwater cultural heritage to support larger issues including tourism is necessary and will make a heritage a higher priority locally.

While some aspects of local pride are celebrated by the public (boat racing on Anguilla), many other aspects are ignored or rejected. For example, on St Kitts where much built heritage is closely associated with slavery, inequality, and oppression, many black Kittitians see the preservation of plantation architecture as an effort by the white minority to perpetuate social injustices (Siegel 2011:viii). This is further supported in their minds by the fact that the membership of local historical societies is dominated by white persons (St Kitts and Nevis field observations 2007). In order to support local preservation efforts, all of an island’s population must be made to feel that it is their history and heritage that is being protected. In a region where that heritage is often a painful reminder of enslavement, relocation, and hardship, it is a delicate task to pay proper respect to groups of historic haves and have-nots.

A conference on slave heritage held on the Turks and Caicos in 2004 brought attention to these issues and challenged archaeologists to develop new ways of presenting local heritage (Informant48). For public support of preservation efforts to happen, an island’s population must be made to feel that it is their history and heritage that is being protected. Once heritage is adopted and supported locally, the protection of archaeological and heritage sites will become a national concern rather than the domain of salvors, preservationists and archaeologists.

**Challenge 9: Missing Knowledge of Resource**

It is important, however, not to confuse or assume a lack of interest where there is a lack of awareness due to a lack of information (Little 2007: 8). During an interview with Anguilla’s Youth Ambassadors, I found them very receptive to information they did not know about the Island’s past. When they were told that Spanish missionaries and their cargo had wrecked on the island in 1772 they responded to the information with ‘Wow, we have that?’ Little information on the past is included in the school’s curriculum; the youth should not be blamed for not caring about the history when they have not had the opportunity to learn about that past. On Anguilla, the problem is less a lack of interest and more about missing knowledge.

Where there is information which has been shared with the public, it is often of very little benefit except to the self-selected curious few. Site reports and project summaries are not necessarily accessible or meaningful to a layperson (Little 2007: 8, 269). The absence of
available material for popular consumption prompted the author to write an illustrated history (Appendix F).

Without readily accessible information about heritage resources officials in charge remain unaware of the potential historic/cultural resources at their doorstep. By extension, any group claiming to be a legitimate operation that seeks permission to work, excavate or develop a site, whether on land or under water, will more likely gain permission on an island that does not have a clear definition or inventory of its resources.

**Challenge 10: Overdevelopment**

For the past forty years, many Caribbean islands have experienced rapid population growth accompanied by the development of land and coastal areas. Population pressures and competition between islands to attract tourism dollars have led to increased demand for better roads and tourist facilities. On many islands, marinas and deep water ports have been created to facilitate cruise ships and attract visitors. During their construction, sensitive archaeological remains have been uncovered (Scarborough Harbour, Tobago; Basseterre Harbour, St Kitts) and often destroyed. Dredging operations in Basseterre Bay to build a cruise ship terminal at Port Zante exposed large timbers and several gold coins which were subsequently sold (Informant45).

Anguilla has experienced a dramatic loss of its Amerindian archaeological heritage as a result of hotel development along the coastline where the sites are situated (Crock 2005). Sprawling urban growth, agriculture, mining and land erosion are among the primary causes of loss on Anguilla and throughout the Caribbean territories (Reid 2008: 2).

**Challenge 11: Lack of Foresight**

In several interviews, elder community members expressed their concerns that those people in power were acting for short-term gain without considering the long-term consequences of their decisions. Common concerns they expressed included encouraging the development of large tracts of land by foreign investors, ‘selling out’ by giving large duty-free concessions to foreigners, and a general trashing of the natural environment. Other Anguillians expressed a similar frustration in the youth, many of whom have traded their land and inheritance for new (fast) cars and ‘bling’. There is a perception and feeling that the Island has traded what was traditional and sustainable for something that is not. With this lack of foresight comes a desire to control other political parties and groups, to ensure the short-term success of the current administration (regardless of the party). An older Anguillian (Informant15) expressed his concern that government leaders pay ‘lip-
service’ to concerns about the environment or culture but are more concerned with maintaining their own position than investing in the long-term future.

Such concerns are not new. Moverley (1960) encountered a similar attitude during his research on Pitcairn Island and, like some of the residents I spoke to, attributed the problem to local philosophy. Moverley writes that massive soil erosion had reduced several parts of Pitcairn to the state of a semi-desert but that the ‘religious philosophy of the Islanders does not encourage them to look beyond the morrow’ (Moverley 1960: 61–7). During my fieldwork, I encountered a similar attitude on Anguilla: ‘Some believe that the things of the earth were put here by God for our use. They are bountiful and He will provide. It’s in the Bible. If you see a turtle, kill it. Turtles are food, we are predators and there is a perfect balance between us’ (Informant05).

Legislation designed and adopted to protect endangered species and other resources often face local opposition. Fishing restrictions on Bermuda and the turtle moratorium on Anguilla are two examples. Bermudians vehemently opposed fishing regulations because they believed their livelihood was threatened. Likewise, many Anguillians opposed the turtle moratorium because they either a) directly benefited from a lucrative industry, or b) believed there should be no restrictions because God made turtles to eat and the earth to exploit. This point is further demonstrated by Anguillians’ failure to impose building restrictions or codes, arguing that it is an unlawful interference with their rights over their lands.

**Challenge 12: Insufficient Legislation and Lack of Knowledge of Existing Legislature**

The first step made to alleviate the crisis following news that artefacts were being taken from the Buen Consejo involved public declarations of existing legislation. This may seem obvious, but on Anguilla there is no Freedom of Information Act or any other legislation to ensure the public has access to information. Announcements to educate the public and retrieve artefacts had some success, suggesting that some Anguillians would have reacted differently by perhaps not collecting or buying looted artefacts in the first place had a public education program been in place prior to the ship’s rediscovery. For example, in 1994 locals were buying artefacts salvaged from the site without understanding they had been illegally obtained: ‘X’ is not aware that she is illegally in possession of property belonging to the crown. She is attempting to ascertain the value and history [of the artefacts]’ (Buen Consejo Correspondance 1994).
The Anguilla Antiquities Act (1982 revised 2000) Chapter A95 forbids the export of artefacts found on Anguilla. It does not as previously mentioned, prevent artefacts from being dug up and sold or traded on Anguilla. As long as they are not removed from the island, it is not a crime under the Antiquities Act. In this respect it might be viewed as an unstated approval for removing artefacts and therefore contrary to the principles enshrined in core heritage legislation in Bermuda, the US Virgin Islands and other countries where heritage management strategies have been revised in the past 20 years to more closely follow UNESCO guidelines and international standards for best practice.

More fundamental is the absence of primary legislation that would protect archaeological material before it is removed. As the Caribbean lacks a central government, submerged cultural resources are not managed by a single authority but by many local and foreign governments.

**Obstacles for Model Legislation**

Not only would a detailed understanding of every island’s individual laws be necessary but also experience in dealing with the British, French, Spanish, and Dutch home governments. Making a coherent piece of legislation incorporating this understanding might be possible and, if so, the next challenge would be to convince each and every Island that it would be in their interest to adopt the legislation. There the process would probably falter, as individual government’s unique concerns became apparent. Also, at this point, individuals with an economic incentive to maintain the status quo would attack the legislation at a local level, as happened each time Bermuda attempted to increase its protection.

**Progress for Legislation**

As already explained in Chapter 1, the possibility of creating blanket legislation at present is remote and better protection must begin locally with locally interested and concerned individuals. Only after brainstorming and communication networks are in place throughout the region may the underwater heritage be successfully protected on a regional scale. The 2001 UNESCO Convention provides an excellent starting point for discussion and an opportunity to raise awareness among legislators. The 2013 Sub-Regional Workshop to draft legislation held in St Kitts and Nevis provided such a forum.

**Enforcement**

Even when effective local legislation is passed, there is often an issue with enforcement. Islands with small policing forces and extensive reef-line will often claim that it is
impossible to police and enforce anti-treasure hunting legislation. Therefore they argue the passage of any such legislation is useless. It is a familiar, but faulty argument. No law is absolutely enforceable but if it is coupled with education a new law can change attitudes, after which enforcement becomes a secondary issue. Drunk driving legislation in the USA is an example; coupled with efforts from MADD (Mothers Against Drunk Driving) and campaigns for Sober Grad Night in High Schools, the number of alcohol related deaths on American highways declined approximately 47% between 1980 and 2005 (Madison 2010: 96). This was after politicians and pessimists claimed that changes in the law were not enforceable and would not make a difference. As a result, attitudes have changed to discourage drunk driving and accident figures have dropped.

On the other hand, when legislation exists but is not adequately enforced, existing attitudes are often a factor preventing positive change. This was the case on Bermuda under the 1959 Legislation. There, the legislation could have been applied to protect the Islands’ UCH but instead its governing body (The Wrecks Authority) used the legislation to promote their own interests. Permits which should have been issued to responsible individuals were instead issued to the committee’s own members. Future protection required that this law be revised and an active campaign put in place to change people’s attitudes. This process has taken time, but as with drunk driving, a new law coupled with active campaigning has worked. After more than 20 years of work, attitudes have changed so enforcement is no longer a major issue. Many local divers in a different era would have salvaged the island’s wrecks, but now they act as stewards who report any unusual activity on the reef. Thus, while the 1959 legislation was ineffective, new legislation (The Bermuda Historic Wrecks Act 2001) combined with a dedicated education program has, over time, changed attitudes and improved the protection of UCH. The creation of such a program is difficult, however, without the presence of trained and educated professionals.

**Challenge 13: Few Local Professionals (Maritime Archaeologists, Archaeologists, and Heritage Managers)**

Unfortunately, the recording and conserving of much cultural material is possible only with the presence of trained professionals. Few Caribbean islands have a trained archaeologist or heritage manager living on the island full-time. Bermuda, Jamaica, the Cayman Islands, Trinidad, and the Turks and Caicos Islands are notable exceptions. While other islands may attract seasonal archaeologists during the summer months, the effect of their presence is diminished with their departure. This is especially true where the island lacks a museum or space to disseminate new information.
Networks

Those archaeologists who are local are often overtaxed and extended well beyond their available resources. Bermuda is fortunate in that although the director of the Bermuda Maritime Museum is not specifically a maritime archaeologist, he has taken an equal interest in affairs under the surface as he has with those on land. Until 2005, Bermuda employed not only a full-time maritime archaeologist but also a full-time conservator who specialized in underwater artefacts. In 2010 the museum hired two full-time maritime archaeologists. Bermuda has also encouraged partnerships with academic institutions including East Carolina University in the United States of America and Bristol University in the United Kingdom. By creating and improving networks between archaeologists living on different islands, as well as supporting links with foreign institutions, it is possible to increase the influence of the current maritime archaeologists in the region and to encourage others to become active locally.

Where archaeologists do work in the region, more effort should be made to collaborate and to share resources. Current transportation links sometimes make travel between islands difficult despite geographical proximity. Working within existing frameworks to foster links between Islands, it may be possible for archaeologists to share their experience and expertise with other islands and groups within the region.

Challenge 14: Top-Down Approach

While archaeologists and heritage managers increasingly recognize the importance of engaging communities on their own terms, there has been a tendency in the past for professionals and government representatives to talk down to local communities and dictate management in a top-down approach. This approach, while necessary for much legislation, runs a risk of separating and alienating local groups from the research/work undertaken. Emphasizing the role of professionals over local groups may lead to disconnect between people, heritage and archaeology. Once disconnected from the past and alienated from its management, looting and destruction are more likely. While locals have often been given preference over outsiders when it comes to awarding contracts or management rights, this preference has been given only with the approval of outside ‘experts’ and governing authorities. This management strategy has often resulted in locals being alienated from the management process and encouraged a feeling that they do not have a voice in how heritage in managed on the island.
Challenge 15: Lack of Permanent Public Heritage Displays

On Anguilla, three and a half decades of archaeological investigations have created an impressive store-house of Amerindian artefacts. However, without a museum or permanent display, these finds are not readily accessible. Management is ad hoc. The majority of artefacts are stored by the National Trust in a storeroom adjacent to their offices. The Anguilla Archaeological and Historical Society also curates some finds and miscellanea including a disassembled ‘Chattle’ house kept in a steel container. A smaller number of more valuable, rare pieces are kept by the Anguilla Police Department in their vault. Without a National Museum or permanent exhibition space to display these objects, they remain outside the public domain.

A lack of access to heritage resources results in a lack of growth in public awareness, appreciation and knowledge (Maarleveld et al 2013: 52). While there are logistical and practical constraints to allowing access including security concerns, these are not insurmountable and could be overcome.

Challenge 16: Lack of Funding

One reason for the absence of trained professionals is funding. Many small islands lack the monies to hire a full-time archaeologist. Where funding might be obtained from the government, the government has yet to recognize the immediate benefits for the island. They may be further dissuaded from investing in preserving the island’s past by the public who have not recognized the tangible benefits of preserving heritage either through a lack of education or awareness. Bermuda is fortunate in that unlike other islands there is a potential, large source of funding from the islands’ local inhabitants. Bermudians are unusually proud of their heritage and often find supporting the work of local archaeologists and projects a self-fulfilling job. A high GDP combined with a local interest and pride in things Bermudian is a boon to archaeology (Jon Adams pers. comm. 2008). Finding the funds on many islands including Anguilla to support even a relatively small project like the 2009 Shipwreck Survey can be a challenge. Creating the infrastructure to support the permanent management of underwater cultural heritage may be out of touch with the real financial limits of many small islands.

Challenge 17: Double Standards

In small communities, it is common for some people to believe that they are outside the law. While one standard applies to some people, another applies to others. For example, a site may be barred to prevent access but individuals may continue to visit it, flaunting
their right despite laws to the contrary (Informant36). This flaunting may be done by the general public, members of groups, or even by government officials.

When a complaints procedure is limited to demanding that those responsible investigate themselves, abuse is common. Bermuda is an overseas territory like Anguilla and provides an instructive example. During its formative years of heritage management, members of the Historic Wrecks Advisory Committee established in 1964 were not required to possess any specific qualifications. Consequently the committee represented wreck diving interests above those of archaeologists, historians, or conservators, none of which were represented until the 1980s. Responsible for granting licenses to excavate historic wrecks in Bermuda’s water, the committee as a matter of course issued licenses to each other. It was, in the words of Dr Edward Harris, Director of the Bermuda Maritime Museum, like having the fox guard the hen house. While members of the committee were granted permission to ‘work’ sites, other applicants were turned down.

A similar double standard exists on Anguilla in respect to sea life where Anguillians are allowed to spear while foreigners are forbidden. When locals are allowed to exploit the sea to benefit themselves they become extremely protective of their rights. On Bermuda dangerously low fish populations were safeguarded by the government which created reef reserves. These no-take zones were vigorously opposed by the fishing community, whose members denied that their methods were responsible for the decline. Only after the fishing community observed first-hand that stocks were recovering in the protected area did public opinion shift to support Government policy. Attitudes in the fishing community ultimately came round to follow suit. The creation of Bermuda’s UCH legislation encountered similar opposition and took two decades to enact. Like the fishing regulations, it ultimately found wide acceptance as the public came to acknowledge that it served the island’s greater good.

Recently, a movement by the Anguilla National Trust to restrict fishing areas and the number of pots deployed has met similar resistance. It is presumed that if a comprehensive law is drafted to protect cultural heritage, it would also meet opposition. However, the Bermuda precedent shows that attitudes (both towards fishing and historic wrecks) can be changed over time, primarily through education and information.

**Challenge 18: Misdirected Enthusiasm**

Enthusiasm is a powerful tool when accompanied by appropriate education and behaviour. Misdirected, it can be a destructive force that destroys heritage and this has been an all too common occurrence. On St Kitts, locals who removed artefacts from the
White House Bay wreck for their private collections and to sell on Ebay destroyed much of
the site’s integrity. Damage in this case occurred both before authorities and experts had
had the opportunity to photograph and map the site after it had been investigated by
Simon Spooner and the Anglo-Danish Maritime Archaeology Team (Spooner 2003; 2005).

On Anguilla, people who are interested in the island’s history may see collecting as a way
to save and preserve the island’s history. The individuals who remove a cannon from the
sea in order to give it to a local museum believe they are doing a good thing because they
are not selling the object for profit but giving it away so people can see it. Unfortunately,
conserving even a small gun can cost thousands of dollars. Colville Petty’s decision to
conservate a small swivel gun is admirable but would not have been necessary if the gun
had not been removed by tourists in the first place. While enthusiasm is responsible for the
destruction of some resources, organized treasure hunting is an even bigger threat to
UCH.

**Challenge 19: Treasure Hunting and the Looting of Archaeological Sites**

Even today treasure hunting remains an acceptable lifestyle in the eyes of many.
Educating officials and the public that there is a better use for their resources is difficult.
Treasure hunters bring big promises to small islands including money, international
recognition, and publicity through well-designed ad campaigns. A rapid cycling of
government officials (many with two years in office) means that every time a petition from
treasure hunters is received, the wheel must be reinvented and managers must race
against the clock to re-educate the decision-makers.

A conversation with two treasure hunters in August 2009 and again in 2010 revealed the
on-going problem on Anguilla. A father and his daughter described how, they had been
coming to Anguilla since 1983 to search for shipwrecks. She described finding ‘their
galleon’ *El Buen Consejo* that year with Bull Bryan and their experiences digging for
artefacts and smashing open concretions with sledge hammers to find artefacts. She
described how because they were on vacation and couldn’t dive their site as often as they
wanted, Bull found other partners. She related how they had hired an attorney to get them
ownership of the wreck and the ‘sad day’ when the government of Anguilla took away
‘their wreck’ (Informant16).

Often, the discoverers of a site believe they have an exclusive right to do anything they
want to the site. On Bermuda, Teddy Tucker publicly claimed wrecks for himself, even
describing the sites as a ‘semi-private Fort Knox’ (Tucker 1962). On Anguilla, a similar
possessive response was recorded in reaction to government restricting access to the site
of the Buen Consejo. In 1994, an Anguillian replied that ‘he don’t give a f— what the government says, the wreck is mine’. In the case of Anguilla, several people believed the wreck should be their property. In 2009 the Anguilla treasure hunters admitted finding many artefacts on multiple sites. All they do on Anguilla, one explained, was search for shipwrecks. Diving on El Buen Consejo which is an Underwater Archaeological Preserve and removing artefacts is not wrong in their opinion because the Government of Anguilla took away what was rightfully theirs. The experience means that now when they find a wreck they keep the location secret, so the government does not interfere (Informant 16).

**Conclusion**

Each of the previous challenges increases the probability that heritage management will be ineffective. If, as archaeologists we accept that our role in the past is more than esoteric and we have a responsibility to protect that past, then we must not ignore these difficulties but rather work to correct and improve as many of them as possible. Our role as stewards of the past is not to prevent that past from being used by others but rather to empower stakeholders to understand the finite nature of the resource and make considered decisions about its management.

The problems described in this chapter are connected, as one may exacerbate another. Any solution must therefore look at the entire picture including local history and how past experiences help shape current attitudes towards heritage resources. The following chapter looks at heritage (cultural resource) management and how community archaeology and public involvement may be utilized by archaeologists to correct many of the problems identified here. For heritage management to be effective, several areas need improvement. Areas with the potential to correct problems are described in the following chapter and include research, education/outreach, local stewardship, heritage tourism, and legislation.

**How Challenges are Realised in Practice**

As an introduction to these areas, two case studies of previous heritage management are presented as examples. Neither case study is intended to be an example of ‘bad’ heritage management. Instead, they illustrate how many of the challenges described in this chapter are realized in practice. Together, they show how the management of significant sites may be frustrated without a heritage management system which addresses the challenges described here.
Chapter 5 An Introduction to Cultural Heritage Management on Anguilla

It is simplistic to write of a solution for heritage management challenges. Instead, managers have often identified categories of need, or areas for improvement in management (Moser 2002, Bainton 2009, Mabulla 2010). These areas including research, education, local stewardship, heritage tourism and legislation work together to protect the past and give heritage a place in the present. Heritage management is in its infancy on Anguilla and recognizing these areas is especially important, to develop a heritage management system where no precedent exists.

With heritage management, mandates are set out globally, nationally, and locally. These dictate how resources should be managed at a local level. For example,

*Government will create and enforce legislation to preserve and promote the country's historical and cultural resources* (Draft Tourism Policy Government of Anguilla 2001)

And

*Whereas Anguilla has a rich heritage of sites of natural, paleontological and archaeological interest and sites and buildings of historical interest [which] together form part of Anguilla’s national identity and part of the world's natural and cultural heritage [the Biodiversity and Heritage Conservation Act] provides for the protection of biodiversity and the heritage resources of Anguilla* (Biodiversity and Heritage Conservation Act, 2008).

Significantly, these mandates prescribe an ideal behaviour which is frustrated by real-life problems. Chapter 1 described how recent legislation on a global and regional level demonstrates a shift in policy, which supports the protection of different types of cultural heritage over its exploitation. This shift in policy is also reflected with legislation on a local level (see Anguilla: Legal and Non-legal Context).

Where there are no archaeologists, heritage professionals or legislation, there can be no heritage management. The first step is to identify the resource. Many developing countries including Anguilla did not recognize their local heritage until recently. For example, in 1979
More than one Anguillian said there were no pre-Columbian Indian sites. Since this seemed unlikely, given Anguilla’s geographical position in the Lesser Antillean archipelago, the Island Resources Foundation...moved ahead to mount and fund a systematic reconnaissance effort to identify archaeological and historical resources (Figueroedo 1979: 3).

That year four archaeologists, Kenneth Dick, Burce Tilden, Alfredo Figueredo and George Tyson Jr, from the Island Resources Foundation in St Thomas travelled to Anguilla as part of a regional strategic planning program to identify pre-Columbian Indian sites. Their initial survey identified 19 Amerindian sites on Anguilla and demonstrated that Anguilla possessed a hitherto unrecognized and rich archaeological heritage (1979 GIS Bulletin Reprinted in Carty 1985: 15). Since that initial survey, more than a dozen terrestrial archaeological investigations and field schools have identified more than 40 sites. The Anguilla Archaeological and Historical Society and Anguilla National Trust currently stores more than 60,000 artefacts from these projects.

The following case studies offer example of how heritage has been managed on Anguilla. The first case study describes The Fountain, a prehistoric Amerindian ceremonial site located in a cave on land while the second describes the Buen Consejo (A-01) a shipwreck located less than 400 meters off the coast of Anguilla. Both are used to illustrate how problems identified in Chapter 4 can manifest themselves ‘in the real world.’

**Case Study 1: The Fountain**

Described briefly in Chapter 2, *The Fountain* was a historic source of fresh water for Anguillians. This use continued through the 1970s, especially during periods of drought. When archaeologists discovered Amerindian petroglyphs and carvings at the site in 1979 they informed the Anguilla government about its significance to regional prehistoric archaeology. Key stakeholders pressured the government to purchase the site (4.75 acres) and as a result, the site became Anguilla’s first National Park in 1985 (Carty 1985: 4).

Several excavations at the site by archaeologists between 1986 and 2007 recovered artefacts and resulted in a complete mapping of the site. The site which is located near one of Anguilla’s most popular beaches at Shoal Bay East is accessed through an opening in the top of a cavern. A large Autograph Tree (*Clusia rosea* or Pitch Apple) guards the entrance.
**Looting**

After the site’s importance became known to the public, rumours grew that one of the site’s main features (a ‘Queens Head’) had been sawn off from a stalagmite and sold for a fortune off-island (Informant37). According to locals interviewed, the crime was committed by a non-Anguillian. Interestingly, locals holding this opinion did not necessarily censor the action as disagreeable. An anonymous individual explained that he [the non-Anguillian] saw the value when none of us [Anguillians] did. Others including members of the original survey team disagree that the site was ever looted. As the crime was allegedly committed before an accurate inventory was made, it is impossible to confirm or discredit the accusations.

Amidst growing concerns that the site’s main petroglyph of the Amerindian god *Jocahu* would be destroyed, the Anguilla National Trust decided to close *The Fountain* and bar all access. To that end, an iron gate was constructed over the opening. According to local reports, the bars were largely ineffective and locals continued to visit the site illegally for several years. In 2005, additional bars were added by the National Trust. However, in 2011, these too had been broken to allow illicit access. While the site is undoubtedly a significant Amerindian site with the potential to become a listed World Heritage site, it has significance to both Anguillians and archaeologists.

Of all Anguilla’s heritage sites, *The Fountain* is the most widely recognized site among Anguillians. The site, like many important heritage sites has multiple values including archaeological, economic and social significance. This is true for both the Anguillians and foreign stakeholders who are invested with its preservation, management and/or development.

**Archaeological Significance**

*The Fountain* was included in 1999 on the Tentative List for World Heritage Sites. The proposal reveals that the site, used between 400-1200AD is the longest used ceremonial cave site in the entire Caribbean and represents an extraordinary example of Amerindian cultural heritage.

**Economic Value of the Fountain**

Since its discovery, the Government of Anguilla, Ministry of Tourism and various stakeholders have independently recognized that *The Fountain* has potential to attract large numbers of visitors to Anguilla. Developing the site as a Heritage Tourism attraction has been a major goal since archaeological excavations began. More than US$1,000,000
has been spent on environmental assessments, carrying capacity studies and development proposals. Access has been a major challenge and is the primary reason the site remains closed. The only entrance is a vertical descent through a hole in the top of the cavern. A ladder erected by the Army Corp of Engineers following the Revolution in 1967 and since replaced has been deemed unsafe as a potential liability. An elevator has been proposed along with a completely new entrance that would provide horizontal access (and which requires a tunnel through rock). While many believe these changes are necessary in order to provide wider access, others believe they would make the site too commercial and destroy the cave’s authenticity.

On a practical level, these plans are frustrated by the challenges in Chapter 4 including Anguilla’s size and wealth. As there are no local professionals, Anguilla has relied on outside experts for consultation and support. While much information has been gathered, it has been impossible to apply advice locally as there are few local professionals and an absence of funding to implement ideas.

The Fountain National Park Corporation was established in 1996 with the Anguilla National Trust as the sole shareholder and primary agency. While this has given the ANT authority to manage the site it is not given them the money to develop the site. In order to raise the money, the ANT has entertained a number of commercial proposals which would include developing part of the National Park for real estate (to raise the money to create a museum and visitor centre for the cavern). This concession has the potential however, to affect the nomination of the site as a World Heritage Site, as UNESCO traditionally encourages the surrounding land to remain undeveloped. To date, the ANT has remained cautious, preferring to keep the site as it is until a better solution can be found.

This recognized potential has meant that even while the site remains closed it has been used to promote Anguilla as a tourist destination. The Anguilla Tourism Board and Ministry of Tourism have utilised the site in literature promoting the Island (noting that the site is temporarily closed). Others have adapted petroglyph designs found within the cavern to create logos for their businesses (Figure 5-1). Cap Jaluca and Fountain Resort Residences are two examples where petroglyphs have been used by developers in their logos.
Social Value

Social value can include the use of a site for social gatherings such as celebrations, markets, picnics, or ball games, activities which do not necessarily capitalize directly on the historical value of a site but rather on the public-spaces, shared space qualities. The kinds of social groups strengthened and enabled by these kinds of values include everyone from families to neighbourhood groups to ethnic groups to special interest groups (Mason 2002:5). That individuals and groups continue to access The Fountain (and the majority do not disturb the Amerindian artefacts) demonstrates that the site continues to be an important social space for Anguillians. The historic value of the site is both archaeological and historical. It is closely associated with a fresh water source and even fertilizer (bat guano) but increasingly as a way to connect with the past.

The capacity of a site to stimulate a relation or reaction to the past is part of the fundamental nature and meaning of heritage objects. Historical value can accrue in several ways: from the heritage material's age, from its association with people or events, from its rarity and/or uniqueness... (Mason 2002: 11)

While archaeologists recognize the unique nature of Amerindian finds in The Fountain, locals also recognize the presence of a reliable source of fresh water, and perhaps sentimentally reflect on a way of living which has disappeared in living memory.

An Anguillian explained that when he was a child and went to The Fountain for water, he never explored the cavern beyond the 1st pool. He spoke with a reverence for the site and explained that he had not been surprised when archaeologists discovered evidence of Amerindian ceremonies and worship. While Anguillians have been frustrated that the site has been closed for many years, the majority recognize the site is truly unique and an important part of local history. Anguillians’ connection to the past extends beyond their colonial forbearers. The Fountain has a spiritual value for modern Anguillians, especially
as a way for them to understand a people who shared their Island (including its trials and tribulations) but whom they never met.

These and all values are embedded in culture and social relations and are constantly in flux. They suggest, however, that Anguillians have a deep connection to their Island and actively choose those areas of heritage which they want to embrace or reject. Like boat racing, Anguillians embrace the Island’s Amerindian past as their own.

**Conclusion**

Despite some public discussion of developing of the site for tourism, the public has often been alienated by the decision-making process. Treasure hunting and the threat of destruction has led to universal access restrictions. The absence of a permanent display on the site and its history has meant that visitors and locals alike are unable to learn about the site while visiting.

Development along Shoal Bay may also impact whether the site achieves World Heritage status and may affect the aquifer which feeds the pools. In conclusion, the future is uncertain despite overwhelming public support favouring the site’s preservation and development.

**Case Study 2: El Buen Consejo**

While underwater cultural heritage resources were mentioned in the 1978/79 Government Information Service Bulletin and the AAHS’ 1985 review, they remained a non-issue. This remained true during the 1980s when local fishermen and visitors salvaged an unknown amount of heritage from the Island’s historic wrecks. Largely unconcerned, the government has taken action, however, when destruction became blatant. In 1971, the Mayor of St Barths was asked to leave Anguilla after he was caught using explosives to dynamite the reef near Scrub Island to remove cannons which were likely from the site of the *Prusiano* (‘Mayor of St Barths- Diving In Wreck Off Scrub Island’) and in the 1980s the infamous treasure hunter Mel Fisher was turned down for a permit to search for wrecks off the coast.

**1983**

When from 1983, ‘Bull’ Bryan, an Anguillian fisherman took at least two American tourists to the site of *El Buen Consejo*, no one took notice (see Chapter 3 A-01 for site information). For the next 11 years Bull and his clients continued to dive the site and recover artefacts every time they came to Anguilla but failed to report it (Informant16).
During the summer of 1994 reports circulated that Bull was diving the sites, recovering artefacts and selling them ‘on the street in St Maarten for next to nothing’ (Informant05). Local responses varied. Many people began collecting, hoarding, buying and selling the religious medallions which made up a part of the ship's cargo. They did so locally on both Anguilla and St Maarten. The ownership of the site was immediately contested by several individuals and groups who sought exclusive salvage rights from the government. The news of the find spread locally and abroad. In September 1994 Mel Fisher and his son, possibly the world’s most notorious treasure hunters sent an application to the government of Anguilla seeking permission for his company *Treasure Salvors Incorporated* to ‘work’ the site.

It is interesting that in 1994 Anguillians believed the Island’s economy would benefit not from the preservation of the site but rather from the sale of artefacts. The year makes a good baseline, showing that even the most active and concerned individuals do not automatically understand the difference between archaeologists and professional salvors. It took several months for the concerned Anguillians to fully realize that archaeologists are not allowed to sell artefacts to fund their work. The AAHS contacted Dr Leshikar-Denton on the Cayman Islands and the Peabody Essex museum in Salem, Massachusetts for help finding a solution. The museum explained about the ethical acquisition of artefacts for use in a museum as well as the possibility of involving maritime archaeologists from Texas A&M University or East Carolina University to help with the excavation and conservation of materials.

In the meantime, the government of Anguilla continued to receive applications from groups; the majority of whom made no mention of artefact conservation or the inclusion of professional archaeologists. Two divers on vacation from Vermont who were shown the wreck by Bull Bryan in 1994 went to the Government and asked for permission to let their group excavate the wreck. Forming a company, *Anguilla Maritime Research, Ltd*, they approached the government with a contract, made under the Receivers of Wreck Act, CAP 158 and the Antiquities Ordinance.

**Salvage Proposal**

If approved their proposal granted Anguillian Bull Bryan:

1) Exclusive right and license to undertake an archaeological and historical survey of the Wrecks and their attendant sites,
2) The right to salvage tackle, apparel, armament, species and cargo,

3) The sole right to develop and utilize an underwater marine park,

4) 80% of the recovered artefacts which represent 80% in value of all the items recovered (the remaining 20% to be given to the government),

5) The above exclusive license for a term of twenty years,

6) The right to sell artefacts salvaged during one calendar year the following year,

7) Duty-free concessions including fuel, spare parts, and equipment free of all tax and custom duties, and

8) The sole right to transfer, assign and subcontract the agreement.

1995

While negotiations continued, the site continued to be looted. In February 1995 the newly formed AMR reported that Bull had dove the site to see if anything was missing and that a 2’ X 1’ cluster of artefacts containing brass medallions had been taken. Moreover, they urged that if action was not immediately taken, ‘there will certainly be nothing left but a hole in the ocean floor where the artefacts had been’. There is no record of what was actually recovered from the site but a number of Anguillians remember a wide variety of recovered artefacts including precious metals, silverware, buckles, cloth seals (one example recovered by the AAHS in 2008 is described in Chapter 3 as SF-09), medallions, bundles of needles and an iron bar.

1996

Recognizing the need to control the recovery of artefacts, in 1996 the area was made a Marine Park. The wrecks committee expressed their concern over allowing foreign interests to excavate Anguilla’s underwater heritage and pointed out that the ‘government should not entertain any proposal which allows artefacts to leave Anguilla permanently, or to be sold’. Statements on the radio and TV were made about the Antiquities Act and Marine Park Act as well as importance of returning artefacts and protecting the sites (see Chapter 4 Challenge 11). The site of the Buen Consejo was subsequently designated an Underwater Archaeological Preserve, making it an offence to be in the area without permission or remove anything from within 500 yards of the site.

After the site became a preserve, there is strong evidence that looting continued. Although many of the artefacts taken from the site between 1994 and 1996 by the initial claimants were returned, others infrequently turn up in private collections on the island or even in
stateside auctions. In reality, no one knows how much was taken, but everyone agrees it was substantial.

2008

On November 30, 2008 one of the *Buen Consejo* medallions taken from the site by David Stevens, a Vermont accountant in 1995 was listed on Ebay for $500. The Anguilla Archaeological and Historical Society and several members of the original Wrecks Committee quickly mobilized to demand that the woman Stevens had given the artefact to should return it to the island. On January 15, she willingly surrendered it to the FBI and provided additional information to the FBI that led to the confiscation of nearly 100 additional medallions (‘FBI Press Release Cultural Artefacts Returned to Anguilla’ 2009).

In 1996, two years after the site initially made headlines, the Wrecks Committee offered their recommendations. Anguilla Maritime Research was awarded a twenty year lease to develop the site as an underwater archaeological preserve. In return, they donated US$25,000 to the National Museum, an entity which as of 2013 has not been created. In addition, the Government of Anguilla invited East Carolina University (ECU) and the Maritime Archaeological Historical Society (MAHS) to the island to survey the site. Their work, the one occurrence of professional archaeology during this period, provided the basis for site’s continued investigation as part of the 2009 Survey.

*Artefacts*

A large number of religious medallions taken from the site by AMR were conserved off-island and returned between 2001 and 2003. In addition, castings were made and reproductions commissioned in silver and gold. At the time of printing they were available to buy online from Trinity Casting Company. Plans by AMR (Anguilla Maritime Research) to develop the site as a tourist and diving attraction failed due to disagreement among the principals.

The incident did not, however, result in any form of blanket legislation that would protect new wrecks when they are discovered. In 2009 the author witnessed two other treasure hunters bragging about their exploits in the *Buen Consejo* Archaeological Preserve and on other sites. They showed off a small medallion from the *Buen Consejo* and talked about cloth seals they had found nearby. A few nights later, they showed several pieces of ‘black sea glass’ to their friends in a local bar (sea glass is glass polished and worn from time in the sea which is used to make jewellery). The two treasure hunters also said that they had
found two more sites but they were keeping the locations secret so the government wouldn’t take them away (Informant16).

These activities continue but there is growing concern and public sentiment that this activity should not be tolerated (Informant11, Informant12).

**Public Response**

It is positive that the public responded to public statements during the ‘El Buen Consejo Crisis’ in 1994-6. If this concerted effort had been carried beyond the project, then momentum might have continued and heritage management developed further. However, once the Wrecks Committee disbanded, there was no institutional memory to move protection beyond a paper park. Attitudes towards collecting and salvaging remained unchanged or even reverted. Despite an amnesty, many individuals choose to keep artefacts from the wreck, correctly believing that their value on the black market would increase. This has happened; at least one medallion has been given in exchange for services in the last three years (Informant42). While the site has status as an Underwater Archaeological Preserve, this designation and its restrictions are poorly understood by the public. Like other parks in the region there is no signage at the site (the White House Bay site in St Kitts similarly lacks interpretation). Treasure hunting continues and is made easier without active enforcement. The absence of individuals with expertise and experience to develop a management plan or stimulate education about the site has created in a general lack of awareness, observed during interviews with the Anguilla Youth Ambassadors (2007).

The 2009 Shipwreck Survey attempted to address these challenges by drawing attention to the UCH but despite its ‘success’ it lacked the longevity or permanent presence to make an impact in institutional memory. Despite this failing the project revealed key areas which needed to be addressed for management to take place. Once these areas had been identified on Anguilla, it was possible to develop a project which addressed challenges directly (the Anguilla Heritage Trail) and which would lay a framework for future management.
Chapter 6 Identified Areas for Improvement on Anguilla

Categories of Need

While every state or Island will by its very nature have individual problems, the solutions to these unique problems have often been outlined in very similar terms (Little 2009:30; Timothy and Nyaupane 2009: 47-8). ‘Categories of need’ have been identified by proponents of community archaeology. In Canada these include the P’s: passion, product, preservation, and protection (Stanley 2006: 2-5). In Tanzania, education about cultural heritage, improved legislation, coordination of roles and responsibilities among various constituencies and among natural/cultural resource managers, training for cultural heritage managers, and archaeological research are five major categories of need for heritage management (Mabulla 2010). These solutions parallel five areas identified on Anguilla during this research:

- Research
- Education/Outreach
- Heritage Tourism
- Local Stewardship
- Legislation

This similarity suggests that while heritage is undeniably a unique resource whose nature varies greatly from location to location, it is possible to identify components of a management infrastructure which may be more widely applicable. While these five areas are independent in some respects (i.e. research does not require heritage tourism in order for it to be successful), they are inter-related and often build upon each other. Together, they create a strong infrastructure for a heritage management system. The remainder of this chapter identifies how these five areas of need: research, education, local stewardship, heritage tourism and legislation help improve heritage management.

Help from within

Traditionally, the development of heritage management systems in the less developed world has relied heavily on outside aid including capital investments and donations. In Asia, China has provided financial support to the Angkor Wat Conservation Project and other heritage initiatives in Cambodia (Aygen 2013: 175-6). While admirable, outside help may create dependence where indigenous solutions are overlooked and a culture of aid
propagated (Kirunda 2011: 52). The proposed solution on Anguilla was to instigate a heritage management system funded locally with local stakeholders and sponsors.

Instead of requiring infrastructure (including permanent museums, salaried professionals, etc.) as necessary background before a project can begin, the project can come first, and lay a foundation for the latter. Further, while some outside expertise is necessary, projects do not always require expensive inputs of staff, facilities, funding and administration but are often best organized on a grass-roots level (and preferably by locals although this may be an ideal rarely realized).

Chapter 4 described how local problems ranging from over-development to treasure hunting threaten the future of cultural heritage management on Anguilla and other small islands. Goals set out in government mandates outline the government’s position towards heritage resources which may or may not reflect the situation ‘on the ground’. On Anguilla these mandates include Antiquities Acts, Tourism Policy (2001), and most recently a Heritage and Biodiversity Act (2010):

*Government will create and enforce legislation to preserve and promote the country’s historical and cultural resources (Draft Tourism Policy Government of Anguilla 2001)*

For mandates and legislation to be effective, however, the public needs to be aware of and comply with the law. A major reason for the failure of these mandates lay in the absence of a management infrastructure:

*The effectiveness of any kind of CHM project depends critically on its organizational framework, including research and curatorial staff, facilities, funding, and administration. Unfortunately, there are shortcomings in some, if not all, of these areas throughout the Third World and in many developed countries as well (Mabulla 2010).*

**Management Infrastructure: The Project as a Beginning**

This chapter proposes that rather than requiring extensive external inputs of staff, facilities, funding, and administration to establish these areas, key elements may be built up over time through projects. Successful initiatives will build on each other’s success and create a stronger system for managing heritage while on the other hand unsuccessful efforts may have the opposite effect. For example, while a successful project will encourage more people to become interested in local history, an unsuccessful endeavour
may discourage future attempts or reinforce a negative attitude that change is undesirable or impossible.

The effectiveness of project-oriented work has been proved on Islands with particularly active heritage groups who have built up their staff, facilities and funding over time. On St Croix, the Landmarks Society has focused on single goals including the preservation of unique sugar estates. Over more than 50 years the organization has singlehandedly preserved a staggering number of sites and persuaded protective legislation to be passed (St Croix Landmarks Society Webpage).

Understanding that different challenges may be met with the same solution is key as once the needs of an infrastructure (i.e. problems in section 1) are identified and the solutions known, it becomes possible to pair the needs of a system with proven solutions. The mechanism for this pairing and the foundation for heritage management becomes the initiative, which should not be random but rather designed to match identified problems with proven solutions.

Research

An important but by no means exclusive component of heritage management infrastructure, research is often considered the necessary or vital first step for heritage management to take place. Management is not practical until the resource has been identified. This was the rationale behind both the 1980 survey by INA in the Cayman Islands (Leshikar-Denton 1996) and the 2009 Anguilla Shipwreck Survey. On Anguilla and throughout the region, there is an absence of systematic surveys to identify and document the type and nature of UCH resources. Researchers have documented and excavated particular sites (Clifford 1991; Cook 1997, Leshikar-Denton 1994; Spooner 2005; Rodgers et al 2006) but these are necessarily limited in scope to a particular site or period. Without documentation, it is difficult to holistically manage the past.

Research, as the first part of heritage management therefore includes both desk-based research and physical survey which work together to identify the resource. In this research, the first part began in 2006 and is on-going. The second was realized during the 2009 Shipwreck Survey.

HER

As described in Chapter 2, research helps provide data to build a local HER (Historic Environment Record) and can be a stimulus to pass more comprehensive legislation. As warned in the conclusion of Chapter 3, identification must be accompanied with a
management plan or it may become an open invitation for exploitation. Importantly, this
holds true for all cultural heritage whether it is located on land or under water.

Legislation

Existing legislation related to the management of maritime cultural resources has been
described on an international, regional, and local level in Chapter 1. Challenges which
affect its enforcement were outlined in Chapter 4, especially as legislation relates to
attitudes towards collecting, a lack of foresight, insufficient legislation, knowledge of
legislation, and double standards (Challenges 3, 9, 11 and 15). That these challenges exist
even where legislation has been created shows that legislation is not an independent
solution. Here, legislation is described as one area of an infrastructure. As with any
infrastructure, the system works only when each area works in concert with its
neighbours; effective legislation is dependent on other areas including education, outreach
and local stewardship.

Heritage managers in Poland have noted that despite incredibly detailed laws, underwater
cultural heritage is difficult or impossible to manage:

\[
\text{Despite the many elaborate regulations the heritage protection law does not automatically guard newly discovered underwater sites...it has to be recognised that the best way to protect archaeological monuments is to develop public awareness (Pydyn 2008: 50).}
\]

Ultimately, no law is absolutely enforceable, rather it is public attitude- their assent that
the law is sound- that is more important (Blair 1887: 33). Preventing pilfering on wrecks
may be all but impossible but it is pretty rare in some countries where the majority regard
it as misguided and antisocial.

Accepting that legislation is limited where it is not enforceable, laws provide a vital
background. Comprehensive legislation, as described in Chapter 1 improves heritage
management infrastructure by providing guidance on what is and what is not allowed.
Laws forbidding the removal of artefacts or the unauthorized excavation of sites create
both a deterrent and the ability to prosecute offenders (Farmer 2011: 121). Without
legislation, a free-for-all exists where heritage may be exploited without restraint or
consequences.
**Top Down Approach**

Legislation is protection from the ‘top down’. Unlike local stewardship, legislation depends on the governing authority accepting heritage as a national resource. Legislation is less dependent on local support and once laws are passed, the public is meant to comply. In practice the government’s mandates may be opposed by a vocal minority but supported by the quiet majority. Thus the majority of Anguillians stopped hunting sea turtles once the turtle moratorium made it illegal while a small minority continued to vocally protest (Informant 06).

When people understand that looting and salvaging historic shipwrecks is illegal, they are less likely to engage in these activities. A few people will continue to break the law, often believing that it is their right or privilege to do so. When the turtle moratorium was passed, a few fishermen continued to hunt turtle, knowing that it was illegal. Similarly, a small number of treasure hunters continued to loot the site of *El Buen Consejo* after it was designated as an underwater archaeological preserve. While education/outreach can reduce the number of people who are breaking the law, it may not dissuade everyone. Legislation provides a means to punish those people and make them an example to discourage others from following suit.

Legislation often relies on negative reinforcement (an exception happens when a monetary reward or compensation is offered in exchange for information or artefacts) to change behaviour. This differs from local stewardship and education and outreach which depend on support from the community (i.e. support from the bottom-up) to protect heritage resources. Thus, the enforcement of legislation is most effective where it is accompanied by other solutions, namely research, education, outreach and local stewardship.

**Education and Outreach**

The most effective way to protect archaeological sites, whether on land or under water, is to instil the public with a sense that these places and objects have value. Jameson and Scott-Ireton (2007: 9-12) write that this is not the intrinsic value of treasure hunter propaganda, but a cultural and historical value as precious pieces of the past.

During this research education kept surfacing as the key for successful management on many levels. Helping people understand that they are connected to the past is vital. While discovery on its own is a rewarding aspect of archaeology, it is arguably meaningless unless it is accompanied with an effort to engage the local community (Cleere 1989, Smith 2002, Shackel 2002). As efforts on other islands have shown, a genuine shift in attitudes
and accompanying policy is possible but may take a generation or more. Importantly any program of public education which begins the process must start within the context of current attitudes and existing knowledge.

In the case of the underwater environment there are deep-seated and entrenched bodies of myth, misinformation, and lies. Despite the archaeological community’s best efforts to combat this, the media have proved highly resistant in changing their popular and over simplistic representations of the underwater world. Media portrayals remain dominated by shipwrecks, treasure and the glorious adventurers on missions of discovery.

Divers are often the most vociferous group interested in the underwater environment; they learn about the UCH from a wide range of sources. Practicing archaeologists who are supported by treasure salving companies, treasure salvors, and glossy spreads in National Geographic and Time which focus on the physical recovery of objects often misrepresent the true nature of archaeology (Fowler 2007: 90-92). Indeed, fostering this misinformation is in the interests of profit-driven salvage constituencies. For example, scavenging divers often cite the Titanic and other iron-hulled vessels as examples, pointing out that these wrecks will soon be gone due to the corrosive properties of sea water on iron (Tolsen and Gerth 2009: 163-185). Unlike seashells which divers have been taught are part of a natural ecosystem, many divers feel that shipwrecked vessels are an unnatural part of the environment; they will disintegrate unless they are recovered and their only function is to serve as an ‘artificial’ reef for sea life. Recovering artefacts is therefore considered a good thing because by recovering artefacts you are ‘saving’ them from a hostile environment where they do not belong and where they would naturally disintegrate and be lost forever. In truth, there are problems with iron and steel wrecks in some environments. However, this information is erroneously misapplied to all wrecks in all environments, sometimes in ignorance but often as justification for recovery. A recent and blatant example is when the Florida-based company Odyssey Marine Exploration wrote pseudo-academic articles on the attrition of wreck sites in order to justify the for-profit excavation of the English warship HMS Victory discovered in 2008 in the English Channel (Tolson 2009 and Tolson & Gerth 2009).

This damaging attitude is being challenged, however, by the world’s major scuba certification agencies. Project Aware’s ‘Protect Our Wrecks’ initiative is a multi-agency effort begun in 2001, following uproar in the 1980s caused by divers disturbing shipwrecks that were war graves. This protocol urges divers to:
Respect the heritage and loss [of life], respect the environment...and respect the history and archaeology. If a wreck or an object of historical importance is located, divers are reminded to leave it where it lies, mark its position and seek advice from local government authorities (Nimb 2003).

The major diver certification also offers recommendations to their divers. The BSAC (British Sub-Aqua Club) tells its divers to ‘Avoid the temptation to take souvenirs...do not dive on a designated protected site, and do not lift anything that appears to be of historic interest’ (BSAC Technical Publications 2002).

However, the growth and success of initiatives to protect the underwater cultural heritage also depends on community involvement that extends beyond the diving community, and which provides a dialogue between professional archaeologists and the public at large. This dialogue may exist in many forms including printed or electronic media including pamphlets, brochures, documentaries, site markers, or interpretive literature. It can also be encouraged through public exhibitions, lectures, and events. Regardless of the format, it is crucial that information is disseminated to the public and put in a format that is both educational and engaging. Of course these measures apply to divers as well: In her dissertation on the Maritime Cultural Resource Management of Preserves, Parks, and Trails, Della Scott-Ireton observed that of twenty-four preserve, park, and trail programs she studied, seventeen included some level of community participation. She writes on the importance of this involvement: ‘In the face of the failure of legislation alone to protect cultural resources, public education and outreach programs appear to be the most effective tools available to managers’ (Scott-Ireton 2005).

That education is needed is further demonstrated by many recreational divers’ lingering disrespect towards submerged artefacts, an attitude that can be corrected through proper education (and not, as was suggested to me, by letting the older generations die off over time)! The Nautical Archaeological Society (NAS) Training Scheme is one of the most successful and widespread proactive training programs (NAS 2011). Developed in 1986, it was a grass-roots initiative to develop an educational outlet for its members, divers, and the public at large. The program is designed around a series of levels designed to teach the principles and practice of underwater archaeology, emphasizing the need to monitor and preserve cultural resources rather than physically recovering them. In the process the challenges and problems associated with removing waterlogged artefacts are discussed, including fallacies such as the opinion that artefacts left in sea water will deteriorate and be lost forever. Originally developed in the UK, it has been used and adopted in countries around the world including Canada, the USA and Australia.
An integral part of this research involves working towards the same ends on Anguilla. Working towards this goal a series of articles (Azevedoa-Azevedol) were published in the Anguillian, a local paper. These focus on such issues as the importance of leaving iron artefacts in the sea and the long-term consequences of looting (using the White House Bay Site on St Kitts) among other issues. Importantly, the diving community on Anguilla is very small and although the dive shops are among the first to recognize the importance of preserving the natural and cultural environment, they are a minority and do not have the same voting power as other groups.

Outreach is necessary for the public to have the knowledge to make informed decisions about the management of cultural heritage and be involved in the heritage management process. To reach as many other groups as possible, a series of outreach initiatives have been organized through the AAHS, the Anguilla Hotel and Tourist Association (AHTA), and the public schools. The following summaries detail this work to date as an on-going effort to provide Anguillians with the information and tools they need to make informed decisions about the management of their cultural heritage (see Appendix A for a chronological list of outreach initiatives).

Examples of public outreach during the course of this research included radio interviews, public presentations which were announced in the local paper and advertised on the radio, open meetings between heritage stakeholders, an orientation directed at taxi drivers following the opening of the Anguilla Heritage Trail and an exposition at Wallblake House sponsored by the Department of the Environment. Three public sessions (one in July 2009 and two in May 2010) were well attended by between 30 and 100 members of the public. Comments made by the public during the events demonstrated an interest in the past by the community members present. For example, comments and questions at the first meeting ranged from site confidentiality to future outreach and projects, the possibility of prehistoric Amerindian sites under water an oral history project and local involvement in upcoming projects. Evoked interest by several locals challenged comments made before the event which inferred there would be a poor turnout by locals and little public interest in the past (see Challenge 5: Expatriate vs. Native Attitudes). This fallacy was further destroyed during several radio interviews (July 2009, May 2010) where concern for the preservation and sustainable development of cultural heritage sites became apparent.

But of all the lectures, interviews and meetings the most surprising outcome was the voluntary and organic formation of the Anguilla Heritage Trail Committee. While every one of the dozen organizational meetings for the Heritage Trail was open to the public, this
group of half a dozen people not only regularly attended scheduled meetings but also assumed responsibility for varied tasks including the writing and publishing of a brochure and map, organizing the opening events, and arranging meetings with the respective Hoteliers and Restaurateurs.

The exposition at Wallblake House in 2010 afforded the opportunity to temporarily display a sample of Amerindian finds (from previous excavations) and medallions recovered from the Buen Consejo. The artefacts were guarded by a local security guard while the public was able to learn about the finds and ask questions about the island’s archaeology. The event was organized by the Department of the Environment to increase awareness about the Island’s natural and cultural resources. The event was well attended and several schools organized field trips to attend the exposition.

**Outreach in Public Schools and the Youth**

Lectures at primary and secondary schools, talks during annual summer camps, organized field trips, and an informal after-school archaeology program were organized to teach students as much as possible about the island’s heritage and archaeology (see Baugher 2013). During the summer immediately following the Shipwreck Survey, a fieldtrip to the shore site adjacent to A-01 (El Buen Consejo) with nine students and their parents was organized. Children were introduced to the methods and technologies used in maritime archaeology and were encouraged to help survey the coast (Figure 6-1). After the ‘survey’ the group returned to a nearby village and were invited to fill out an archaeological record form to record their work and experiences. One participant recorded,

*It was very exciting when we began identifying bolts, stakes, nails and even what we thought looked like a pair of scissors. As we progressed down the scraggly rocks the tide began to spray...I found it very interesting and would do it again in a heartbeat.*

Her father remarked that it was a great learning experience. ‘It opens your eyes to the little island of Anguilla.’ Participants included proportionally fewer Anguillians to expatriates; to reach more local students, school visits were organized at each of the five local elementary schools to speak with students in grades five and six (ten and eleven year-olds).
In addition to information about the maritime sites discovered during the survey, the visits provided an opportunity to assess the knowledge base of this group and understand local perceptions of ‘what heritage is.’ During each visit, a list of heritage sites was compiled. Students were asked whether the past was something they felt should be part of their education and they were invited to submit their ideas for a logo to be used for the Heritage Trail. While none of the logos were chosen for the Trail, finalists were honoured during the Opening Ceremony in May 2010.

While each of the outreach efforts succeeded in reaching the youth and exposing them briefly to the Island’s heritage, it was unclear whether this single education experience would have a lasting effect. One possible solution came during a visit to neighbouring St Maarten. Archaeologist Dr Jay Haviser (2009 interview) described an Archaeology Club which he initiated in the Dutch Antilles and which had been successfully running for several years. There the group had successfully completed several projects including measuring and recording the Island’s largest trees together with their oral tradition where it was available.

Soliciting interest from older students who expressed an interest during the Wallblake Exposition and members of an extra-curricular club at the High School, half a dozen students agreed to participate. Attendance during the first few sessions was irregular.
while topics of local history were discussed and brief fieldtrips to several sites (including Wallblake House, local cemeteries and Amerindian sites) were conducted. Hopefully lessons learned, better organization, and a more comprehensive syllabus will help the initiative grow with time.

**Lectures and Activities for Local Non-Profit Groups**

In addition to the public and the youth, non-profit groups are an important stakeholder in the Island’s heritage. Aims of organizations including the Rotary Club, the Soroptimist Group, the Anguilla Archaeological and Historical Society and the Anguilla Beautification Club resonate with this research. Outreach to these groups not only helps increase heritage’s profile locally but also creates an opportunity to reach many of the Island’s political and social leaders.

Lectures on both the Island’s maritime heritage and the creation of the Anguilla Heritage Trail while it was being built not only offered a forum to share information with the public but more importantly, provided a review process. For example, while sharing the sites with the Rotary Club and the information to be engraved on each marker, important errors were caught, causing an initial uproar among members that errors would be permanently engraved. The site at Katouche Bay, had been erroneously reported to be the site of the 1745 French by an English cartographer in the mid-twentieth century, a story which had been repeated until many believed the Bay’s name ‘Katouche’ was a corruption of the French invader, Monsieur de La Touche. As corrected, the actual landing took place in nearby Crocus Bay and the name Katouche Bay, according to historian Don Mitchell, originated from cadeaux, the French word for ‘gifts’, and the original name of the plantation. The case is significant as it demonstrates a strong local interest concerned with ‘getting the facts straight’ and the determination of locals that if the past is going to be represented, it must be represented authentically.

**Dissemination of Information to Visitors and Tourists**

While community archaeology is necessarily focused on the community and public, it is important to make the same educational information available to visitors and tourists. While in many places this is obvious with the presence of visitor centres or museums, this is not true on Anguilla. During an interview with Condé Nast magazine prior to the Heritage Trail’s opening, the interviewers described their experience on the Island (at the Viceroy Resort) and confessed their challenge understanding how the ‘real’ Anguilla fit within the artificial elegance of the resort.
While the Heritage Collection in East End provides one opportunity for visitors to learn about the Island’s past (especially the Revolution) the Heritage Trail offers another. There is hope that these initiatives will demonstrate how promoting the island’s heritage adds a unique quality to tourists’ time on-island and enriches their experience (see Heritage Tourism).

**Local Stewardship and Community Archaeology: Public Engagement beyond Outreach**

Local stewardship and community archaeology moves beyond education and outreach: whereas education is concerned primarily with education and is often a top-down approach with professionals engaging with the public to disseminate information and research results gathered by professionals, local stewardship is most often bottom-up, where the control of the resource is placed in the hands of the public. Stewardship and community archaeology is therefore distinguished by its dialogue between equal stakeholders.

*It is very important to talk to people here, because if you make an excavation without talking to people it will mean nothing. It would be useless...but people trust you now, because they see you are not trying to hide anything from them* (Resident of Quseir, Egypt cited in Tully 2008).

The roots of public engagement and community archaeology (sometimes referred to as public archaeology) date to the early 1970s when post-processual theory began to replace processualism (see Liddle 1989: 44-46). This theoretic shift in archaeology not only challenged the previously unquestioned authority of professional archaeologists but also brought into question the existence of a single true reading of the past (Shackel 2002; Hodder 2003). Indigenous and local perspectives of the past gained increased validity among academics. While a few archaeologists had long recognized the importance of working with the public, the first book exclusively dedicated to ‘Public Archaeology’ was published in 1972 (McGimsey 1972). Archaeologists who recognized the need to make more efforts to involve the local community made their research accessible to a broader audience, sometimes with popular publications (Kirk with Dougherty 1974, 1978, Leone 1983). The possibility of ‘multiple pasts’ (Hodder 2003) was considered along with the role of indigenous archaeologists (Ucko 1989). This period of reflexivity and introspection (Kohl et al 2007) has been followed by a more socially, politically and economically responsible practice in archaeology (Sakellariadi 2010: 514-527).
Stephanie Moser (2002: 221), of the University of Southampton describes the importance of community archaeology within archaeology: ‘it is no longer acceptable for archaeologists to reap the material and intellectual benefits of another society’s heritage without that society being involved and able to benefit equally from the endeavour’. In practice, community archaeology denotes a wide range of projects, the key ingredient being direct public involvement. The term describes practices as varied as local communities, involving communities of local descendants and people, either diasporas or locals, and communities that stem from a shared identity, belief or interest (Sakellariadi 2010: 514-527). Community archaeologists work to engage the public, recognizing that the academic community, in a rush to publish material or debate the merits of minute academic details, have sometimes forgotten that they are not the only beneficiaries of their work. Their interpretation of the past is not the only one which is valid, and the public benefits of archaeology may in fact be the most important part of their work. More recently, the field has moved towards civic engagement and ‘action archaeology’ (Little and Shackel 2007, Sabloff 2008).

Moser has written that when and if local people are not involved in showcasing their heritage, their sense of ownership and concern for maintaining a site or museum is diminished. This recognition has been accompanied by a broader shift in heritage management, specifically the management of protected areas. The ‘New Paradigm’ for Protected Areas (Error! Reference source not found.) stresses the importance of local involvement and the cultural element of protected areas.

In the Caribbean the challenge is therefore to encourage greater community involvement where there is little education in history and an apparent lack of interest in archaeology. Projects like the 2009 Anguilla Shipwreck Survey stress the importance of the past to the community and have the potential to provide opportunities for members of the public to get involved. Community archaeology methods and practice were adopted for this research following the Shipwreck Survey because the qualities of community archaeology in practice contribute to the more effective and sustainable protection of the archaeological heritage (Sakellariadi 2010: 514-527).
Table 6-1 A New Paradigm for Protected Areas (after Beresford and Phillips, 2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AS IT WAS: PROTECTED AREAS</th>
<th>AS IT IS BECOMING: PROTECTED AREAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WERE ...</td>
<td>ARE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned and managed against people</td>
<td>Run with, for, and in some cases by local people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run by central government</td>
<td>Run by many partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set aside for conservation</td>
<td>Run also with social and economic objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managed without regard to local community</td>
<td>Managed to help meet needs of local people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed separately</td>
<td>Planned as part of national, regional and international systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managed as ‘islands’</td>
<td>Developed as ‘networks’ (strictly protected areas, buffered and linked by green corridors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established mainly for scenic protection</td>
<td>Often set up for scientific, economic and cultural reasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managed mainly for visitors and tourists</td>
<td>Managed with local people more in mind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managed reactively within short timescale</td>
<td>Managed adaptively in long-term perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About protection</td>
<td>Also about restoration and rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewed primarily as a national asset</td>
<td>Viewed also as a community asset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewed exclusively as a national concern</td>
<td>Viewed also as an international concern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There can be little doubt that engagement with archaeology enhances knowledge and awareness of local heritage while at the same time sets the grounds for broader cultural links. Community participation projects around the world have reported among their results building up feelings of local pride and bonding, communication, understanding and formulating a sense of local identity and belonging (McManamon 2000). In fact, it all comes down to the empowerment of these communities through knowledge to better cater for and learn from their past, decide and act on their present and future conditions for their own benefit (Sakellariadi 2010: 514-527).

Today community archaeology occupies its own, albeit little, space in academic teaching and research, publications, conferences and most important archaeological practice as a particular and valid theoretical, methodological and practical field (Saakellariadi 2010). Considered primarily as a tool for cultural resource management and not as an academic sub discipline in the USA, a methodology for community archaeology has been slow to develop (Tuscott 2004; Tully 2008).
A methodology which has been developed in the UK (Moser et al 2002) includes seven components designed to maximize community involvement:

1. Communication and Collaboration
2. Employment and Training
3. Public Presentation
4. Interviews and Oral History
5. Educational Resources
6. A Photographic and Video Archive
7. Community Controlled Merchandizing

These components have the potential to overcome many negative effects of archaeological fieldwork namely the drawing attention of sites during a survey or excavation and giving people a clear message where to dig when the archaeologist leave. They also have the potential to enhance and diversify archaeology’s benefits.

One way to do this is through communicating ideas, research, and history with the public. Just because a country has a particularly deep or rich history does not automatically mean that the community will be interested in or know that it exists. On Northern Cyprus, archaeologist Matthew Harpster discovered that basic lectures teaching the island’s 10,000-year history to the community made a positive impact. Locals became interested in the past once they learned it was something positive (Informant51). In my conversation with Anguilla’s Youth Ambassadors, I had a similar response (2008). While lectures are one way to communicate with the public and share basic information, interviews provide another means. In Egypt, oral histories (where living members of a community are interviewed about their memories of the past) have created a more diverse and comprehensive picture of Quseir al-Qadim’s long history (Field et al 2000: 35-48). On Anguilla, when asked about their heritage and history in 2008, a group of high school students knew little. They explained that I would have to speak with their grandparents (Informant02). Apart from oral tradition, there are few means of conveying history from one generation to the next. When a man in his 60s (Informant26) was asked how he learned about the Island’s history, he joked that he had lived most of it. The older generation often spoke with responsibility for the Island’s history while many of the younger generation lacked the same sense of identity. Influenced by many modern technologies, their experience is far removed from their parents and grandparents: washing machines, paved roads, cable television, and the internet are just some of the developments which have become mainstreamed in a single generation.
Educational resources are another way to engage the public and get people thinking about the past. In Myos Hormos, Egypt, these include site visits and children’s books, both of which create an opportunity for the youth to learn about Myos Hormos and about archaeology. Moser (2002) writes that this outreach seems to ‘foster pride in the unknown antiquity of Quseir and imaginative thinking about life in the past’ In Egypt, interviews provide archaeologists with a means for communicating directly with members of the community and discussion creates an opportunity to receive immediate feedback.

Disseminating research is key. Moser and others have worked hard to involve the older generation through a visual artefact database showing the latest discoveries and the conservation of artefacts. These component parts are complemented by a photographic and video archive of formal and informal occasions during the Quseir excavations. This archive provides potential display information for a visitor centre. Merchandizing and its running are managed locally, putting resources and planning for the city’s financial future into the hands of the local community. In Guatemala, a visitor centre, guide service, inn, and camp site around the park’s entrance provide additional valuable income. Collaboratively managed by three local villages, these resources have paid for local schools, medical supplies, and water systems. Associating these positive changes with the protection of archaeological resources, Demarest (2004) and his team have fostered a local appreciation for archaeology. Appreciating their work, and respecting the site is vital to stop the looting of archaeological sites and ensure their long-term stability. Community archaeology draws its strength from its sustainable and holistic way of approaching heritage protection which is not dependent on legislation and law enforcement. On Anguilla and other small islands where heritage-based legislation and enforcement are less developed, stewardship provides a way to protect heritage resources while allowing for individual and social economic benefits. Community archaeology therefore has the potential to not only enrich people’s understanding of the past but also help people living today. In community archaeology, the public takes control of ‘their’ resource and its success is dependent on community members seeing the potential for archaeology to benefit themselves and/or the community.

As community archaeology has become more popular there has been a movement to assess its methodology and impact (Tully 2007, Simpson 2008).

**Archaeological Stewardship of Local Heritage**

Whose past is it? Who owns the past? These questions in archaeological discourse relate not only to archaeological stewardship and archaeologists’ assumed role as stewards of the past but are also fundamental to the concept of national culture and identity. These issues
have been of major debate, especially as indigenous groups in North America and Australia have asserted their right to archaeological remains (e.g. Kinnewick Man) and post-colonial governments have requested the repatriation of archaeological artefacts.

As heritage became a public issue, and was claimed by Indigenous people in post-colonial countries, archaeological access to the database became a significant disciplinary issue (Smith 2004: 81-104). Advocates for indigenous people’s rights asserted that indigenous claims to the past were valid; on the other side archaeological discourse stressed the ‘professional’ nature of archaeology, distinguished between ‘amateur’ and ‘professional’ archaeologists and the necessity for anyone engaged in digging up the past to have professional training and education. 

Contemporary Indigenous culture and politics were constructed as separate from their past. This alienation has increased, as McGuire and Trigger argue, the distrust of Indigenous people for archaeologists, particularly as it impedes moves to self-determination through a denial of Indigenous peoples’ sense of their own history (Smith 2004).

While processualism and the search for universal laws in archaeology (Binford 1988: 30) were partly responsible for this separation between the archaeological past and the modern present, archaeologists working in a post-processual and post-colonial context have promoted the role of the past in the present (Layton et al. 2006). Community archaeology and action archaeology are recent sub-disciplines which show how the past can be relevant in the present. Proponents argue that not only is it possible for archaeology to enlighten current political and cultural issues, but the very position of the ‘professional’ archaeologist has changed.

For example, archaeologist Dr Stephanie Moser (2002) sees her role in Quesir, Egypt as a facilitator who works with the community to set research questions and goals. She presents her findings to the local community ‘in as many ways and as many forms as possible.’ In addition, she places the decision about what to say and how to display the results of the excavations firmly in the hands of the community.

While some indigenous communities have seized the opportunity to claim the archaeological record, others including Anguilla have not. One reason lies in a lack of education and outreach. For locals to claim the archaeological record as their own and for local stewardship to occur, people must have information and knowledge of the past. While a ‘professional’ archaeologist may provide information on the past local stewardship (defined here as local people taking responsibility for the well-being of the archaeological
record) cannot be forced. In practice, stewardship will not happen until local community members are empowered with the necessary tools, knowledge and motivation to act.

Without local stewardship, the archaeological record may still be used and consumed. Archaeologists may conduct excavations and sites may be developed for tourism or appropriated as a symbol for government. However, without a local understanding of the resource’s nature it is highly likely that this use will result in exploitation and a permanent loss of heritage.

When a country possesses cultural heritage worthy of world heritage status or attracting large numbers of visitors, it quickly becomes a national concern. Today, most of the significant archaeological sites in the world that are major tourism destinations are state-owned and operated. They are national monuments that present distinctive (selective) images of a country’s history and culture to the outside world (Evans-Pritchard in Chang 2001). As national monuments, they are managed from the ‘top down’. This is an expert-driven ‘blueprint approach’, and incorporates the anticipated needs of the community into a plan. Unfortunately, the approach may create gaps as opposed to connections between groups which must be identified and filled to bring groups into a more cooperative relationship (Chang 2001: 131). In contrast, local stewardship provides a seamless approach where the needs and wishes of the community are met throughout the management process. Where local stewardship is accompanied with the authority to manage cultural resources, this happens from the ‘bottom up’ or from the public as opposed to from the government. In practice, neither approach needs to be exclusive; the best management usually occurs where both local and government entities are invested in working together to manage the cultural heritage.

Through self-representation, members of the public are able to express their preferences and goals directly. First person portrayals of community culture and history allow for a richer understanding of the past and more comprehensive interpretation (for example in visitors’ centres and museums). Multiple meanings of a site are presented and many perspectives offered. This is especially important in a post-colonial setting, where the descendants of historic groups of haves and have-nots may share different personal experiences of a shared legacy. Slavery and poverty are two regional examples but different meanings may also exist for archaeologists and locals on a site-level. For example, The Fountain Cavern may be understood both as a regionally-significant Amerindian ceremonial site and as an important resource for subsistence.

To summarize, local stewardship is a cornerstone of heritage management infrastructure because it encourages more local responsibility for cultural heritage resources. This
responsibility supports a broader interpretation of the meaning and significance of cultural heritage resources and the enforcement of legislation. Where it exists local stewardship can act as a buffer, protecting the archaeological resource by increasing the effect of protective legislation (for example when local fishermen and divers discouraged the removal of underwater cultural heritage on Bermuda). In turn local stewardship supports a community archaeology which is both by the people and for the people.

**Heritage Tourism**

In Florida in 2004, 123,000 jobs were created as a result of historic preservation activities and more than 3.7 billion dollars were spent by tourists visiting historic sites.

*A multi-trillion dollar industry and growing, tourism is the largest industry in the world, and approximately 85% of countries have tourism as one of their five leading sources of foreign exchange (Sabloff 2008: 85). The industry accounts for 11.5% of the world’s GDP and US$18 billion each year in tourism receipts in the Caribbean (Clayton and Karagiannis 2008: 185).*

In the tourism industry, heritage tourism is widely recognized as one of the fastest growing sectors. The private sector benefits from heritage through tourism and it is increasingly clear that heritage conservation is the business of all.

**Characteristics and Development of Heritage Tourism**

*Heritage tourism is ‘travel concerned with experiencing the visual and performing arts, heritage buildings, areas, landscapes and special lifestyles, values, traditions, and events of a place’ (Jamieson 1998: 65). Elements of heritage tourism include natural, cultural, and built elements (Poria 2003: 238-254).*

The tourism industry has long capitalized upon the public appeal of the past. The seven wonders of the Ancient World emphasized the unique cultural achievements of past and present civilizations. Contemporary heritage tourism has risen out of a shift in the tourism paradigm. On one hand the public has become more discerning about choosing their destination and on the other hand places dependent on tourism have recognized there is not an unlimited demand for the tourism product (Brown and Cave 2010: 87-95). Following this acknowledgement has been a growing concern for more careful management of heritage resources which may attract visitors (including archaeological sites, natural landscapes, monuments, and the like).
ICOMOS

ICOMOS’ International Cultural Tourism Charter (ICOMOS 2002) focuses on the dynamic interaction between tourism and cultural heritage and the relationship between stakeholders, heritage resources, and tourism. Heritage tourism should, according to the charter have the following characteristics:

1. Involve host communities in planning for conservation and tourism (Principle Four)
2. Benefit the host community through conservation and tourism (Principle Five)
3. Utilize significant portions of the revenues derived from tourism in heritage locations for the conservation and interpretation of those places
4. Have a minimal adverse effect on the cultural heritage and lifestyles of host communities (ICOMOS 2002: 7-14)

The heritage industry is necessarily invested with the consumption of heritage resources, as the past is presented and sold to the public. In practice the ICOMOS charter is an ideal rarely attained (Daher 2000: 117).

Heritage Tourism in the Caribbean/Island Context

Tourism is singularly significant for the Caribbean region. While originally seen as a panacea for economic hardship, tourism has been by best accounts a mixed blessing. A narrow resource base and limited economic development on many islands in the region has led to an overwhelming reliance on tourism for economic growth (Strachan 2002: 10; Hampton and Christenson 2007: 998-1020). Dominating island society and economy, local infrastructure and human resource planning has been minimal due to the rapid and uncontrolled growth of tourism (Brown and Cave 2010: 87-95). Unsustainable development and the corresponding destruction of natural and cultural resources have been widespread. In many cases American culture has been readily adapted en-mass, supplanting ‘old-time’ traditions and practices (Dunn 1995).

In an increasingly competitive market, destinations have relied on staged cultural authenticity, resort enclave hedonism and utopic visions of paradise to attract visitors (Connell 2003: 554-81). While Anguilla has attempted to develop a more elite high-end tourism, it has not been immune to these effects:

The development of tourism has opened Anguilla to cultural influences from North America and in particular to the materialist and exploitative values inculcated by tourism as it has been established in the Caribbean (Fahie 1982).
The erosion of local culture has been aided by regional marketing of a homogenous Caribbean, complete with lush tropical forests, pristine beaches, and friendly, smiling natives. These powerful stereotypes may be present regardless of the environmental and cultural reality (Strachan 2002).

While there are recognized drawbacks with tourism, heritage tourism as envisioned by ICOMOS (2002), with its emphasis on local cultures and identity has been recognized as a potential buffer for these effects.

The cultural heritage of a particular region should be seen as a source of inspiration for future generations and as a means for resisting globalization and commodification of the built and social environments (Daher 2000: 107).

Despite its potential contribution, heritage tourism remains undeveloped on many islands. Where it has been developed outside the region, it has often been criticized for not involving or benefiting the local community or for exploiting/destroying the resource it ought to protect. This is especially true in developing countries with a rich history but poor modern infrastructure or where the resource is controlled by a small group including investors, hotel developers, foreign aid agencies and transnational capital (see Daher 2000). The situation on Anguilla and on many Caribbean islands is different.

In 2009, heritage tourism on Anguilla was virtually non-existent. Existing attractions included an excellent private collection in East End (Colville Petty’s Heritage Collection) and a display in the National Trust. These two public displays provided the only information centres for local history on an Island where over 80% of the GDP comes from tourism. While individual taxi drivers and locals hold a wealth of information, this resource may be tapped by luck rather than design.

**Preservation vs. Consumption: Is Heritage Finite?**

By its definition, culture is constantly changing (Nanda and Warms 2011: 39). New forms replace old forms and the meaning of the past changes from one group to another, from one generation to the next. Festivals and carnivals which celebrate aspects of local heritage which are intangible may be created or changed from year to year (Quinn 2000: 262). New traditions may replace old ones. Culture is never destroyed. On the other hand, artefactual heritages and some intangible forms of heritage may disappear completely. Europeans aren’t building any more ships of discovery and Amerindians are not carving any more petroglyphs. Archaeological sites and artefacts are non-renewable resources. Thus, while some forms of heritage are finite others are continually being re-invented or
rediscovered. Sometimes, especially when the local economy centres on tourism, archaeologists and conservationists may come into conflict with stakeholders who want to develop heritage, especially as the former may consider increased site visitation as inimical to preservation (Sabloff 2008: 87).

As more communities seek to enter or simply better manage the cultural tourism market—an area already dominated by corporate and government interests—control, over representation, economic benefits, sustainable resource management and culturally appropriate ways to experience or use heritage have become key areas of concern (Mortensen and Nicholas 2010: 11-12).

For a solution to be found, major stakeholders need to be identified. In practice, many groups in both the private and public sector have an interest while all do not share equally. For long-term management, marginalized stakeholders including host communities and descendent populations need to be sought out. In other words there is a growing notion that stakeholders are present beyond the formal tourism industry and the interaction between residents, tour providers, community groups and visitors is important. Stakeholders in the public sector may include host communities, indigenous groups, residents, visitors and tourists, tour operators, community groups, local and state governments, non-governmental organizations and heritage managers among others. The private sector may include off-shore investors and big business, entrepreneurs and philanthropists, hotel developers and foreign aid agencies.

Despite the private sector’s role in developing heritage assets for tourism in some regions including Anguilla in the near future, they have rarely been considered a major stakeholder in heritage conservation (Dahur 2000: 1-2; Eboreime 2009: 2). One consequence is that the private sector has often been criticized for destroying sensitive archaeological sites in order to maximize profits and not distributing financial benefits equitably (Dahur 2000: 10). While there are some sites which have been destroyed through development, it is not always an inevitable outcome. Collaboration has been identified as a possible solution.

The Challenge of Collaboration

The economics of heritage preservation and protection frequently entails the forging of uneasy relationships with the tourism industry. While visitors can generate both direct and indirect income for site owners and managers this may be accompanied by environmental and social impacts of tourism development.
and raise questions of quality, authenticity, heritage integrity and long term sustainability (Robinson 2000: vi).

Collaboration between stakeholders concerned primarily with quality, authenticity, and long term sustainability and stakeholders concerned with creating a viable financial product can be understandably tense. Empowering marginalized stakeholders (i.e. the host community) may benefit the community at large but this may or may not be a primary goal of empowered stakeholders. Creating a product which is mutually beneficial and acceptable is admittedly difficult. Balancing the goals of numerous stakeholders is difficult in the best of situations and made even more difficult when local needs and values are unarticulated.

The (Non-Economic) Benefits of Heritage Tourism

True cultural tourism is a socio-culturally embodied phenomenon with diverse dimensions and untold influence of which economics is but one (Robinson 1998: 31).

Heritage management is a way to promote tourism and sustainable concepts that encourage both preservation and the recognition of socio-economic values held locally (Jameson and Scott-Ireton 2007: 10).

Heritage Tourism has the potential to reinforce the importance of the past and positively challenge our relationship with the past: ‘One view is that in its search for heritage ‘products’ the tourism industry is re-enforcing the importance we attach to the past and positively, challenging our relationships with the past’ (Robinson 2000: vii). The benefits of heritage tourism can include preservation, increased local pride in heritage resources, community continuity, community participation, social revitalization, and community development. For all this to happen, the development of heritage resources must support community-based approaches. Entrepreneurs and philanthropists must become involved rather than solely profit-orientated businesses and investors. Cultural heritage must be owned and managed by the community.

Most heritage tourism projects claim community development as one of their objectives; in reality they result in dormant and drugged local communities who become addicted to deterministic modes of developments (e.g. the banal overemphasis on traditional crafts as if they were the only mean for development). Wealthy investors who prioritize profit and capital accumulation usually operate such developments. Thus, local communities substitute long term with short-term economic stability (Daher 2000: 116).
Potential Pitfalls of Heritage Tourism

When balance is not achieved, cultural commodification may be one result. In heritage tourism the commodification of culture is often manifested in the museumization of environments that are voided from the lives of their respective communities. More tourists are confronting ‘packaged experiences’ where they find themselves dealing with ‘constructed images’ and ethnicity of the past. This results in a lack of immersion in culture and a lack of appreciation of cultural difference, presumably the essence of cultural tourism (Daher 2000: 116).

This occurs most often when tourism is developed apart from the current lives of community members (Crouch 2000: 93). Modern ways of living are dismissed as modern or inauthentic. Past ways of life are given preference and featured even when they have little connection to the host community (Pearce and Butler eds. 1999: 117). Freezing change (living in the past) dismantles the link between the past and the present, alienating local populations from their own heritage rather than helping communities connect with their past. Packaged experiences with little relevance replace authentic ones and modern ways of living are ignored or divorced from the past. When communities become involved with the process and have a role in determining how heritage is interpreted and presented, this becomes a non-issue and the true benefits of heritage tourism are realized.

Heritage tourism as heritage management

Heritage tourism is not offered here as a panacea for the effects of increasing monoculturization or the erosion of cultural values. This research is concerned primarily with the improvement of cultural heritage management; heritage tourism is therefore offered in the context of identified areas necessary for effective heritage management. Many of the non-economic benefits of heritage tourism match objectives in Moser’s methodology for community archaeology (2002) already described in this chapter.

The relationship between community archaeology and heritage tourism is potentially beneficial. Heritage tourism demonstrates the tangible benefits of heritage in economic terms. Having an economic incentive encourages local stewardship, as more locals are likely to ‘get on the heritage bandwagon’ once they see how using heritage can benefit themselves. Importantly, the economic benefit may be the most alluring for local communities while other benefits are more profound (Timothy and Nyaupane 2009:65).
The cultural heritage of a particular region should be seen as a source of inspiration for future generations and as a mean for resisting globalisation and commodification of the built and social environments (Daher 2000: 124).

Cultural heritage has been linked to the construction of national identity and the strengthening of local cultures (Sabloff 2008: 91). These are significant political issues in the region and important for tourism as visitors to the Caribbean often cite culture as a determining factor when choosing their destination.

Heritage tourism has the potential to support other areas of heritage management. It provides an outlet for research to be disseminated to the public and for information to be shared. Managed for profit, tours not only give information to visitors, but also increase local awareness of and a local responsibility to care for heritage resources. Just as heritage tourism has potential to increase local awareness, heritage protection and enrich visitors’ experience, it has an equal or greater potential to destroy the same. Few heritage sites are suited for mass tourism; others are inaccessible, underwater, or fragile. The selection of which sites will be developed or promoted as heritage attractions is all-important and should not made by a sole stakeholder. Heritage tourism is heritage management and the former must go hand-in-hand with the latter. Developing heritage tourism ought to be a conscious decision accompanied with planning. A critical phenomenological theory of community development in the age of globalization provides an outline for heritage tourism endeavours (Table 6-2):
The following chapter looks at the Anguilla Heritage Trail, a conscious effort to promote heritage tourism on Anguilla through a community project. The project is outlined from conception in October 2009 to its launch in May 2010 during Anguilla Day celebrations. As an example, the project provides a model for other community projects in the region.
and hopefully encourages other researchers to take the step from research into the community. A critical assessment of the project is made in the concluding chapter.

**Conclusion: The Role of the Initiative**

Each of the components described above may be present in any initiative. By design, an initiative will cover more than one area; for example, even a purely research-orientated project will have a component of education/outreach and/or be affected by the presence or absence of legislation. Each initiative will not address every area equally although one area may strengthen another. For example, public stewardship will encourage community archaeology; community archaeology may support heritage tourism which will in turn provide tangible benefits to the community, and encourage more people to become involved, which will raise the profile of heritage locally even to a point that new legislation is created to safeguard the resource.

**Keys to Success**

These five areas (research, legislation, education and outreach, local stewardship and heritage tourism) were connected by English Heritage in 1983 in the ‘Virtuous circle of heritage participation’ (Table 6-3 Virtuous Circle of Heritage Participation by English Heritage). They recognized that participation in heritage initiatives caused greater understanding which led to people valuing heritage which in turn led to people caring which in turn led to enjoying, increased understanding and more participation (Bryan 2006: 77). Since its formation, the ‘Virtuous Circle’ has been used successfully in the Caribbean on the Cayman Islands (Leshikar-Denton and Scott-Ireton 2012: 349).
The following chapter looks at how these areas are connected and the role of the initiative in building a heritage management infrastructure. The Anguilla Heritage Trail is described in detail so that it may be assessed, together with the 2009 Shipwreck Survey, in this thesis’ concluding chapter. A detailed description of the project is now offered as a case study. Ethnographic methods are used to demonstrate the nuances and challenges of any community project, including the role of local personalities, interests and skills. Perhaps must crucially, the success of any community initiative depends on the strength and dedication of the individuals and/or groups involved, the resources available and the strength of the research design.
Chapter 7 Case Study: The Anguilla Heritage Trail

Immediately following the 2009 Shipwreck Survey, it was clear that an additional project was needed to encourage more public involvement to ‘get people thinking about the past’. By identifying challenges and areas of improvement during the Shipwreck Survey, the Heritage Trail was conceived as a project with the potential to help create heritage management infrastructure.

Theoretical Background: Heritage Trails

Heritage Trails denote a wide range of projects, roughly defined as:

*a means of organizing the visitor experience by providing a purposeful, interpreted route that draws on the natural or cultural heritage of an area to provide an educational experience that will enhance visitor enjoyment* (Hayes and MacLeod 2006: 45).

Trails can be marked on the ground or on maps, and interpretive material is normally available to guide the visitor. While ‘informed urban walking’ can be traced to Europe in the 1700s, the last half of the 20th century witnessed an increasing variety and number of trails. Tourism organizations, local development agencies, civic societies, and local authorities began using trails to assist with visitor management and environmental conservation (Weaver 1995: 593-604). Different heritage themes developed including architecture, famous people, local industries, historic events and wildlife (Hayes and MacLeod 2006: 45-58). Underwater virtual diving trails were designed in Florida (Scott-Ireton 2003; Terrell 2003), and shipwreck trails in Australia, the UK and the USA (Philippou and Staniforth 2003; Spirek and Harris 2003). Trails can be a few hundred metres or thousands of miles long (African Diaspora Heritage Trail). Routes can be set or may consist of various sites grouped together by common traits. Their design is extremely flexible and they have the potential to incorporate a wide range of heritage resources. For example, in the Cayman Islands, a maritime heritage trail follows the coast and is accessible to non-divers. Submerged points of interest and maritime features on land are incorporated using a number of terrestrial vantage points marked with signs (Leshikar-Denton and Scott-Ireton 2008). The number of sites incorporated into the trail can also range widely. The Nevis Heritage Trail utilizes 25 sites, 36 are found in the Cayman Islands’ Heritage Trail and St Croix has more than 200 including scenic overlooks, wildlife habitats and more!
Keys to Success in the Cayman Islands

During the creation of the Cayman Islands Maritime Heritage Trail Drs Leshikar-Denton and Scott-Ireton identified three ‘Keys to Success’ (Leshikar-Denton and Scott-Ireton 2008:229). These provided excellent guidelines for the creation of the Anguilla Heritage Trail. They included:

- Build relationships with experts, government agencies, non-governmental organizations and the public
- Use established, successful models (Florida, Australia, United States national marine Sanctuaries)
- Be flexible to accommodate new locations, situations and infrastructure (Jameson and Scott-Ireton 2007: 67-70)

These keys to success emphasize flexibility and collaboration. While the Cayman Islands Maritime Heritage Trail was not a community archaeology project by name its emphasis on community involvement and public ownership provided an excellent example of how heritage could be used by the community to increase both local and visitor awareness of heritage resources.

Creating a Sense of Place

Heritage Trails have been recognized by managers as a way to draw attention to less well-known heritage sites and create a more holistic sense of place. In places where much heritage is intangible, interpretation and signage make heritage visible. This step is vital in order for the heritage to be managed (Deacon 2004: 1-9). By creating markers at sites where historic events occurred but where little archaeology remains, intangible heritage is made visible. This creates an opportunity for descendants to remember the past. In the process, people have the opportunity to reconsider the role of the past in the present and how heritage is recreated and given meaning in a modern context. Of course, there is a danger that if one group selects all the sites or provides all the interpretation, sites may promote a single past or heritage of one group over another. Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy are two 20th century examples where heritage was badly misappropriated with devastating consequences. Throughout history, the past has been variously used to promote political agendas or national pride; the selection of sites and how they are interpreted is extremely important. As a non-political initiative, the inclusion of as many stakeholders as possible was important on Anguilla to help ensure a variety of perspectives were included.
Previous Heritage Trail Projects on Anguilla

Having studied terrestrial heritage trails on Nevis and maritime trails on the Cayman Islands, I was interested to learn how the idea of a trail would be perceived by the public in Anguilla and importantly whether it would be supported. If such a trail has been proposed in the past, I was interested to learn why it no longer existed and what the local reaction had been. I learned that in the 1990s, the AAHS had planned a heritage trail/tour of the Historic Lower Valley of Anguilla. Members of AAHS had offered guided walking tours and a large boulder was engraved to designate the area (Figure 7-1). Within a year however, fewer people participated and the initiative faltered. In 2009 the AAHS (Informant38) encouraged me to pursue a renewed heritage trail, despite at least one member being sceptical of its success.

Conscious that previous initiatives had failed from lack of public involvement, the Anguilla Heritage Trail was designed to encourage as many interested stakeholders as possible to participate from the earliest phase. Before taking the idea to the public it was important to understand other trails in the Caribbean and the type of trails which had been successful on other islands. These observations provided a background to the Anguilla trail. Successful trails were presented during a public meeting in winter 2009 that allowed the public to choose which aspects they would like to see incorporated into the Anguilla trail. Research into Caribbean heritage trails revealed some common traits. Regional heritage trails invariably included 1) a form of on-site interpretation, 2) road signage and 3) additional information (including a brochure, map or website). Strong storms, sunlight and heat are regional environmental factors to be considered when choosing materials for signage. These observations were presented together with the project’s rationale at an open meeting held in October 2009.

Rationale

*The Heritage Trail rewards both visitor and resident, enriching the St Croix experience (National Geographic Traveller Magazine 2001 quoted during 1st public presentation for a Heritage Trail on Anguilla).*

Heritage tourism has been successfully realized throughout the region as a growing niche market. Anguilla depends on tourism and related activities for over 80% of its GDP. In 2009, there was no interpretation at historic buildings or sites on Anguilla and no regularly scheduled heritage tours. Development of historic attractions has been hindered as many sites on the Island are physically unimpressive and do not justify an independent
tour (or large capital investments for restoration). Combining the sites into a single activity or trail enables less interesting sites to be packaged with more significant or visually attractive ones; this mix creates a richer experience while representing a wider variety of sites and local history. Heritage trails have the potential to add value to visitors’ experience, providing a cultural dimension to their vacation experience.

Designing a trail on land (as opposed to under water) made sense on Anguilla where there was little interpretation of heritage resources. Promoting visible heritage on land was felt to be more effective than designing an underwater trail as it would allow the greatest exposure of heritage resources to the widest audience. A land-based trail would also serve as a gauge for interest in heritage and be a marker for how future heritage initiatives might be perceived.

Figure 7-1 Historic Lower Valley Marker erected by AAHS
Institutional memory (Chapter 4 Challenge 6) offers a major challenge to heritage management. When experience and lessons learnt are not passed on new projects must continually reinvent the wheel. It is an exhausting process. The creation of permanent engraved stone markers ensures that the trail’s main features will survive even if less permanent elements (PVC signs and interpretive brochure) do not. In a worst case scenario, the markers will remain as monuments and may provide a future heritage manager with the foundation to design a new heritage initiative.

**Methodology**

*People are more unlikely to object to projects they have participated in planning. Therefore ignoring them in the early planning stage increases the risk of raising objections later (Sakellariadi 2010: 514).*

In addition to the keys to success identified by Leshikar-Denton and Scott-Ireton (Leshikar-Denton and Scott Ireton 2008:229; Jameson and Scott-Ireton 2007: 67), many of the components of community archaeology described by Moser (see Chapter 5) were used during the design and implementation of the Heritage Trail initiative. These components including training and the creation of a photographic archive were integrated into the design of the project. In developing a methodology for Anguilla’s Heritage Trail, this initiative used Moser’s developed methodology not as a recipe but for ‘some useful ideas for others seeking to undertake work of this nature’ (Moser et al 2002: 220-248). Components of Moser’s community archaeology methodology employed included an orientation of the sites’ history with guest speakers (training), the creation of a photographic archive of the building of the Heritage Trail, public presentations and school visits (during the planning phase and at the Trail’s opening). While no educational resources were created for the opening of the heritage trail, each of the primary schools were visited and children encouraged to participate in designing a logo that could be used for the Heritage Trail. The development of educational resources and community controlled merchandizing are two areas which could be further developed but which were not included in the initial project design. The most important aspect of Moser’s methodology which was deeply imbedded in the Anguilla initiative was the importance of communication and collaboration. Each major decision was made following a review which took place either during a meeting or through email correspondence.
Making the Heritage Trail

Community Involvement

Projects in Florida show that when the community is involved at the start of a project, they become stewards, helping protect the site's historical and physical integrity.

_By encouraging citizens to adopt their local shipwreck Preserve, learn its history, and care for the site, a sense of stewardship is developed that helps to protect these resources from damage and exploitation (Scott-Ireton 2003: 102)._ 

To encourage public participation during the initial planning phase, three public meetings were held. Recognizing first my role as an outsider and second my position as a facilitator, I presented models of heritage trails throughout the Caribbean and offered suggestions how they might be adapted to fit Anguilla. Following each presentation, the public was encouraged to make suggestions and recommendations.

Public Meetings

At the first meeting, a PowerPoint presentation not only described the nuts and bolts of the potential trail (signs, interpretation) but also its role in the community, including supporting local stewardship of heritage resources. Interpretation methods including possible brochures or information that could be made available online were presented. The St Kitts and Nevis’ Hotel and Tourism Association’s website was used as an example how the Heritage Trail could be used to augment the tourism product. Signs of various materials including wood, PVC, metal and stone were presented as possible options for Anguilla.

I explained that people become guardians of the past as they learn about sites and their importance for research and recreation and that interpreted cultural resources become heritage attractions for their communities, providing economic benefits through tourism and site visitation, concepts which had been described in detail by Drs Leshikar-Denton and Scott-Ireton (2008). During the initial meeting, I also warned against the inclusion of sites which were particularly vulnerable or unsuitable for public access at the time.
I argued that to be considered for inclusion, a site should fit the following minimum five (5) criteria (adapted from Jameson and Scott-Ireton 2007):

1. Have a reasonably verifiable identify and history
2. Have robust features
3. Be robust enough to withstand sustained visitation without compromising archaeological integrity
4. Be accessible to the public
5. Have safe visitation conditions

These five criteria assured that sites which were located on private land and which the landowners did not want to allow access to or which, like the Fountain Cavern were closed would be excluded from the initial Heritage Trail sites but could be included in the future if they met the criteria. Possible information that could be included on each sign based on other heritage trails included the site history, related figures, photographs and images, a small map of the heritage trail and/or the trail logo. These options were later winnowed. It was decided that less text and no pictures on the plaques would cut the cost and enable the site’s name and a brief history to be permanently engraved (see Trail Marker Sponsorship).

At the first meeting, a proposed budget and time frame was presented using a $3400 grant from the Governor’s office as a working budget. This budget was later revised as the project design shifted to accommodate new opportunities. The original time frame submitted in October 2009 called for the logo design, site selection, written interpretation, printing of signs and erection of markers to be completed by February 2010. This four month schedule was revised and the trail’s opening changed to be integrated with Anguilla Day, held on May 31, 2010 (Anguilla Day is a National Holiday celebrating the 1967 Revolution). Festivities include a boat race, parade and speeches).

Importantly, the PowerPoint presentation ended with a list of decisions and choices which needed to made. These included the type and material of the signs, what interpretation would be given, the sites which would be included on the trail (I suggested an initial 10-12 to ensure the project could be completed in a timely manner), whether the brochures would be sold or donated, and the content of the brochure. I ended the presentation asking for public assistance including any time or expertise that could be donated. By listing the decisions which needed to be made, the public was included in the major decision making choices and my role was reinforced as a facilitator with external expertise.
After the initial meeting, the project moved forward. While the first meeting had been announced on the radio, in the paper and through the ANT and AAHS, subsequent meetings were announced through email, every attendee having left their contact details at the previous meeting. Thus the Anguilla Heritage Trail mailing list grew over time and included an increasing number of interested persons or ‘Friends of the Heritage Trail’. Meeting minutes were sent out following the meeting to everyone including those who had not attended and comments or suggestions encouraged.

Before the second meeting, a list of known sites was compiled from data collected by the Anguilla National Trust and Anguilla Archaeological and Historical Society. At the following meeting this list was discussed and additional recommendations made. Other sites were recommended and a final list compiled of 36 potential heritage sites (Table 7-1 List of Sites Nominated for Anguilla Heritage Trail).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Sites Selected</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>c1760</td>
<td>Wallblake House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>20th C</td>
<td>The Wardens Place and Outlying Buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>c18th C</td>
<td>Courthouse Foundations/Ruins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>20th C</td>
<td>The Factory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>X/X</td>
<td>17th C</td>
<td>Sandy Ground Salt Ponds and Pump House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>18th C</td>
<td>Crocus Bay (w/ in-situ cannon)/defence point at Katouche Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Governor Richardson’s Grave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic Lower Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roadwell Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy Ground Cemetery of the Plantocracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>20th C</td>
<td>The Old Valley Well by the Agricultural Grounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Woodbine Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Forest Boat building Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>18th C</td>
<td>Rendezvous Bay (History of French Invasion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sugar Ruins near St Augustine’s Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Old East End School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Heritage Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Restored Lutheran Church (east end of Long Bay Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hughes Estate (Little Corito Dump Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valley Boy’s School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cottage Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Former Bank of America Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Slave Cemetery on the land of the late mother of ‘Richie’ Richardson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>First Guest House (Rendezvous or Lloyds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Trough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>West End Salt Pond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hughes’ Estate Smoke House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Benzies Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foundations of Dr. SB Jones’ quarantine station on Shannon Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shoal Bay Path (Amerindian track used to access inland cassava fields)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gavannah Cave Phosphate Mine (only with Rev. Gumb’s permission)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indian Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Old Customs House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coke’s Chapel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fort Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bethel Methodist Church</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After questions were asked about various sites, everyone was encouraged to vote for their top ten sites. The voting was advertised in the local paper and announced by the AAHS and ANT. Forms were available online and a week allowed for the public to submit their votes. Participation was unfortunately low, with less than a dozen votes received. While members of the public expressed their interest on an individual level and meetings were well attended, many people who had given their contact details and received a voting form by email did not respond. During the voting process and throughout the project many people were interested to follow the development of the trail from a distance. Despite the option, many chose not to become directly involved with the decision making process.

Student Involvement

After second and third meetings in October and November 2009, primary school students at five of the local elementary schools in grades 5 and 6 were introduced to the concept of a Heritage Trail and encouraged to submit their ideas for a logo. At each school, students brainstormed a list of heritage sites. While ‘Missing Knowledge of Resource’ had been identified as a challenge facing heritage management (Chapter 4, Challenge 7), this should not be generalized to include all the Island’s public school students. Students informally interviewed during these visits expressed a good background and general knowledge of
local heritage including the Revolution but also extending to Amerindians and Slavery. While local heritage is not formally included in the curriculum many local teachers have recognized the importance of including it wherever it may fit. This circumstance means that having heritage discussions in the classroom are left to the discretion, imagination and initiative of individual teachers. Student education in local history is dependent on individual teachers and there is consequently inconsistency.

Logo designs submitted by the students were reviewed in January 2011. While the Heritage Trail Committee decided that none of the drawings were suitable for a trademark, it was agreed that the students should be recognized. The AAHS agreed to give each of the finalists a one year subscription to the AAHS and a certificate of recognition that was awarded during the Opening Ceremony. AAHS Board Member Don Mitchell presented the awards (Figure 7-3 AAHS Member Don Mitchell awarding Tia Sepersaud recognition for designing a logo for the Anguilla Heritage Trail).
Figure 7-3 AAHS Member Don Mitchell awarding Tia Sepersaud recognition for designing a logo for the Anguilla Heritage Trail

Figure 7-4 Rayme Lake and Anguilla Masonry excavating the markers for the Anguilla Heritage Trail
Heritage Trail Brochure

An interview with Nigel Sadler, former director of the Turks and Caicos Maritime Museum in fall 2009 provided the inspiration and template for the Anguilla Heritage Trail brochure. During the first two meetings, the committee had discussed the possibility of a two or three fold brochure. At the third meeting, an 8-fold 16” X 22” brochure created by the Turks and Caicos National Museum was presented as a template which might be adapted for the Trail. The brochure had the potential to include not only a map of the heritage sites but also additional information about episodes of Island history which were not represented by the ten sites included. These topics included the 1967 Revolution, harvesting salt and boat building. Having richer text would also make it possible to request a donation for the brochure and hopefully raise funds to reprint the brochure in the future (giving the trail sustainability).

The governor’s wife, Mrs Sarah Harrison volunteered to write the text for the brochure. While some of the sites were reasonably well documented (Courthouse, Wallblake House), others were less well defined. Mrs Aileen Smith of the AAHS provided research which had been undertaken by the AAHS on several of the sites and local historian Colville Petty offered additional information. Mrs Aileen Smith contacted her daughter Adele Berolacci, a graphic designer living in the USA, and enlisted her support with the design and type-set of the brochure. An initial print run of 500 brochures was made for the Opening Ceremony and a second printing of 1500 followed shortly after.

Local Sponsors

During the second public meeting, people emphasized that the trail should reflect Anguilla as a high end tourism destination. A sign erected by the AAHS in the Historic Lower Valley in the early 2000s provided one example how a marker might be constructed out of local stone to designate an historic area. The concept of using local materials to create a permanent heritage monument resonated with the stakeholders. We approached Mr Rayme Lake, CEO of Anguilla Masonry Products with the idea for a trail and markers and asked whether he would sponsor the physical construction aspect of the project. He agreed and a large quarry with several limestone boulders was sourced and permission for excavating the stones granted. Using Mr Lake’s equipment, ten stones were chosen and excavated (Figure 7-4).

As soon as permission from the landowners was given, Mr Lake moved the boulders to the ten sites voted on by the public. In each case, the landowners were first asked whether they would grant permission for their land to be included on the Heritage Trail and the
potential benefits/impacts explained. These included additional visitor traffic by tourists visiting the site and possibly asking questions about local history. In each case, the landowner granted permission and recommended the place they would like to see the marker placed. At this time, the stones were dropped in their approximate locations. Several weeks later (after the Christmas holidays) the ground was excavated and the boulder ‘planted’ so that its flattest side faced outwards. This face was subsequently carved using a jackhammer and grinder and the tile plaque mounted.

Meanwhile, we commissioned a local engraver to engrave each stone tile with a brief history of the sites. The tiles were donated by a local developer, Shoal Bay Corp. The boulders were each measured and a tile cut to fit the available space on each stone. These tiles were engraved with both the logo of the Heritage Trail and a description of each site. The logo was designed by the committee and included three dolphins symbolizing the endurance, unity and strength of Anguilla’s people (and which is found on the Anguilla Flag) and an ‘H’ for Heritage. This logo also appeared on 33 small directional signs printed on PVC which were erected to guide people from one heritage site to another. The engraving was finished shortly before the scheduled opening; the plaque at the Opening venue was installed so that it might be unveiled during the opening ceremony while other tiles were displayed throughout the venue before their installation over the following weeks.

After the opening, a generator, grinder and jackhammer were used to cut the large boulders. Once the remaining nine stones were cut, tile cement was mixed and the plaques mounted on each marker.

*Creating the Anguilla Heritage Trail involved the excavation and moving of more than 20 tons of rock. Today the trail exists thanks to the dedication and generosity of Anguillians like Rayme Lake who have donated their personal time, money, and equipment to ensure the future of Anguilla’s past (Anguilla Heritage Trail Brochure).*

In all, Mr Lake donated more than 80 hours of manpower and equipment hours totalling $10,000 in labour and equipment.

**Publicity**

From the initial meeting, the Ministry of Tourism and Anguilla Tourism Board were actively interested in the project. Radio interviews and free exposure by the local press including TV coverage of the Opening were invaluable to spread the news. Mailing lists of
persons to be invited by the Opening were worked on in advance by committee members. Invitations were donated and delivered by the Governor’s office. Each step of the project was published in the Anguillian newspaper. Following the opening, the sites were included on the annual SKYVIEWS map, an official tourist publication and tourists’ main source of information about local restaurants and shops. Another publication, ‘What we do in Anguilla’ which is readily available at Anguilla’s entry port at Blowing Point has featured the trail since 2009 (to current time of printing). This information is supplemented by a small ‘Heritage Trail Centre’ at Wallblake House where additional information, brochures and tours are available. Publicity continued after the opening. A Press Release announcing the Trail’s opening was sent to overseas reps in Europe and America. An Italian tourism website www.cosasifa.it featured the Trail on its homepage in June 2010 and other reps sent back positive feedback that Anguilla was diversifying its tourism product beyond luxury accommodation, fine dining and white beaches.

Discussion: Reasons for Success

Several challenges encountered during the course of the project had been previously identified (see Chapter 4 Problems on the Ground and Challenges Related to Local Attitudes). An understanding of these affecting issues played a significant role in shaping the direction of the project. While knowledge of these issues was one contributing factor enabling the project to be completed as envisioned, an absent knowledge of these issues partially explains why previous initiatives were less successful. This is especially true of projects envisioned and spearheaded by non-Anguillians.

Challenges: Attitudes and Infrastructure

In addition to identified and therefore expected challenges, this project faced several unexpected obstacles. These localized challenges included land-issues, unrealized pledges, misinterpreted and destroyed signs, and discouraging personalities. Off-setting these setbacks, however has been public support and local stewardship. Not all 19 previously identified challenges affected the Heritage Trail project directly. Challenges which were apparent included:

1. The island’s small size and lack of wealth
2. Expatriate vs. Native Attitudes
3. Missing Knowledge of Resources
4. Lack of Institutional Memory
5. Few Local Professionals
6. Lack of Permanent Public Heritage Displays
7. Lack of Funding
Other challenges affect heritage management on Anguilla but did not directly affect the Heritage Trail initiative. The challenges above can be roughly divided into challenges related to local attitudes and challenges relating to infrastructure (logistics). Importantly, logistical issues are sometimes a product of local attitudes and vice versa. A discussion of how identified challenges were addressed is now presented to help understand the importance of understanding problems on the ground.

**Local Funding**

Following the first meeting where no mention of fundraising was made, an Anguillian approached me and explained that her family had been planning to erect a sign at the Old Court House in memory of their ancestor, John ‘Morsa’ Brooks (Informant39). She explained that the family would be happy to sponsor the site in his memory and would donate the money they would have spent on commissioning the sign to the Heritage Trail project. It proved the first of several generous gestures which demonstrated throughout the project, Anguillians readiness to recognize their past. This recognition negated one of the challenges previously identified: Challenge 8: Little Interest: Heritage as a Low Priority and Little Pride in Local Heritage. While it was often repeated during my research (mostly by non-Anguillians) to be a major reason for a lack of heritage management, I found many Anguillians eager to support an initiative which would recognize their past, I believe that Anguillians are proud of their past and if given the opportunity and tools, they will work to make heritage a higher priority.

**Over Budget**

The original budget did not include the labour or erection of permanent stone markers. While the labour and materials were donated by Anguilla Masonry, the engraving proved expensive and the project was left with a US$4000 shortfall. While it would have been possible to have the work done off-island for a fraction of the cost, as an outsider I felt it was important to have the work completed on Anguilla by an Anguillian. Part of this shortfall was met by the AAHS and ANT. At least one non-Anguillian resident warned that based on their experience trying to fundraise, it would be next to impossible to raise the remaining balance. Convincing locals to give money, he explained, would be very difficult (Informant41).

This was not the first time off-islanders underestimated Anguillians’ dedication to support an idea. In 1837 an inspector of schools from Britain came to Anguilla to examine the feasibility of building a school on the island. He reported that ‘such was the diminished and scattered state of the population it was difficult to say how and where to place a school
house’ (Petty 1993). As a result, earmarked government funds from Britain were dropped. The islanders, however, took up the idea and established their own school without outside assistance, finding the money to support a teacher despite acute poverty. This spirit of resilience and determination in times of hardship has not disappeared.

Despite suffering from the global economic downturn in 2008, each Anguillian business that was approached to support the heritage trail pledged their support. In less than three days, pledges to meet the shortfall were found and the Anguilla Heritage Trail moved forward. This aid, together with contributions from the ANT ($500) and AAHS ($1000) was crucial. Events including the Opening held at the Pumphouse in Sandy Ground and which was attended by more than 100 persons and a site orientation for tourism professionals in Shoal Bay were subsidized by local businesses. For example, at the Opening, the AAHS paid for the bar, the Pumphouse provided staff and a venue, and the Governor’s office provided canapés. At the Orientation, Shoal Bay provided both the venue and drinks. Without this overwhelming support, it would have been impossible to hold these events and it is unlikely that free publicity after the Opening would have been so forthcoming.

**Local Attitudes and Local Allies**

After the Heritage Trail opened, a long-term resident expatriate confessed that the Heritage Trail was the first project he had witnessed during 30 years on Anguilla which had been successfully initiated by an off-islander (Informant40). His opinion, while not completely accurate, demonstrates the difficulty many non-Anguillians who would be philanthropists encounter on Anguilla.

Before initiating the Heritage Trail meetings, I had been warned that previous efforts by well-intending foreigners to ‘help Anguilla’ met resistance and failure. Efforts to introduce wind farms or fund under-privileged children were openly resisted by the public despite obvious and tangible benefits. Past experience has made many locals suspicious of off-islanders who bring promises of money to ‘fix’ or ‘help’ the Island. In the past charitable donations have been offered in exchange for goods, services or status. This has led to a local scepticism that any good act by an off-islander is selfless or actually for the good of the community. Where expatriates have successfully been involved with projects, many are openly delighted with their part. Locals listening to the ‘look what I’ve done to help this poor little island’ speech are often put off from working with expatriates.

As a result, the Heritage Trail initiative recognized the need for locals to be actively involved with both the decision making process and implementation of ideas. The
Heritage Trail sought and found a local sponsor who could be recognized for his role and help. Mr Rayme Lake not only provided invaluable logistical support but acted as a rallying force, leading other Anguillians to understand that the Heritage Trail really was a project for Anguillians and was not the pet project of an off-islander seeking self-glorification. His enthusiasm was critical as he encouraged other Anguillians to get on board. Together we met with the local artist who would do the engraving and gave directions for the cutting and installation of the plaques.

**Unexpected Challenges**

Land-ownership issues: While each property owner was approached for permission prior to the placement of each boulder there was confusion over the placement of a marker at Katouche Bay. Land-issues and ownership are a sensitive issue on Anguilla. When the confusion arose I was off-island and learned from a solicitors’ email that the boulder had been dropped on private property without the owner’s permission. A flurry of emails worked to ascertain who owned the property and whether permission had been obtained from the correct landowner. Several days later the would-be claimant realized the stone was not in fact on his property and the complaint was dropped.

In the past, the Anguilla National Trust gained an unfortunate reputation as a group which sought to control people’s property. The incident with the heritage trail demonstrates that property continues to be a sensitive issue. The relationship between landowners with historic/archaeological sites on their property and groups with mandates for their preservation is delicate. Having the support and collaboration of local property owners is imperative, especially without protective legislation in place. By demonstrating that sites on private property can be an asset to landowners by attracting potential customers, the Heritage Trail worked to show a tangible benefit from heritage and hopefully prevent their needless demolition.

**‘Don’t Count Your Chickens until They’re Hatched’**

Support for the Heritage Trail was unexpectedly strong. Locals and non-Anguillians quickly grasped the potential significance to the Island and pledged their support. A minority of these promises (three out of a dozen) however, failed to materialize. Despite phone calls, reminder notes and ultimatums the promised sums were not forthcoming. Fundraising had stopped when the pledged support equalled the anticipated shortfall. This meant that the final bill for the engraving remained outstanding (a partial balance was paid). In hindsight, the committee ought to have anticipated this complication and doubled its efforts to raise more than the required funds. A direct consequence was that
the sponsored signs remained unfinished; small brass plaques to be mounted on the markers to honour each site’s sponsor were uncompleted by the engraver. It was impossible to press the issue until the balance was paid in full and as a result, these plaques were not mounted until the following year (2011). While the sponsors understood, it was an awkward situation that was only solved when additional funds were raised.

An additional consequence was that the routine erection of a sign to designate the Heritage Trail Centre became controversial. Money collected from brochure sales and tours at Wallblake House were collected and saved to print a sign which would mark the site and hopefully attract more visitors to the Centre (and thereby boost the sale of brochures). The committee was divided on whether these funds (US$200) should go towards reducing the debt owed or if they should be invested in a sign which would hopefully attract more visitors and donations. The latter finally won support and the sign printed.

**Destroyed/Vandalized signs**

The committee always recognized the potential for Heritage Trail signs to be vandalized by humans or destroyed by hurricanes. Initially a small sum recovered from the sale of brochures was earmarked for the repair of damaged signs on the Trail. In August 2009, Hurricane Earl (CAT2) tested the markers and directional signs with 90 mph winds. The Trail withstood the storm and after twelve months only one directional sign needed replacement. The damaged sign is near a roundabout and it is unclear whether it was damaged accidentally or on purpose. The damaged sign provided an opportunity to reflect on feedback received after the trail opened and reconsider the directional signs’ design. For example, several people misinterpreted the ‘H’ to stand for ‘hospital’ instead of ‘heritage’ and felt that the word ‘heritage’ or ‘heritage trail’ should be included on the sign. Others suggested that the distances should be given in miles and yards instead of metres. A meeting in July 2011 to discuss these concerns led to a small redesign of the signs which would be incorporated into future replacements (Figure 7-5).
Long-term Management: Finding a Home for the Trail

Once the trail was successfully initiated more groups chose to take a role in the decision making process. While relationships between the trail and collaborating organizations did not change from the trail’s conception to its completion, once the trail became a public asset at least one group attempted to exert approval/veto power over decisions made by the committee. When designing the trail, we had approached AAHS to be the endorsing organization. Funds raised from pledges were placed in the AAHS account and the Society accountant was also involved with the Trail. This was an ideal scenario in the short term as it provided Institutional memory and a working bank account. After the Trail opened, it was necessary to find the initiative a permanent home that would allow the trail to develop and function independently, insuring the project’s sustainability. I approached the Wallblake Trust about the possibility of utilizing Historic Wallblake House as an office for the Anguilla Heritage Trail. The former plantation Great House and three outbuildings were vacant. In exchange for office space, the Heritage Trail offered to provide information and tours of the building. This solution was well received as the building was currently tenantless.
Local Stewardship of Sites: The Good and the Bad

In early 2011, a visit to one of the Heritage Trail markers overlooking scenic Road Bay revealed three Ficus trees had been planted nearby and the surrounding area landscaped. The work was anonymously done by local residents. The spontaneous effort by Anguillians to beautify the site suggests that locals recognized the site as a local asset worthy of investing in time and money. Another site adopted by a non-Anguillian resident has been regularly maintained and kept litter-free while another (which had not been buried as it was situated on asphalt) was cemented in place. Each of these sites is located on private property; their maintenance and improvement by individual landowners demonstrates individual pride in local heritage (and approval of the markers). On the other hand sites located on government property have not fared so well. One of the Trail’s most prominent features, the ruined foundation of the original courthouse at Crocus Hill was adapted by an Anguillian in 2010/11 to serve as a holding pen for goats. Ground surrounding the foundations was used to pasture two donkeys and serve as a broken vehicle car park. This use and grazing detracted from the site’s visual attraction as a stop on the Heritage Trail. More importantly, grazing accelerates the deterioration of the foundation and quickens its final demise (Informe06).

Stewardship is ultimately dependent on the community. The Trail has shown that while it may be more difficult to include sites on private property initially, they are more likely to be adopted and maintained by individuals who take personal pride in their presentation.

The Beginning of Sustainable Tourism

The Heritage Trail was a self-contained initiative which following the erection of markers and the printing of brochures could be considered complete. Having an achievable objective (the erection of permanent markers, directional signs and a brochure) which was realized in a set time was important. Completing the project was a main objective as several previous initiatives including the creation of a National Museum and Heritage Village had been left incomplete. As a consequence, these projects did not create a foundation for other initiatives and may even have discouraged future efforts. In order to complete the Anguilla Heritage Trail and avoid repeating incompletion, there were compromises. For example, the decision to use ten sites (which was made for logistical and financial reasons) has led some visitors and members of the public to believe that the Heritage Trail represents the entire Island’s heritage. Importantly, the Heritage Trail was not designed to be a comprehensive tour of all Anguilla’s Heritage but rather to be a sample of sites which the public voted to represent their heritage.
Finally, the opening and completion of signs was not intended to mark the end of the project but rather the beginning of sustainable heritage tourism. As a project, the Trail has potential to be a cornerstone to be built on and be expanded over time. The committee has considered several options including fundraisers to add additional historic sites to the trail or diversify to include sites of natural heritage and public attractions.

As suggested in Chapter 5, the individual initiative is the key to building a heritage management infrastructure. Understanding its role allows future projects to be designed to address specific areas of need. This strengthens weaker areas of infrastructure and allows the heritage management system to be more effective, facilitating the implementation of mandates ‘on the ground’ and providing a bridge between policy and the current situation. The remaining chapters critically assess the work on Anguilla and what can be learned from the island to improve heritage management elsewhere.
Chapter 8: Assessing Impact and Future Directions for Maritime Archaeology and Heritage Management on Anguilla

This thesis set out to better inform the methods of maritime heritage management in the region. Methodologically, Anguilla was chosen as a laboratory to show how small islands, despite many persistent challenges, could develop and improve the protection of their maritime cultural heritage on land and underwater, namely by using maritime archaeology and heritage tourism.

**Accomplishments**

The body of this thesis described practical steps which had been taken ‘on the ground’ to address local challenges (see Chapter 4). This practical work to improve heritage management included:

1. For the first time, compiling data on underwater archaeological sites to create an HER
2. Encouraging the AAHS to endorse the UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage (2001)
3. Recommending heritage management steps to the Sustainable Tourism Master Plan consultants (2010). In 2011 these recommendations were included when the plan was accepted by the Government of Anguilla.
4. Designing and managing the creation of the Anguilla Heritage Trail (2010)
5. Writing a 55-page illustrated history book and providing a draft copy to the high school as a trial (2011).
6. Establishing a centre for the Anguilla Heritage Trail (2010). Between 2010-2012, more than 120 guided tours were given to visitors and residents
7. Engaging descendant communities and reaching out to neighbouring islands including St Kitts
8. Establishing a paradigm for other Islands

In addition, the author witnessed legislation and official policy passed by the Government of Anguilla including the Ministry of Education’s 5 year Education Development Plan (2010) and the Department of Environment’s Biodiversity and Heritage Act (2008).

Revisiting a list of questions posed at the beginning of this research (Aims and Objectives page 1), this chapter relates how well the achievements above have informed these
questions. Has this research made an impact locally and what is the future prediction for heritage management on Anguilla? Here some practical steps that were taken are used to suggest a clear way forward. More importantly, what does this work mean in terms of protecting maritime cultural heritage on Anguilla and in other similarly challenged places?

**Questions Answered**

**How to create an HER?**

One of the first questions raised on Anguilla in the absence of previous systematic surveys, was *how small islands could take the first steps to establishing a record of the type and extent of maritime heritage resources through the creation of an HER (historic environment record).*

The 2009 Anguilla Shipwreck Survey was used as the first step to establish a record. Before the survey began an assessment of the available written records revealed that written documents were scattered and incomplete. While the situation is marginally better for terrestrial sites, the general condition of archives on Anguilla was and remains poor. The absence of a detailed written record means that archaeology has a unique place to help build an understanding of the past.

To create an HER on Anguilla it was necessary to synthesize the available data. (Appendix B: HER Draft Summary of Historical Research used to brief divers for 2009 Shipwreck Survey). The survey contributed raw data on wreck locations, artefacts and features *in situ*. This data provided a foundation for an official list of historic sites and resources. Unpublished here, but made available on Anguilla, this data is important not only to inform government decisions to designate and/or protect resources, but also for non-governmental organizations (including the Anguilla National Trust, Anguilla Archaeological and Historical Society, Ministry of Tourism, etc), who are responsible for the practical side of heritage management and who make decisions how resources will be protected and/or developed.

On the Cayman Islands, INA’s initial survey in 1980 created such a foundation; the database currently holds details on more than 140 archaeological sites located under water (Leshikar-Denton 2002). This database is an invaluable tool for professional archaeologists and managers, on one hand to increase knowledge of the past and on the other to showcase the island’s heritage and knowledge of that past to the public. The creation of such an extensive resource takes time. In the meantime it is possible to create a wider understanding and appreciation of the past by sharing new discoveries with the
public. This may be in the form of a lecture, a popular publication in the local newspaper or with a comprehensive exhibit.

The importance of an HER is therefore not only to have the information officially to hand, but also in the process of building one, in outreach and being able to use new discoveries to inform the lives of ordinary people.

Before the 2009 Shipwreck Survey, anecdotal evidence and treasure hunters’ boasts offered tantalizing but unconfirmed evidence for underwater heritage around Anguilla. The survey in 2009 demonstrated without doubt that Anguilla had a unique and untapped resource. The survey revealed the presence of a resource worthy to be protected where none existed. Simply, it generated the data that is necessary to not only create an HER but also manage all heritage.

In the past, a lack of awareness at an official and policy level of heritage resources has meant these resources have been ignored. It is impossible to manage heritage without evidence it exists. As heritage is vulnerable to outside influences, this research sought to understand how unseen and intangible heritage could be recognized and protected from the globalizing forces of encroaching development.

**How to recognize and protect intangible heritage?**

There are two parts to answering this question. The first lies in how small islands can recognize their intangible heritage, and the second is how they can guard that heritage from homogenizing forces. Two ways of recognizing intangible heritage are 1) by building a record of resources (HER) and 2) by creating a visible monument from an intangible resource. For example, a memorial on Nevis dedicated to the victims of the Christina ferry disaster is an example how memory of an intangible event can be made tangible.

As early as 1990, Anguillians expressed disillusion that American culture was the solution to local challenges. A series of radio shows and oral history interviews by the Anguilla National Trust (preserved in cassette recordings in the National Trust) attempted to raise awareness and preserve Anguilla’s intangible heritage. Ironically, this movement slowed in the mid-90s, while the Island prospered and individual wealth increased. Recently, in the past five years concern over culture has reappeared, at a time when there is declining tourist growth and rising personal debt. In the context of surviving the global economic downturn, protecting its tourism-based economy and resisting homogenizing forces, the island has increasingly recognized its intangible heritage. Many local festivals have grown in popularity including village festivals celebrating local food and industries. Welch’s
Cultural Fest and Island Harbour’s Festival del Mar are two examples. Increased interest parallels international trends that recognize intangible heritage including the 2003 UNESCO Convention on the Protection of Intangible Heritage.

On a policy level growing concern for culture has been shown by numerous departments since 2009: 1) The Ministry of Education’s 5 year Education Development Plan (2010) makes “Institutionalizing culture, morals and valuation” its third of five objective; 2) the Department of Environment’s Biodiversity and Heritage Act (2008) aims to protect natural and cultural heritage; 3) the Ministry of Tourism’s Sustainable Tourism Master Plan seeks to integrate heritage and tourism sustainably and 4) the Ministry of Social Development and Youth and Culture intends to safeguard Anguilla’s intangible cultural heritage and by 2014, to produce a body of knowledge about Anguilla’s intangible cultural heritage that will be available and accessible to the public.

In this context, the Anguilla Heritage Trail was timely. As a project, it spoke to rising concerns over ‘culture’ and ‘forgetting the past’. It also showed how examples of intangible heritage including landscapes and places not very inspiring in their own respect could be combined and integrated to make an interesting whole. Its good reception demonstrates a recent shift in public attitude and a rising sympathy for preserving the past.

Why have societies, mostly Western societies, decided to safeguard elements of their past? Reasons have emerged in the literature, but those that have greater explanatory power include the desire to offset feeling engendered by change and modernism with its loss of connections to the past; nationalism and collective nostalgia where heritage becomes valued as a means of maintaining identity; scientific and educative importance because of what heritage resources can tell us about our past and what lessons we can learn; because they hold aesthetic value and represent such diversity that we cannot afford to lose them forever; and finally because heritage resources can be reused and it makes good economic sense to conserve heritage that can be marketed and sold to tourists (Timothy and Boyd 2003).

Or, as the historian David Lowenthal writes, ‘Dismay at massive change stokes demand for heritage...beleaguered by loss and change we keep our bearings by clinging on to remnants of stability’ (Lowenthal 1998). Just as modernization took time to come to Anguilla, so has recognition for the Island’s heritage resources.

Anguilla is at a turning point and this research is poised to assist. In 2011 the Heritage Trail Committee and I offered recommendations to the consultants researching the
Sustainable Tourism Master Plan. Based on research and our experience to date, we were able to recommend steps that would not only protect heritage resources but also foster a connection between the past and present and benefit people living today.

The dialogue between heritage professionals and the tourism industry has often been strained, especially as many professionals worry that heritage will be misappropriated, destroyed or disneyfied if it commoditised, packaged and sold to visitors. Anguilla presents a unique opportunity to disprove this opinion.

**How to use maritime heritage to promote tourism?**

When this research began, information on how small islands could sustainably apply maritime cultural heritage resources to promote heritage tourism and tourism in general was missing. In 2009 there was no inclusion of heritage resources (history, archaeology) in destination packaging material for overseas reps. This provides a striking contrast to many destinations including the Yucatan and Egypt which rely heavily on interpretations of their past to attract visitors.

Where history was featured in tourist literature on Anguilla, it was often out-of-date or incorrect. For example tours were advertised to visit the underwater site of the *Buen Consejo* (www.spanishgalleon.ai was such a website in 2009 but it was removed in 2010) or the Fountain Cavern, both of which are inaccessible to the public.

Again, the Heritage Trail offered a way forward, a means to bring attention to under-recognized heritage resources and enrich Anguilla’s tourism product. A comprehensive PR campaign by the Heritage Trail committee ensured that hotels and overseas reps were aware of the project up to and after its official opening. Material and brochures on the trail were made available to overseas reps and representatives from tourism bodies (AHTA, Ministry of Tourism, independent villa owners and managers, hotels) invited to become stakeholders.

The Heritage Trail was opened in May 2010 and headquarters set up at Wallblake House in August the same year. Accurate visitor numbers are difficult to reproduce as the Trail is self-guiding. However, approximately 1200 brochures have been distributed and more than 100 groups have visited the Heritage Trail Centre since it opened at Wallblake House.

In 2010, *Archaeology and History* were included for the first time on the annual Visitor Exit Poll. The survey reveals a market interest in archaeology and history. Although less than 5% of visitors surveyed partook in heritage activities in 2010, twice that number, or 10% expressed their interest in such activities. In comparison, large numbers of visitors
(up to 80%) enjoyed traditional sea, sun and sand activities. Those polled reported an interest in alternative activities and excursions. This parallels the growing demand for destinations to offer more adventure/cultural options and visitors’ expectations to learn about the history and ‘discover’ their destination. Similar participation vs interest ratio was true for scuba diving (5% vs 10%). High levels of interest suggest a niche market may exist for a product that combines visitor interests in scuba diving and heritage and which features maritime archaeology. Linking tourism and heritage is a win-win scenario, especially if preserving local heritage is linked to sustaining Anguilla’s reputation as a tourist destination. Again, the future of the past rests on its relevance in the present.

Linking knowledge of the past to national pride and stewardship?

If one output of this research is to showcase and market Anguilla internationally, another is to promote pride in Anguilla’s past locally. When this research began, I asked how maritime cultural heritage could be used in education to encourage national pride, stewardship and ultimately the protection of maritime cultural heritage for future generations.

Education was always considered a key component and this has been reinforced since 2007. It is impossible to have pride in the past, when that past is forgotten. The problem on Anguilla was the absence of tools to remember the past. When this research began, there was no local history curriculum at a school level. Teachers suffered from a lack of teaching material and, without teaching resources, primary and secondary school students learned about the past solely through informal classroom visits and irregular fieldtrips to heritage sites.

This research wanted to use maritime heritage to introduce young Anguillians to a fuller understanding of the past. Initially, a series of classroom visits and lectures was organized, focusing on topics including the wreck of the Buen Consejo and the creation of the Heritage Trail. These lectures provided an introduction to heritage and while children undoubtedly enjoyed the break from traditional topics, many did not retain details. Questioning the same students a year later when they visited the Wallblake House, they more often remembered my accent or the cannon ball than the topic of the lecture. Organized field trips off-campus to the shore adjacent to the Buen Consejo site (2009, 2011), and Wallblake House (2010-2012) created a more-lasting impression but few specific details were recalled.

What can this tell us? Both exercises are valuable but limited. If the goal is to generally excite children about the past, then the facts and details are secondary to the experience. If
on the other hand, the goal is to encourage national pride and foster an attitude that supports the protection of heritage, children must gain as much as possible from the experience. While a ‘cool old building’ may be enough to excite some children about history, it will not foster a preservationist attitude; a fun day out does not automatically lead to pride in local culture. Children would have gained more from the experience if they had been briefed before their visit, and the visit used to reinforce what they had already learned in class.

For this to happen, teachers need to have educational materials to hand. While several books have been published on specific topics (Berglund 1995; Carty 1997; Petty 2008; Westlake 1973), these are often age-inappropriate, having been written for an adult audience. In an effort to create more suitable material, the available sources including this research was synthesized to create an illustrated 55-page book which is currently available for download from scribd.com:

*Drawing from these experts’ work and my own research, the following book provides a jumping-off point, a text that can be adapted for use in the Island’s schools and an illustrated history for visitors and locals interested in Island history, a supplement to the nascent Heritage Trail (Draft Introduction of The One-Page History of Anguilla).*

In addition to the maritime heritage, the book is divided into sections, focusing on topics including plantations, local industries and natural history. In September 2011, a draft copy of this history book was presented to one of the high school teachers to assess in the classroom. The book is designed to provide an easily accessible and readable yet factual account of Anguilla’s history. It is not designed to be comprehensive but rather an introduction to local history. Its flexibility allows for easy reproduction as a school text or for interested visitors. If printed as a school text, critical thinking questions may be easily added.

It is important to encourage national pride in the past through involvement. Students may become involved out of interest or more likely, if a real benefit is promised. For example, in October 2010 six students agreed to participate in an after-school program organized by this researcher to learn about the local heritage and archaeology. Of those students, three attended for approximately 2 months, while one continued to study through March 2012 (when the researcher left Anguilla). The program was matched with an extra-curricular program through the high school. The student received a Duke of Edinburgh Bronze Achievement Award at an awards ceremony during the Royal family’s visit on March 3, 2012 for his efforts, a tangible reward for his efforts.
Finally, for the past to be used in the present to promote local pride, the public must have information and knowledge. Armed with knowledge, they must judge for themselves the work of their ancestors and choose those characteristics they will carry into the future.

When the *One-Page History of Anguilla* is published and made available to the public, it will outline the Island’s history for the first time in a digestible form. It will provide grist for dialogue on the past and what it means to be Anguillian. Its impact, however, and the role of the past in the formation of Anguillian consciousness depends heavily on having information to hand. In the future, this information may not be available if institutional memory is not improved.

**How to improve institutional memory?**

As stated at the beginning, this research explores how small islands can improve heritage management by creating a system that builds institutional memory of heritage resources. The creation of educational material will go a long way towards that goal but is still dependent on a system which will see the material updated, reprinted and generally made available.

Each project developed during this research was developed with an eye to overcome a lack of institutional memory. For example, the Shipwreck Survey provided data, the Heritage Trail made intangible heritage visible and permanent in the public domain and the *One-Page History* was designed to make local history accessible to more people. Each contributed in its way but is insufficient without a larger system. This is reinforced by local research into previous heritage projects.

**Stepping Stones**

In 2008 I found the history of previous archaeology and heritage initiatives confined to the shelves of box files and books in the library and National Trust. In this archive was evidence that active organizations had achieved impressive results in past decades: For example, the Wallblake Trust raised over $250,000 to restore Wallblake House in the 1990s, the Anguilla Archaeological and Historical Society obtained historic landmarks including the Old Court House Foundations, a building to create a museum and prevented a contract between treasure hunters and the government to sell artefacts excavated from the *Buen Consejo* site underwater. Despite their successes, these projects did not lead to long-term management due to a lack of institutional memory and infrastructure.

Mid-way through this research it was realized that institutional memory will continue to be a problem despite the ‘success’ of individual projects as long as there is not a
permanent mechanism to put heritage permanently in the public domain. In other words outreach lectures and events raise temporary awareness but are eventually forgotten; published materials are not reprinted and most significantly, the people behind the efforts become discouraged, lose interest or move away.

A permanent mechanism is needed which will last beyond this author’s time on Anguilla. Initially the Heritage Trail was considered a solution, a series of permanent markers and stone monuments describing episodes from the past. Yet if the directional signs are removed and the brochure never reprinted, these markers are nothing more than interesting rocks engraved with brief histories, monuments without context. In fact a pessimist might argue that all the projects that are part of this research, from the 2009 Shipwreck Survey, to the Heritage Trail and the *One-Page History of Anguilla* will disappear unless they are part of a larger *system* that builds institutional memory.

In large countries, bodies including English Heritage (UK) and the National Park Service (USA) are provided with a permanent staff and funding by the government to manage heritage. Permanent museums and professionals ensure that institutional memory will be present even if volunteers and temporary staff are not. Anguilla and other small islands have fewer resources and often lack government funding. Despite this, many Islands have been able to overcome this challenge.

The Bermuda Maritime Museum at the Docklands in Bermuda (which is now the National Museum) provides a useful example. In 1974, the abandoned dockyard and decaying buildings were derelict. That year a slow but relentless transformation began. Piece by piece, the derelict buildings were restored. Using volunteer labour and donations, the process could be compared to the restoration of Wallblake House. But where the project on Anguilla ended when the building work was finished, it was beginning in Bermuda. When the Commissioner’s House was restored, it was transformed into a venue for events and formal occasions. Other buildings and sites were slowly reclaimed, each successful project a piece in a larger system. For example the Keep Pond which was once used to transport ammunition from outside anchored ships to the fortress became home to *Dolphin Quest*, a place where visitors could interact with dolphins; the Barracks were converted to showcase exhibits from the Island’s history, and the outbuildings converted to apartments to house visiting scholars and volunteers. Other spaces became conservation labs and offices, together creating a vibrant yet practical centre for maritime heritage; in 2010, this centre became the National Museum of Bermuda. The mechanism and driving force behind this process ben been Bermudian archaeologist, Dr Edward Harris.
Looking at Bermuda’s achievement, it is clear that building institution memory requires a combination of individuals’ perseverance and government (i.e. institutional) support. The cycling of officials remains a problem on Anguilla. Some improvement can be made through the public (from the bottom up) by involving individual stakeholders. There comes a time, however, when public attitudes need to be adopted and supported by policy at the government level. Until this happens, there needs to be an on-going effort through research, education and outreach. Professionals and resources are needed together with an achievable business plan. If the majority of the population support the preservation of local heritage, but the institution of government refuses to acknowledge or support the public’s work, then efforts will not be successful. The 2009 Shipwreck Survey and Anguilla Heritage Trail owe their success to support by the Government and Governor’s Office. Heritage management must have the support of these institutions, even if it remains unstated.

**Imbedding Anguillians’ experience and memory in heritage management**

If the highest international standards are married with local expertise, the result will not only be a centre that residents are proud to claim as their own, but also be a paradigm for Islands around the globe. When this research began, I asked *how the experiences and views of people from small islands could be integral to the interpretation of heritage resources, and how could community archaeology be encouraged locally?*

The question was posed at the beginning of this thesis, as the researcher looked in on an island from the outside and wondered how to ‘get in’. The answer I’ve found here lies within, in involving and empowering the community. The success of the Heritage Trail depended on local support and input throughout its design and completion. Future heritage management including the development of a Heritage Centre must rely on similar input.

When people contribute, they share their ideas and experience. The Anguilla Heritage Trail relied on locals to share their knowledge and history of sites, to choose where the stones would be placed, the type of materials they were made from and even which sites were recognized. I believe this has encouraged more locals to become involved. The youth has also become a focus. The future of the past begins with the youngest generation. In addition to lectures and visits, part of this research included creating an after-school group of students from the High School. Interest shows that despite bad press on some youth activities, many students are interested and willing to become involved. When people are aware of an effort that interests them and believe their help will be appreciated and
recognized, they become stakeholders, a valuable constituency that can apply pressure for change.

When this research began, I was warned that locals had little interest in their history. It is a common argument encountered which has been proved wrong here and by others (Moser, Interview, 2011). Coming to Anguilla, it was apparent that few heritage resources were interpreted and although locals might be interested in exploring their heritage, they lacked the means to do so. Making heritage accessible became the first step to encourage more people to become involved.

It was also clear that some types of heritage were more celebrated than others. The Island’s pre-Revolutionary history was viewed primarily a reminder of poverty and inequality, starvation and poverty. History for many adults began with the Revolution in 1967 and the creation of a National identity. Yet the same slavery and inequality that left the Island a backwater following slavery’s abolition in 1834, defined the character and skills of a population that would survive and thrive despite huge odds; it would define their maritime prowess and skill as traders and smugglers and their independent spirit which would see their Revolution succeed.

On the Turks and Caicos Islands, controversial heritage has been used to give the past power and meaning. On Grand Turk Nigel Sadler used the wreck of a slave ship, the Trouvadore to link modern descendants of shipwrecked slaves to their ancestors. Genetic research has linked modern islanders with areas in Africa where their ancestors were enslaved (Sadler Interview 2009).

The other key is empowerment. My work, in the spirit of community archaeology advocated by the University of Southampton, was primarily that of a facilitator. Finding local patrons and people on-island with the interest and motivation to help was vital. Individuals and corporations were keen to get involved. Supporters included individuals and their corporations including Rayme Lake and Anguilla Masonry Products, Will Fleming and Anguilla Great House and residents Sarah Harrison, Steve Donahue, Gina Brooks and many others. From leading businessmen to the general public, success is realized when many individuals are invested.

Significantly, public support is never automatic; it depends on realistic, optimistic aims and professional leadership. When leadership is poor, goals poorly defined or progress looks improbable public support will disappear. Empowering others has benefits: throughout this research and at various public events, a list including contact details for all people who attended events or meetings has been compiled. The Friends of the Heritage
*Trail* is now an electronic mailing list of approximately 40 residents who volunteered to stay informed and involved with future developments. Approximately ½ of these are Anguillian. This body provides an interested forum and outlet to share ideas and receive feedback. Many of these individuals are interested in different aspects of heritage; they are generally interested in the past, from the creation of the heritage trail to archaeological survey and archival research.

**How to unify intangible, tangible, terrestrial and maritime heritages?**

A profound moment during this research happened when I realized that it is not only possible for small islands to unify different aspects of heritage including tangible and intangible forms of heritage located on land and under water, but also preferable. When I noticed that some people who attended a lecture on Anguilla’s maritime archaeology (July 2009) also supported the Anguilla Heritage Trail, I realized that some people who are interested in archaeology are willing to support other types of heritage activities. For example some people supported both terrestrial heritage (i.e. The Heritage Trail) and maritime heritage (2009 Shipwreck Survey). Anguilla’s management strategy should be equally flexible.

This is important on Anguilla where heritage resources and supporters are both limited. Compared to islands that were more densely populated historically, there are relatively few monumental sites on Anguilla. Individually, many are not significant to warrant individual attention. Even the Island’s surviving symbol of plantocracy (Wallblake House) has struggled to attract visitors.

On the other hand, Anguilla has a rich resource if you combine the Island’s monumental sites with non-monumental and intangible heritage resources. There are more than 4 dozen recorded archaeological sites. There are numerous historic landscapes and features on land and underwater. There are scattered archives and private collections of historical material. There are living traditions, foodways and oral histories. Altogether these make up a unique body of heritage resources. At the beginning I struggled to conceptualize how these disparate resources could be unified. In 2009 these resources were outside the public domain with little interpretation; variously owned by the government and individuals, with few on a large enough scale to justify independent interpretation or development.

This thesis recognized that the sum of these parts was greater than the parts themselves. Together sites and resources which are unimpressive on their own can be combined to create an interesting and compelling story. The Anguilla Heritage Trail illustrated that
individual sites could be successfully combined to create a single experience. It offers an example of how places with scattered heritage can recognize their past. Despite identifying many answers to these questions, this research was ultimately frustrated by the realization that all the research and outreach in the world will be insufficient until Anguillians choose to embrace heritage management. The challenges and proposed solutions have been outlined here; two successful projects and a written book demonstrate an unsuspected level of public interest.

The limits of this research and this researcher are to recommend a course which the evidence suggests, and accept that it is impossible (and morally questionable) for this researcher to try and impose a future program where it is unwanted. Help can come from outside but sustainability must come from within. Still the nature of this research has led to author to consider the next step, if help were wanted and there was support within the community and government to improve heritage management on Anguilla. The penultimate chapter in this thesis is therefore a guide to heritage management strategy (2013-2020) founded on this research and observations since 2005 on Anguilla.

Specifically, this chapter looks at ways to imbed individual projects (e.g. The Anguilla Heritage Trail) inside a management system. This chapter is not an exact recipe to be followed, but a list of ingredients, guidelines and ideas to inspire future discussion and work. While the recommendations are specific to Anguilla, they should be of interest to other managers working in places where the challenges articulated in this thesis are familiar.
Chapter 9 Heritage Management Strategy on Anguilla: 2012-2020

Strategy: Formulation and Implementation

Culture and tourism have a symbiotic relationship that has the potential to make places more attractive and competitive (Richards 2010: 1).

This strategy is not about how to manage heritage best, rather it is about what position heritage occupies within the process of producing a destination. It is about what position heritage has within the wider frame of regional or national development (Liwieratos 2009: 62).

The future of maritime archaeology and heritage management on Anguilla depends on a strategy. The strategy for heritage management proposed for Anguilla recognizes that heritage is part of a larger system, an input as opposed to a cost, a resource which if combined with other components can be turned into an output, a ‘special product’ for consumption (Liwieratos 2009: 43). This strategy is suited to Anguilla, as the Island has developed a tourism product but has not integrated heritage into that product.
If cultural resources are recognized as one of the most valuable assets a destination has to market itself, then the management and conservation of those resources is of primary concern to the future sustainability of tourism. The economic value of heritage sites can only be realized, however, through long-term, government sponsored management to ensure that sites are protected for future generations (Leshikar-Denton and Scott-Ireton 2012: 353).

**Preservation vs. Consumption Strategy**

Strategies that look at managing cultural resources for tourism typically focus on either the preservation of those resources (to ensure they are available of the next generation of visitors) or the consumption of those resources (to fund the current regime). The creation of museums is one example of the first approach while selling permits to treasure hunters is a blatant example of the second. A preservation strategy is argued here as the more sustainable option. Unfortunately the long-term profitability of preservation is often unrecognised in the short term. This may explain why many small islands have and continue to struggle with the decision whether to conserve or exploit their cultural resources. Most recently, in 2012, the Government of the Bahamas lifted a moratorium on treasure hunting (*Nassau Guardian* 2012), believing that the Island would benefit more from the commercial licensing and exploitation of wrecks, and accompanying media coverage, than from their *in-situ* preservation out of sight and mind.

In either a preservation or consumption strategy, heritage can be used to create a destination for visitors. In a competitive market, islands may use heritage as a way to emphasize exotic and unique characteristics of a place, to attract tourists. For example, world heritage sites on St Kitts and St Lucia by these small islands to attract more visitors and income from tourism.

**Foundations on Anguilla**

In 2010, Anguilla began the process of incorporating heritage into the island’s tourism master plan. That year, the author met with representatives from the Ministry of Tourism to suggest how heritage could be incorporated into future tourism policy on Anguilla. The Sustainable Tourism Master Plan was released in 2011 provides a clear vision for future tourism on Anguilla. Critics will point out that such visions are impractical and unsustainable. It is true that previous proposals to develop heritage resources including a National Museum have failed to materialize. However, given the progress made during this research and the success of the Anguilla Heritage Trail, it may be possible.
The Sustainable Tourism Master Plan released to the public on November 17, 2011 describes the vision and integration of heritage resources with tourism by 2020:

In The Valley, the major innovation has been the creation of a Heritage Centre at the Wallblake estate. With imaginative use of the historical estate buildings as art galleries, craft displays, the location of the national museum, with a genealogy centre, Wallblake has become a focal point to socialize for the tourist and local resident alike.

The product offer, while still based on the island’s world class beaches, excellent accommodation and fine dining experiences, is more developed and diverse with an increased range of attractions and activities. In this respect, a major focus has been on the promotion of historical and archaeological sites and attractions. The Fountain Cavern, for example, was given appropriate recognition in 2015 as one the most important Amerindian cultural sites in the north-eastern Caribbean and is now inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage list. An important element in the heritage programme has been the anchoring and linking of the sites by developing products that effectively integrate sites, attractions, events, activities and associated accommodation. The Nature and Heritage Trail launched in 2013 certainly was instrumental in the development and conservation of the island’s nature (both terrestrial and marine) and heritage sites through circuits and trails with appropriate signage and interpretative information and linkages.

Wallblake Heritage Centre as part of The Valley town ‘make over’ now provides the hub for the Nature and Heritage Trail and is also the place to be and be seen in during the day and evening, where it’s vibrant and lively with a café culture attracting both locals and visitors.

The Sustainable Tourism Master Plan recognized that heritage is an asset and argues for its preservation. Heritage is managed and preserved in a way that provides a regular income rather than a one-off sale. In this vision heritage is linked to the needs and concerns of the larger community, namely the creation of a centre that serves the needs of the community. The Plan also recognized that heritage may be insufficient by itself, and therefore links heritage with other activities for tourism, including nature and food. This ‘clustering’ of activities protects heritage and local culture becomes a vehicle for economic and community improvement (Richards 2010: 3).
Management Strategy: Getting from 2012 to 2020

In the Sustainable Tourism Master Plan, the Heritage Centre is established at Wallblake House (Figure 8-1), an 18th Century Great House restored by the Wallblake Trust and one of the 10 sites included on the Anguilla Heritage Trail in 2010. Wallblake House may be an ideal property for a heritage centre, but many challenges remain for it to be developed and fully utilized.

1. Identify Stakeholders

As a first step, stakeholders and current owners need to be openly approached with the idea. There is a tendency for exclusion and competition between organizations which needs to be overcome.

2. Research Design

Secondly, a clear research design needs to be presented and approved by major stakeholders. More research is needed to understand the site including its historical significance. The property’s construction, original owners and history are unknown. The site should be outlined within the current framework of relevant heritage legislation, both local and international, to ensure the site is protected against over-commodification and Disney-fication.

3. Physical Assessment

A physical condition assessment will identify areas in need of restoration and the site’s carrying capacity for tourists. Permissions, agreements and contracts between the site’s owner, manager, tenants and other involved parties (including the Anguilla National Trust and Anguilla Archaeological and Historical Society) should be made to everyone’s satisfaction.

4. Committee Established

This process should be overseen by a committee that will coordinate and assign responsibilities. The Anguilla Heritage Trail project demonstrated the need to make mandates and responsibilities clear during the early phases of project development. Responsibilities including the site’s physical upkeep, interpretation and budget should be assigned as soon as possible in the process.
5. Outside Aid

Where few historical records remain, a program of historical archaeology would be especially useful to understand the history of the site. Caribbean Volunteer Expeditions (CVE) is a volunteer work holiday group which helped with an assessment during the site’s restoration in the 1990s, and would be a good point of initial contact to solicit outside aid. Ideally this research should be led and co-ordinated by multiple stakeholders including local historians and individuals most familiar with the site.

Implementation: Projects

Projects have been used in this research to raise the profile of heritage resources with an aim to improve the protection of cultural heritage. The STMP discusses several heritage projects centred on Wallblake Hose which could continue this process. Two examples are the establishment of a Caribbean centre for genealogy research and an oral history project. Public consultation is a key element which was not explicit in the STMP which needs to be a priority. A program to construct heritage infrastructure builds momentum by first focusing on projects popular within the community. Without community support neither the Anguilla Shipwreck Survey nor the Anguilla Heritage Trail would have been realized. In addition, every project should be independently assessed for its ability to contribute unique data (as the Shipwreck Survey did), its likeliness for completion and its long-term sustainability.

To stress the importance in selecting projects, consider the following grant proposals written by the author for projects on Anguilla between 2009 and 2011.

These included:

- Underwater Survey and Training Program (Grant application submitted to Anguilla Community Development Board 2010)
- Extension of the Anguilla Heritage Trail and addition of new sites (Application submitted to American Institute of Archaeology 2011)
- Anguilla Heritage Centre (Application submitted to Windsong Trust 2011)
- Underwater Snorkel Park Small Grant Application (Application to Government of Anguilla 2011)
- Heritage Education Project to develop and print copies of One Page History (see Appendix F: ) Small Grant Application (2011)

Of these projects, none were successfully entertained. Funding has been difficult to locate and will continue to be a challenge under current global conditions. With little or no
outside funding, projects must find even greater support within the community. Failing the discovery of outside sources, projects proposed in the STMP (or by any group) must be supported by multiple stakeholders.

**Heritage Management Sustainability Plan Phase I: First Two Year:**
**Fundraising, Research and Product Development**

Focusing on funding, research and product development during the initial phase will help build a base for future projects. Raising funds must be an integral part of the research design. Failing the miraculous appearance of a millionaire patron, the infrastructure must be economically sustainable.

In the first two years, the existing Anguilla Heritage Trail could be a source of critical revenue. The trail could be commercialized by working directly with the major hotels; an official guided tour with licensed guides could be offered through Anguilla hotels and villas. Guided tours will be marketed as an alternative to the self-driving tours, and official guides could have the option of showing some ‘special’ sites not included in the official guidebook.

Admittedly, the commercialization of heritage can have disastrous consequences if done incorrectly. However, I believe that faced with an increasingly threatened future, it is best for this development to be proactive and guided by a group of stakeholders who believe that preservation is sustainable and desirable.

The annual Festival del Mar in Island Harbour is a recent example of a community utilizing its local culture and heritage to attract visitors and raise its profile. Other projects which could be considered include an audio tour of heritage sites and an underwater snorkel park. Options for projects centred on education include:

- Temporary Exhibits featured from the collections of the partner organizations (i.e. AAHS, ANT) and individual collections
- Establishment of an accredited course for tour guides in local history
- Further development of heritage focused curriculum
- Expansion of the Anguilla Heritage Trail
- Restoration/repair of building at Wallblake House
- Historical Archaeology at Wallblake House

The second phase implementing a heritage management system on Anguilla could focus on larger-scale objectives, namely the establishment of a National Museum, the refurbishment of Wallblake House as envisioned in the STMP. Basic infrastructure would be in place from Phase I, including necessary repairs to and the establishment of a community and public information centre at Wallblake House. Phase II would see this centre ‘fleshed out’. The support of stakeholders including the AAHS, Colville Petty, and ANT is crucial as these entities hold unique information and collections. The managing group would operate as a forum to bring these groups together.

Moderate commercial development including the expansion of heritage tours and activities could provide one source of revenue while government and non-governmental entities another.

Collaboration with groups could create support for existing initiatives including the Anguilla Garden Show and proposed projects by the AAHS including the Endangered Archive Project. Other sponsored projects may include:

- The refurbishment of rooms in Wallblake House to pre-1790 condition
- The planting of a Heritage Garden
- Creation of accessible genealogy materials, online or on-site
- Expansion of the Anguilla Heritage Trail to include other types of heritage including natural or maritime sites
- Summer Internships for students from overseas’ institutions

Heritage Management Sustainability Plan Phase III: 2018-2020: International and Regional Excellence

By 2018, a small staff (approximately 3) could co-ordinate and oversee fundraising locally abroad for a range of projects that will generate local data and international recognition. In addition to commercial projects including the Anguilla Heritage Trail, guided tours of Heritage Attractions and equipment rental, Anguilla will, as a regional heritage centre of excellence, be able to offer the following by 2020:

- An accredited course in Caribbean colonial history through partnerships with overseas institutions
- Small scholarships for Anguillian students to study local history or learn archaeology with partner organizations abroad
Training programs and short courses in maritime history, heritage gardening, sailing, genealogy and the like

Regular summer excavations sponsored by partner institution

Academic and popular articles in international journal showcasing heritage management on Anguilla

Themed heritage/working vacations in terrestrial and maritime archaeology

Publish new reports and reprint out-of-print sources

If these steps were followed, Anguilla would have an enviable program, an outstanding centre and a sustainable program managing its underwater and terrestrial heritages. The challenges identified in previous chapters are not prohibitive. On the contrary, Anguillians have over greater obstacles regularly throughout their history. The determining factor for this strategy to be effective is Anguillians, themselves.

I believe Anguillians will only take control of managing their heritage when they (and no one can tell them when) recognize that by remembering the past, they are able to represent themselves in the future. In other words, when they see that their past can be used to both enhance the island as a destination and their own lives. When they recognize that it is in their own interest to protect the past, the past will be protected.
Chapter 10 A Paradigm for Other Researchers

The maritime heritage of a single island appears at first inconsequential. Yet, studying heritage management on Anguilla reveals many of the dilemmas facing maritime archaeology globally.

2 ½ Years Study

Discovering the history and studying heritage management on Anguilla has involved not solely academic research, but also close coordination with local descendant communities. I chose to live on Anguilla for 2 ½ years during this research in order that I might:

- Build relationships within the community
- Assess heritage management within a larger framework of local communities and changing governments
- Actively implement research initiatives

This has enabled a more thorough understanding of the primary issues affecting heritage than could have been collected during a single field project of season. This has also enabled multiple projects to be planned, implemented and assessed.

Need for a Key Person

As a researcher I wondered how the UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage could be implemented on an island with little infrastructure and/or previous experience. It was the case on Anguilla (and other islands), that there needed to be an initial investment of time and energy, to determine the local level of awareness, potential archaeological resources, attitudes towards the past and towards outside interference, and to identify key stakeholders.

In the absence of institutional infrastructure on Anguilla, stakeholders in the community functioned to guide the management process. However, even when stakeholders are interested and present, as was the case on Anguilla, they need a facilitator, a key person who can provide guidance on working methods and best practice by leading:

- Stakeholder discussions
- Project designs
- Regular communication
As this person, I was able to use both the 2009 Shipwreck Survey and the Anguilla Heritage Trail to raise awareness. By using established methods of public archaeology, locals were directly engaged in developing the Heritage Trail and became vocally-supportive of the protection of their cultural heritage. This public archaeology project was realized through stakeholder discussions, community-led designs, regular communication, and open-ended interviews. These collaborations resulted in additional support for heritage resource management. In 2008, the AAHS endorsed the UNESCO Convention for the Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage and in 2010, the British Royal Navy assisted in an aerial survey for the wreck of the Meppel (see site A-09 MV Meppel pg117).

Data, Data, Data

The Anguilla Shipwreck Survey, a low-budget, research survey project, provided key data on the underwater historic environment which had not existed. Originally intended as the capstone for this research, the survey showed the impact a single individual might make in a small community or for that matter, country! There are many small countries similar to Anguilla with no HER, where independent researchers could make a valuable contribution to local knowledge.

Fieldwork

For an in-depth analysis, fieldwork purposely considered a single island, with comparative references to specific cases on other islands (i.e. a Heritage Trial on Nevis, a museum on Bermuda and legislation in the British Virgin Islands). While individually different, many islands nonetheless share similar challenges with Anguilla. While observations and insight for Anguilla cannot be universally applied, the Anguilla research is relevant throughout the region. In particular, insight into the challenges developing sustainable tourism, a lack of community involvement and the risks facing underwater cultural heritage are central to understanding heritage management challenges which are regional (Timothy and Nyaupane 2009: 3-19).

Public Support

I offer the public support behind the Anguilla Heritage trail project as an example of how this research has contributed understanding of how maritime heritage management can work in the developing world:

- Connect the past with current issues of importance
- Assume support rather than disinterest
- Find local champions for the cause
Guide process but surrender control

As the first community archaeology project of its kind on Anguilla, the good reception and completion of the project refuted common misconceptions that locals do not care about their heritage and would not financially back a project that recognizes their history.

The Larger Political and Economic Framework

We live in an increasingly complex world that is simultaneously becoming culturally more homogenous. As researchers and academics, our role in that world is debatable. As community archaeologists we engage the public because we recognize that the academic community is not the only beneficiaries of our work. The public benefits of archaeology may in fact be the most important part of our work (Sabloff 2008).

We cannot ignore that Anguilla and many other places’ needs revolve around a dependence on tourism. Heritage and archaeology, though non-renewable, are resources like any other. Small, cash-strapped governments are eager for any opportunity and archaeologists are uniquely qualified to facilitate the protection or destruction of this heritage.

This thesis is not a standard PhD in that it initiated efforts to improve that situation ‘on the ground.’ Maritime archaeology and heritage are part of the present. The meaning and importance of local history is determined by living people. Understanding this connection between the past and present has enabled this research to add a small but meaningful piece to a growing body of literature on heritage management in the region. It contributes data but more importantly provides a paradigm for other researchers in the region for engaging the community in active heritage management on a grass-roots level. Many of the Anguillians who supported this research believed that by understanding and remembering the past, they are better prepared to represent themselves in the future. This knowledge has enabled the Anguilla Heritage Trail and book, *Anguilla Beyond the Beach* to focus on what matters locally to Anguillians. Even if academics and descendant community sometimes disagree on why the past matters, we can agree that it is important and work together to protect it for the future.
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Appendix A: Chronological List of Outreach on Anguilla 2009

Summary

Throughout the islands people over 30 expressed their opinion that there is a general disinterest among the youth in things old. Importantly, at no point during any of the nine lectures in front of Anguilla’s school-age children did they express anything but interest in their island’s past. While this does not prove there are not disinterested children, it does suggest that future activities focused on the past would be well received by the majority of young children. For example, several days after one of my lectures at Alwyn Allison Primary School two young girls approached me on the dock as I was returning from diving. “I know you” one of them said, “You spoke at my school.” Another approached me in a restaurant with his dad, and excitedly introduced me (Informant19, Informant18).

Education is a key part of promoting heritage; over time it will change attitudes and demonstrate to people that the island’s submerged cultural resources are an interesting and valuable part of their heritage. While first steps may be relatively easy, it is important that a program is developed to continue to promote and advocate UCH in the long-term. Through education, a genuine change in attitude has been demonstrated to take decades or even a generation. Instilling children with an appreciation for their past is a vital step but one whose effectiveness may only be realized in the long term.

Rotary Club Meetings- Thursday July 2, 2009

The team’s first group outreach included the sharing of several images and underwater drawings which the team produced during the first two days of the project. The Rotary Club was very interested in the work and the team attended several subsequent sessions throughout and after the project’s completion.

The Buen Consejo Field Trip- July 25, 2009

Sponsored in part by the AAHS, a group of nine children (aged 9 to 14) and their parents visited the Buen Consejo site near Junk’s Hole. AAHS member Don Mitchell described the area’s geology and fauna on the way to the site. At the shore, the group was told more about the ship and its background, the number of passengers who came ashore, and the natural and human processes which have made the site appear like it does.

The children were introduced to the methods and technologies used in maritime archaeology and were encouraged to help survey the coast (Figure 27). The group worked together, one of the students used the handheld GPS and another recorded positions on a slate. The group learned why archaeologists leave artefacts where they are found and saw first hand what happens to iron after it is removed from the sea. After the survey, the group returned to Island Harbour where they were shown a number of images from the 2009 Shipwreck Survey, including the cannon and anchors next to the site just visited. To complete the tour, they were invited to fill out an archaeological record form to record their work.

As an activity, it successfully engaged a small number of people and introduced them to their heritage first hand. In terms of public archaeology, it was the first of a series of activities geared to educate and excite people about their heritage. The eldest child participant wrote of her experience, “We arrived at the Art Cafe at 7. We were then introduced to the site on paper and were shown various tools such as GPS and under water camera cases that can be used. The case allowed for about 100m (approximately 300 ft).
It was very exciting when we began identifying bolts, stakes, nails and even what we thought looked like a pair of scissors. As we progressed down the scraggly rocks the tide began to spray and we were encouraged not to go too close lest we get wet. I found it very interesting and would do it again in a heartbeat not to mention we had great company, Lily of course. Cheers from Anguilla AXA.” Her father, the manager of “Mangos”, one of the Island’s fine dining restaurants also commented, “I had an awesome time with my son and daughter and felt that it was a great learning experience. It opens your eyes to the little island of Anguilla.”

Radio Interview on Cool FM Monday July 26, 2009

The radio interview worked to disseminate the project’s findings to a larger audience and advertised upcoming events, namely the public presentation conducted two days later on July 28th. The time slot of the program is normally dedicated to the National TruSt Farah Mukhida, the National Trust’s director and “Brother Lee”, the radio host, took turns asking questions about the 2009 Shipwreck Survey and discoveries made to date. In addition to describing the survey, Brother Lee and Farah, discussed the public’s ongoing support and concern for other heritage sites on the Island. Of these, the most iconic is The Fountain, an Amerindian ceremonial site and an important source of fresh water to the island’s early settlers. Management and public access were not discussed but concern for preservation and sustainable development was apparent.

Public Presentation Wednesday July 28, 2009

A public presentation at the public library attracted over forty leading members of the public. Among those present were the current Chief Minister, Permanent Secretary, Speaker of the House, Governor, and former Chief Minister. A 40-minute talk disseminating research and the results of the three week survey were well received. Afterwards, the public asked questions ranging from site confidentiality to future outreach and projects. The possibility of prehistoric Amerindian sites, an oral history project, and local involvement in upcoming events were brought to the author’s attention. One member of the audience suggested everyone present offer future support including funding and in-kind support. The AAHS benefited from ten new annual memberships and the Governor of Anguilla presented the Society with a cheque to help cover some of the project’s expenses.

Presentation at Kids Connect! Summer Camp August 11, 2009

Kids Connect!-Summer Camp was founded by Latoya Scarbro, Twyla Richardson, Cherise Gumbs, and Charla Conner to “give back to the community through the development of our youth” (Scarbro 2009). During a 1-hour presentation the students learned about the island’s underwater heritage from images and artefacts (Figure 28). Of the 20 children, four had gone on the Buen Consejo field trip. They remembered many details from the trip and were happy to share what they had learned about the island’s cannon and anchors with their classmates. The kids were between the ages of 5 and 11, with the majority about 8 years old.

The Blowing Point Youth Development Centre was established following an outcry by Anguillians in Blowing Point that the village’s youth were in crisis. Each year the village has a summer camp that enrolls about 30 children to learn about the island’s local culture including foodways, heritage and music. A 30-minute lecture with Don Mitchell during the opening ceremony helped introduce them to Anguilla’s rich heritage. Again, emphasis was made on the importance of leaving marine artefacts in the sea and the students were encouraged to consider how this resource might benefit future generations of Anguillians. The children were told how important it is to record where artefacts came from and were shown how to record, photograph, and return artefacts to their natural environment. All
of the children raised their hands when asked them if they would like to see the shipwrecks found during the survey. Don explained some of the island’s history including the early governors, the working parts of a sugar plantation, and his pastimes as a child living in the Caribbean.

Involving Members of the AAHS- Sunday August 30, 2009

A trip to the shore site of the Buen Consejo with AAHS member Gordon Andrew helped relocate the permanent datum point established in 1996 by the underwater archaeological team from East Carolina University (Figure 29). The rebar piece driven into the shore has nearly disappeared from exposure to the elements but a 1-inch piece remains. The relocation of the datum point is excellent news at it further corroborates the relation of the known site of the Buen Consejo with the new area located during the 2009 Underwater Survey.

School Lecture September 3, 2009

Approximately 40 children in 4th, 5th, and 6th grade learned about maritime archaeology during a 45-minute about marine archaeology and the importance of preserving the island’s shipwrecks and other marine resources. Several artefacts including encrustations and a cannon ball from the site of the 1772 Spanish wreck off Scrub Island were used as educational aids. When asked how these sites might be developed to help the Island, one girl suggested that visitors could be taken on a tour of the site to see the archaeology. As a group, the large majority could swim, knew how to fish, and had someone in their family who owed a boat. They also unanimously thought all sharks were bad.

Meeting Between Stakeholders to Develop a Heritage Trail, October 22, 2009

An invitation was sent out through the Anguilla National Trust and AAHS to invite interested members of the public to attend a meeting designed to find stakeholders and assess the level of interest on the Island. A Power Point presentation introduced the 15 attendees to Heritage Trail initiatives throughout the Caribbean and a discussion how those ideas might be developed and adapted to fit Anguilla followed.

Valley Primary School Lecture, October 28 and 30, 2009

Approximately 40 students listened to a 50 minute talk on the importance of local heritage. The students brainstormed a list of potential heritage sites including Big Spring, Colville Petty’s Heritage Collection, caves at Katouche Bay and Wallblake House. The concept of a heritage trail was introduced and some of the shipwrecks found during the 2009 Shipwreck Survey were described in detail. The students asked many questions and one of the teachers expressed his own surprise to learn that artefacts are better preserved by leaving them where they are found. A cannonball was used to get the children thinking about heritage and they were invited to submit their ideas for a logo to be used on the trail which would represent all the types of heritage discussed.

Vivien Vanterpool School Lecture, Island Harbour, November 18, 2009

Approximately 40 5th and 6th graders were introduced to the island’s marine and terrestrial heritage. When asked whether any of the students have dove the wrecks around the island, one of the students replied that she had seen many wrecks with her father including one in Sandy Hill Bay which had not been surveyed during the project. Education works both ways. By teaching the island’s youth about some parts of their history they are less familiar with, there is always the possibility of learning something new.
Adrien Hazel Primary School Lecture, November 19, 2009

About 50 students in an outside assembly learned about the island’s heritage and were encouraged to submit ideas for a logo for the Heritage Trail. A cannonball was used again as an education tool and the students were told about the importance of leaving artefacts in-situ.

Morris Vanterpool Primary School Lecture, December 1, 2009

The entire school of approximately 60 students learned about the island’s heritage during an outside assembly. Following the talk a teacher described a site on Rendezvous Beach where he and his friends used to find many cannon balls. It is possible that the site is part of the French invasion in 1796, a wreck site, or the remnants of a battery.

Orelia Kelly Primary School Lecture, December 3, 2009

Approximately 40 5th grade students listened to a 20-minute talk and asked questions about Anguilla’s underwater and terrestrial heritage. Teacher Orelia Kelly was substituting the class (former head teacher and school namesake) and shared her own memories of the Old Courthouse as a child. She remembered the 15 steps to the offices, the green grass, and a special sense of community. She reminded the students that “Anguilla has a very rich history” and encouraged them to remember the lesson.
Appendix B: HER Draft Summary of Historical Research used to brief divers for 2009 Shipwreck Survey

Introduction

To date underwater archaeological explorations around the island have been negligible. As early as 1971, underwater archaeologists recognized that there was potential for research on Anguilla. That year underwater archaeologist Alan Albright from the college of the US Virgin Islands visited Anguilla to look for shipwrecks (Albright, 1971). Unfortunately, he left no record whether he found anything. His work was not built upon and the underwater cultural heritage of Anguilla continued to be ignored until sport divers began recovering artefacts from the Buen Consejo, a known 18th century Spanish Nau in 1994.

In 1996, in a response to concerns that sport divers were looting the shipwreck, East Carolina University and the Maritime Archaeological Historical Society (MAHS) were invited to Anguilla to survey the site (Rodgers, 2006). Shortly after, the site was declared an Underwater Archaeological Preserve. Poor diving conditions and a remote location have made developing the site for tourism difficult. Over a decade later it remains intact but difficult to access and monitor.

There are those in Anguilla who would like to address these issues but who have neither the expertise or resources to do so and it is these needs that are related to my own research. My PhD at the University of Southampton examines current underwater heritage management in the Caribbean region and how positive attitudes can be fostered so communities can assume a more active role in managing their local underwater cultural heritage. I believe the 2009 Anguilla shipwreck survey has the potential to do this; by promoting radical change both in the way all Anguillians think about their island’s past and the way that past is managed.

Importantly, before an effective management strategy can be developed, Anguilla needs more data on the extent and nature of their resource. The primary objective of this project is therefore to begin gathering this information thereby increasing awareness of its nature and importance. The project will bring together a team of archaeologists and divers to survey identified areas of potential significance and, through carrying out archaeological work in collaboration with the appropriate bodies, raise the profile of this important, non-renewable resource.

Previous and Related Work

To date, there has been no effort to systematically record the island’s underwater cultural resources. Underwater heritage and history in general has understandably been and remains a low priority for many Anguillians in the face of larger concerns including the economy and natural disasters including hurricanes. Public education includes little information on the island’s history before the island’s revolution in 1969. This lack of official interest extends into the island’s public schools and has left the island’s underwater cultural resources vulnerable and without effective protection.

Unfortunately trying to convince officials to protect things they don’t know exist is not possible. For this reason, the island’s submerged landscape must be surveyed and the resource identified. On the Cayman Islands a survey by the Institute of Nautical Archaeology (INA) at Texas A&M in 1979 and 1980 proved that scientific scrutiny, rather than the hunt for treasure, can bring aspects of national heritage to light. That survey also provided a baseline to which information could be added to over
time. Today, the Cayman Islands have over 140 recorded sites of historic and prehistoric significance. The Anguilla survey will serve a similar function.

Like INA’s 1979 survey, this survey will reveal a previously unknown resource. It will create a baseline of data that can be built upon over time. By involving the community from the start, Anguillians will learn first-hand how to record and manage the island’s underwater cultural resources. This will allow them to become more involved in actively managing their past.

**Objective**

With the support of the Anguilla Archaeological and Historical Society, this project will search for sites of historic wrecks, many of which date to the 17th and 18th centuries. We believe that it is highly likely that we can locate these and many other sites of major historical significance during this survey. By establishing a heritage database of these and known sites according to best practice, effective management and protection can come a step nearer on Anguilla. In addition, by involving the local community we aim to make the Island’s underwater cultural heritage a community concern and a focal point for local and national cultural identity.

**Methodology**

Using these documents along with information offered by local fishermen and divers, we have created a target area to survey (see coordinates given). Additional areas of interest identified by members of MAHS during their survey in 1996 will also be explored as secondary targets. The project is set to run from July 1-22nd. Local accommodation is being provided and donated to the project. Meals (except breakfast) will be provided to the participants out of the project’s budget during full-work days. Participant teams will take turns preparing the evening meal on a rotary basis.

The University of Southampton is providing equipment including an underwater video system, survey equipment and software, post-processing facilities and personnel. At least two members from the Maritime Archaeological and Historical Society in Maryland (MAHS) who worked with East Carolina University to survey the Buen Consejo in 1996 are providing their time, expertise, and additional survey equipment including a side-scan sonar unit to the project. The target area is divided into sections that will be ground-truthed by teams of divers. In areas less than 3 metres depth, teams of divers will use a combination of the Mark-1 eyeball technique and metal detectors to explore the area. In deeper water, the survey boat will tow divers to visually check for sites.

This is a non-invasive survey. Artefacts and features of interest will be surveyed and mapped in situ. Their locations will be plotted using handheld GPS units. On the survey’s completion, this information will be handed over to the Anguilla Archaeological and Historical Society for safekeeping. With their encouragement and the team’s expertise, the 2009 Anguilla Archaeological Survey can mark the beginning of an on-going series of exciting discoveries of Anguilla’s past. Long-term international collaboration and effective management of Anguilla’s underwater cultural heritage can become a reality.

**Shipwreck Data by Area with Historical Information**

**Prickly Pear (5)**

1628 Spanish Merchant Ship, Anguilla’s first recorded shipwreck and our primary objective. If anyone is good at reading 17th Century Spanish, please see Appendix 1 which contains several documents copied from the Archivo de Indias in Spain relating to the event and contemporary Caribbean life on St Kitts and St Maarten. Vince Hubbard on St Kitts is
helping with translations but I do not know how far he will get before the survey. Research at
the Archivo de Indies by myself (and John DeBry) have provided documents showing that
the ship left San Juan on December 12, 1628 carrying “frutas de terra” and was lost off the
north coast of Anguilla shortly after. Records at the Archive of the Indies also show that the
pilot was named Juan de Acosta and that he reached Spain three months later, in February,
1629.

1766 William and Mary- An English (possibly American) schooner which was lost on the Northern
Reef and which was en route (according to Berglund) to St Kitts from South Carolina. Other
unverifiable evidence in Berglund’s book supporting the presence of at least one late 17th–
early 18th century wreck near Prickly Pear states that a coin from the late 1600s was found on
a beach on Prickly Pear WeSt

1811 Several Unidentified American Merchant ships wrecked “on the North side of Anguilla.” It is
not known whether this was Anguilla itself or the reef at Prickly Pear and Scrub Island.

1870 The George William Morris, an English Brigantine carrying salt to New York was lost on
Prickly Pear.

1900s An American (Canadian?) ship is lost on a reef East of Prickly Pear

**Scrub Island (3)**

1771 The Antelope was an English slaver registered in Lancaster, England. She was jointly owned
by at least six men: W. Watson, J. Watson, Rob Dodson, Thos Hinde, Richard Millerson and
Henry Lawrence. The Antelope was a small Brig of 40 tons, had a crew of 20, and 2 guns of
unknown size. On May 8, 1770 she departed Lancaster for the Windward CoaSt There a
number of slaves were purchased and taken on board. An unknown number of slaves were
disembarked in Grenada (perhaps all). She was lost on the reef off Scrub Island shortly after.

1772 The “Jesus Maria Y Jose” (673 tons) (also commonly referred to as “El Prusiano” or “La
Concordia”) 30 guns, Captain Juan Ignacio Iturralde. Outbound cargo listed as tin plate,
iron bars, wire thread, textiles, wax, wine, books, clothing, a number of unspecified crates, an
unusual amount of cinnamon and so on. Fifty two Franciscan missionaries and their
religious articles were aboard. St Eustatius appears to have provided the most assistance to
the victims in the way of ships, food, and water. The Lieutenant Governor of Anguilla, Mr.
Benjamin Roberts, “did not give any help” and even claimed 1/3 of the salvage, which was
being carried out, almost unassisted by the Spaniards. A frigate, sent from Antigua, helped
calm this “confrontation.” The Commander of the Flota was Don Luis de Cordoba. There
was no loss of life.

1800s An unknown ship which was documented by MAHS and ECU at the same site as the “Jesus
Maria Y Jose.” Both sites are badly eroded and constantly being moved by the surf. The ship
had brass fastenings, two 6-foot sliding stock anchors, cross linked anchor chain, portholes,
and a sophisticated mechanical pump. There are a small number of timbers wedged between rocks at the site. The anchors’ size suggests that this was not a large vessel.

**Junks Hole**

1772 “Buen Consejo” (990 tons), Captain Julian de Urculla sinks. Most of the cargo was not salvaged as the ship capsized. In 1994 “Bull” Bryan and sport divers began recovering artefacts from the wreck. In February 1995, Anguilla Maritime Research Ltd, reported that Bryan had dove the site to see if anything was missing and that a 2’ x 1’ cluster of artefacts containing brass medallions had been taken. Moreover, they urged that if action was not immediately taken, “there will certainly be nothing left but a hole in the ocean floor where the artefacts had been.” The area was made a Marine Park and the Wrecks Committee continued to meet to advise the government what action should be taken. In 1996, ECU and MAHS surveyed the site (see Appendix III, 1996 Anguilla Shipwreck Survey) and a 20-year lease was granted to AMR.

Since 1996, very little has been done to the site. On June several medallions recovered by the FBI were returned to Anguilla. AMR has abandoned this project and its other operations in Anguilla. They have been struck off the Anguilla Registry of Companies. Goals for 2009 include determining whether the site has significantly deteriorated since 1996 and whether mitigation is necessary in the near future. In addition, we would like to locate the ships’ ballast. This information will better inform us of the ship’s final path and the site formation process.

**Sites with Shore Access**

**Corito**

There are plans for a commercial harbour facility at Corito which may include building a breakwater. A survey of the area to be disturbed would determine whether this planned activity would affect any cultural resources.

1800s The “Governor Light” was wrecked on the reef south of Corito. An iron ladder and lead ballast may remain. Located on the outside of the reef about due south of the cistern hole dug by Charlie Gumbs (and never built upon) on his land in Corito².

**Blowing Point - Lockrum**

1833 May 20- The French Brigantine, “The Centro American” is lost. The ship “was stranded on the south east part of this island which if trending from the north east to the south west is directly to [Prickle-] and entirely exposed. That for the first several days after the shipwreck the weather was uncommonly boisterous or arisingo. That the said place of shipwreck is remote from any habitation, difficult of access both by sea and land, that there is no possibility of a cart approaching near enough to convey the goods therefrom, and it is only practicable by water in light weather” (Copy of letter in PRO, Kew, London. CO.239/34 page 18 copied by Don Mitchell) See Appendix II for more information.

---

² Taken from Berglund’s Shipwrecks of Anguilla
1833 May The “Desiada” is lost. “That some time past a vessel from Guadeloupe laden with fine Brandy and Wine bound to Saint Bartholomew having touched at Marigot to land a passenger was stranded on a reef near Blowing Point on the south side of this island. That the captain at Feraud received every possible assistance from the neighbouring inhabitants made his own bargain with the salvors without the interventions of the Magistrates and shipped his part of the cargo to Marigot, some in a vessel belonging to this island, the residue in one belonging to Saint Bartholomew employed by the owner of the vessel wrecked. That Mr Assistant Justice Lake, a gentleman residing in the neighbourhood, immediately afforded personal assistance and is in possession of a certificate signed by the captain, and written and witnessed by the owner, acknowledging to have received such assistance both in his private and public capacities” Copy of letter in PRO, Kew, London. CO.239/34 page 19 copied by Don Mitchell

Road Harbour

1672- 10th May. An English vessel, the “William and Nicholas” sank in Road Harbour after seeking shelter from a storm which damaged her severely. The vessel “Swan” was dispatched by the owner, from Barbados, to remove the cargo and continue the voyage. In the meantime, the ship and cargo were seized by the then Lieutenant Governor, Sir Charles Wheeler, on a misinterpreted point of law. Sir Charles was recalled and the King ordered Lieutenant Colonel Stapelton, Governor in Chief of the Leeward Islands, on July 13th, to return the logwood cargo and the ship. The ship had sunk in the meantime but the logwood was successfully reflated.³

Other Shipwrecks

The above represents a sample of shipwrecks known to have been lost. There are many others and hopefully this survey will reveal their location.

³ Taken from Berglund’s Shipwrecks of Anguilla
Appendix C: Shipwreck Database

Anguilla Shipwreck 1628

Information on Anguilla’s first shipwreck initially proved illusive. The treasure hunter, Robert Marx writes, “Anguilla: Year 1628. Two unidentified Spanish merchant naos sailed from Puerto Rico for Spain but one of them was wrecked on December 12 on the north side of this island and Frenchmen from St Kitts salvaged some of its cargo” (Marx 1971). This popular account is readily available but is unverifiable as Marx does not reference the information. Another published account written in French states, “L’autre deposition emane du pilote portugais, Manuel Franco Camerino. Celui-ci s’est perdu avec son batiment a Anguilla, d’ou il a gagne Saint-Christophe a ou il est utilise par les Francais comme pilote” (Moreau 1992). Moreau references this account to the Archivo General de Indias, Indifferente General, legajo 1153. After two unsuccessful trips to Seville in November 2007 and February 2008 to locate information on the ship finally, in November 2008 two testimonies by the ship’s pilot were located which provided a rare account, guiding the search area for the Anguilla 2009 Shipwreck Survey.

Moreau, Jean-Pierre. Guide des trésors archéologiques sous-marins des Petites-Antilles: Daprès les archives anglaises, espagnoles et francaises des XVIe, XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles
Indifférente 1153: Testimony of Balthasar de Blancas, Master of the ship Nuestra Senora del Buen Viaje

Angelique

Captain Brunel du Havre, left Martinique on May 6, 1755 wrecked on the coast of “Petite-Anguille” at 12AM-3AM. The ship’s equipment was saved but the cargo and ship were both lost


Antelope

David Berglund’s published book of Anguilla’s shipwrecks states that the Antelope was an English Brig which wrecked on a reef off Scrub Island while travelling from Grenada to England. The Antelope was, in fact a slave ship registered in Lancaster involved in the notorious triangle trade between the England, Africa, and the New World. The ship was first registered in Lancaster on October 28, 1763 and was probably purpose-built for the slave trade. Lancaster vessels were typical Brigs or Snows between 20 and 100 tons and 40 to 50 ft in length, smaller than contemporary slavers operating from Liverpool or London (Schofield notes Liverpool University Archives). Their smaller size enabled them to navigate the Windward Coast, the River Gambia and African estuaries. It also allowed them to spend less time along the African coast, reducing the risk of contracting tropical diseases and allowing less time for potential slave revolts. The Antelope was an average Lancaster Brig, being 40 tons, carrying two guns and a crew of 20. She was owned by a group of Lancaster merchantmen including Thomas Hinde (Figure 7), John Watson, William Watson, Robert Dodson, Richard Millerson, Thomas Millerson, and Henry Lawrence. Multiple
owners were not uncommon in Lancaster and many of the partners had been involved with the trade for some time. Thomas Hinde financed numerous trips before the Antelope in the 1750s (Duke of Cumberland), 1758 (Cato) 1759 (Juba), 1760 (Rainbow), 1761 (Thesis II and Lion), and 1765 (Antelope).

The Antelope successfully completed four previous trips. The first (Captain Thomas Paley) in 1764 carried 250 slaves from Africa to Charleston, South Carolina and returned to Lancaster in 1764. The second (Captain Paley) purchased 169 slaves from Senegambia and the Offshore Atlantic and sold 150 in Charleston before returning to Lancaster on July 29, 1765. The Antelope's third trip (Captain Paley) collected 109 slaves from Africa and sold 97 in Savannah, Georgia. The Brig's fourth trip (Captain John Read) left Lancaster on July 12, 1768, purchased an unknown number of slaves in Africa and sold them in St Kitts, returning to Lancaster in September 1769. On August 5, 1770 the Antelope left Lancaster for the Windward Coast for the final time. The ship and Captain (John Read) were spotted in February 1771 “with a cargo of 100 slaves well betwixt the Capes” (Lloyd's List). The Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade Database reports the vessel's subsequent fate as “unknown” (Trans-Atlantic Slave Database 2009).

Documents from Anguilla’s Court of King’s Bench pick up the trail and reveal that the vessel left Grenada July 9, 1771 and that “On Monday night the 15th instant about eight o’clock runs on the reef of Anguilla adjoining a key called Scrub Island and on the 16th instant early in the morning several boats with people [from] Anguilla came to our assistance but no possibility of [ ] saw Brigantine off as she was then bilg’d but saved [ ] cases of the goods tackle apparel and furniture etc [ ] said Brigantine Antelope” (Anguilla Treasury Records Court of Kings Bench 1771).

**Bell**

Brigantine wrecked in 1760 on “uninhabited island” near Anguilla. Information found in Mitchell’s research on Anguilla’s shipwrecks.

Anguilla in the Admiralty
By Benjamin Roberts, Esquire, Judge of the Court of Vice Admiralty for said island.

Whereas complaint hath been made unto me by the inhabitants of the said island being salvers of the tackle, apparel and furniture as also the lading on board and belonging to the Brigantine “Bell” of Liverpool, Nathaniel Sayers master, that Thomas Preston, agent or factor for the owners of the said Brigantine and her lading, that the said Thomas Preston refuses to allow the said inhabitants [-] salvage of all such goods they saved according to custom being a one third part demanded. These are therefore in His Majesty’s name to require you, Peter Harragin, Deputy Provost Marshall, to summons the said Thomas Preston to be and appear before me at [-] Court of Admiralty held in said island at my house on Monday the first day of December between the hours of eight and nine o’clock in the forenoon of the same day to show cause for such refusal and for your so doing this shall be your sufficient writ. Given under my hand and seal this 27th day November 1760, Benjamin Roberts. Passed the office, Joseph Burnett, Deputy Secretary. At a Court of Vice Admiralty held for said island of Anguilla at the house of The Honourable Benjamin Roberts, Esquire, on the first day of December in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and sixty. Present: Benjamin Roberts, Esquire, Judge of said Court for said island.

The inhabitants being salvers of the tackle and furniture and lading of the Brigantine “Bell”, Nathaniel Sayers, master, Against Thomas Preston, agent or factor for the owners of the said Brigantine “Bell” and her lading. After hearing what could be said
and alleged as well on behalf of Thomas Preston as on the behalf of the salvers who make appear in this Court that with great difficulty trouble and expense of the hire of two Sloops, three trips, also eight boats, four days and four [-] upon rent for thirteen days with sundry other charges attending which they the said salvers paid the said Brigantine “Bell” being wrecked upon the uninhabited [-] island it is ordered decreed that the one fourth part of the said Brigantine [Bell] her touchable apparel and furniture and her lading on board be delivered to the salvers as a salvage for saving the same said salvers to pay the cost of this Court.

Signed; Benjamin Roberts.

**Betsy**

A local sloop from St Croix wrecked in 1763 “near this island.” The sole reference is Berglund’s Shipwrecks of Anguilla, which was probably taken from the Court of Kings Bench Records CKB (693).

**Brown Galley (Gully, Gally)**

A merchantman lost in 1755 north of Anguilla. The vessel was either American (Berglund) or English (Marx).

**Buen Consejo**

18th Century Spanish nau. See Archaeological sites for more information.

Loyld’s list, nº 3805, 4 September 1772
Baquero, Garcia. 1976. *Cadiz y el Atlantico, 1717-1778* p.392
Moreau, Jean-Pierre. *Guide des trésors archéologiques sous-marins des Petites-Antilles: Daprès les archives anglaises, espagnoles et françaises des XVIe, XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles*

**Carolina**

An American schooner lost in 1830. (Council Minutes Anguilla 1819-1841)

**Castle Shallop**

An English ship sailing from St Kitts to England with a cargo of sugar was lost in 1733 on the south coast of Anguilla.

Berglund
Marx, 260
Millás, José Carlos. *Hurricanes of the Caribbean and Adjacent Regions 1492-1800.*
Moreau, Jean-Pierre. *Guide des trésors archéologiques sous-marins des Petites-Antilles: Daprès les archives anglaises, espagnoles et françaises des XVIe, XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles*

**The Castle-Shallop**

belonging to the Estate of Sir William Stapleton, had been with a Load of Sugar at Basterre, from whence the three Negroes, that sailed her, ventur’d out in the Storm, and to the wonder of many, kept the Sea, till they reach’d Anguilla, where they were glad to run her ashore to save themselves, and are now return’d safe in another Vessel with the Riggin, etc. Of the Shallop. But a White Man, with two choice Negroes in Mr. Pemberton’s Castle-Shallop, quitting her, got on board Captain Payne after he had put to Sea, and with him the two Negroes perished, the white Man sav’d himself on the Bottom of the Bermudas Sloop. (Letter to a Gentleman in London 1733 in Millás: 188)
Centro Americain

A French Brig lost on the SE part of Anguilla in 1833 which was stranded near Rendezvous Bay (Berglund, Anguilla Council Minutes 1819-1841)

Desiada

A French Sloop carrying wine and brandy which struck a reef and sunk in 1833 (Mitchell).

Double Cross

A yacht which wrecked in 1972 on Anguilla (Berglund).

Elizabeth

A Canadian? Brig which wrecked on Sandy Island in 1769 carrying coffee, rum, cotton, and salt (Berglund, CKB 405)

George William

An English Brig which wrecked on Prickly Pear Cays in 1870 (Berglund).

Governor Light.

Late 19th Century wreck near Corito which has been salvaged for lead locally.

Greyhound

English sloop lost in 1761 south of St Maarten (Berglund, CKB 611).

Jesus Maria, y Jose

18th Century Spanish merchant ship wrecked off Scrub Island.

Lepricon

An early 19th, possibly 18th century Irish vessel reported to have been responsible for a number of Irish immigrants (online Ancestry website). No physical remains or documentary evidence has been found.

Several unidentified ships

Several American ships were lost in 1811 on Anguilla (Berglund)

Temple

Information on the Temple can be found in Lloyds List, the Liverpool Registers held at the Merseyside Maritime Museum in Liverpool, and the Anguilla Treasury Records (Court of Kings Bench) of which a transcribed copy exists in the Heritage Room in Anguilla's Public Library. The Temple was a 90 ton Brigantine captured from France in 1762 and legally condemned by the courts in Liverpool. The Liverpool Register records that, “the Brigantine Temple of Liverpool whereof Charles Campbell is at present Master being a square Sterned vessel. Burthen about 90 Tons was a prize taken this present War from the Subjects of the French King and legally condemned” (Merseyside Maritime Museum). The vessel, under new ownership sailed for Jamaica on November 21, 1762. The vessel “fell in with Dog Island near the aforesaid Island of Anguilla” on the 22nd day of January. “She struck upon a rock and bilged and filled full of water.” On April 26, 1763, an entry in
Lloyds List stated that "The Temple, Campbell, from Leverpool for Jamaica, struck on some sunk Rocks off Anguilla, and was immediately stove to pieces, but most of the crew are saved."

Anguilla Treasury Records Court of Kings Bench
Lloyd’s List nº 2847, 26 April 1763
Moreau, Jean-Pierre. Guide des trésors archéologiques sous-marins des Petites-Antilles: Daprès les archives anglaises, espagnoles et françaises des XVIe, XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles

Sarah
Lost in 1779 under Captain Hooting?

Moreau, Jean-Pierre. Guide des trésors archéologiques sous-marins des Petites-Antilles: Daprès les archives anglaises, espagnoles et françaises des XVIe, XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles

Trader
A sloop lost in 1955 or 1960 on Anguilla (Berglund)

United Courage
A schooner lost around 1935 in Mead’s Bay (Sir Emile Gumbs interview June 17, 2009).

William
An English ship lost in 1773.
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William and Mary
A schooner, probably English, lost in 1766 on the Northern Reef.

Unnamed Vessels
1755 French merchantman lost North of Anguilla travelling with English ship, Brown Gally (Berglund)
1863 Spanish Brigantine carrying 2000 bags of flour (Berglund)
1866 Antiguan ship carrying salt (Berglund)
1900s early Canadian or American ship (Berglund)
1942 Schooner carrying tinned food (Berglund)
## Appendix D: 2012-2020 Anguilla Heritage Foundation Budget (Draft)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lease</strong></td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Insurance</strong></td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Renovations/Maintenance</strong></td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Director/Curator</strong></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>26,250</td>
<td>27,563</td>
<td>28,941</td>
<td>30,388</td>
<td>31,907</td>
<td>33,502</td>
<td>35,178</td>
<td>36,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asst Curator</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consumables and General Office</strong></td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Materials and Signage</strong></td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>6,655</td>
<td>7,321</td>
<td>8,053</td>
<td>8,858</td>
<td>9,744</td>
<td>10,718</td>
<td>11,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heritage Garden</strong></td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heritage Trail Tours for Schoolchildren</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marketing</strong></td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purchase of Minibus</strong></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Running Costs and Gas</strong></td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,150</td>
<td>3,308</td>
<td>3,473</td>
<td>3,647</td>
<td>3,829</td>
<td>4,020</td>
<td>4,221</td>
<td>4,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost of Merchandise</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audio Tour Costs</strong></td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>1,005</td>
<td>1,055</td>
<td>1,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projects, Surveys and Excavations</strong></td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,060</td>
<td>2,122</td>
<td>2,185</td>
<td>2,251</td>
<td>2,319</td>
<td>2,388</td>
<td>2,460</td>
<td>2,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grant or Major Fundraising</strong></td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>2026</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>2029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from Booklet Sales</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>12,100</td>
<td>13,310</td>
<td>14,641</td>
<td>16,105</td>
<td>17,716</td>
<td>19,487</td>
<td>21,436</td>
<td>23,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from Wallblake Tours for Tourists</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Donations from Fundraising Events</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from Government (Education)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from Government (Tourism)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach Costs Rebilled to Schools</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packaged Heritage Holidays</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guided Tours of Heritage Trail Sites</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>9,520</td>
<td>10,662</td>
<td>13,942</td>
<td>17,615</td>
<td>19,729</td>
<td>22,096</td>
<td>24,748</td>
<td>27,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales (Audio Tours)</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,150</td>
<td>3,308</td>
<td>3,473</td>
<td>3,647</td>
<td>3,829</td>
<td>4,020</td>
<td>4,221</td>
<td>4,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales (Merchandise)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rentals (UW mp3 players and cameras, GPS)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Rental for Events</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>-88</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,440</strong></td>
<td><strong>-9,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,853</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,398</strong></td>
<td><strong>-5,647</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,703</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,387</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Balance Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
<th>2028</th>
<th>2029</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance Sheet</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,453</strong></td>
<td><strong>-1,847</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,006</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,404</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,757</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,459</strong></td>
<td><strong>27,846</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E: Proposal Submitted to Community Development Board

Preliminary Draft Proposal for

2011 Underwater Heritage Management Survey and Archaeological Tourism Pilot

Prepared by: Lillian Azevedo, MA

PhD Candidate, University of Southampton
Introduction- History of Underwater Cultural Heritage and Archaeological Tourism on Anguilla

In light of the recent drafting of Anguilla’s Tourism Master Plan and the global popularity of heritage tourism and marine leisure activities including snorkelling and scuba diving, I have been asked, as the sole maritime archaeologist living on Anguilla (and responsible for the 2009 Survey and the creation of the Anguilla Heritage Trail), to suggest how Anguilla might incorporate UCH in their tourism product.

In 1971, the potential for discovering underwater cultural heritage (UCH) around Anguilla was recognized by archaeologists from the College of the Virgin Islands. Nothing, however, was done and in the mid-1990s treasure hunters came to the Anguilla asking for the right to salvage and sell Anguilla’s cultural heritage. In the absence of effective legislation\(^4\), artefacts from at least one ship were raised and illegally taken from the island\(^5\). In 2009, I and a team of maritime archaeologists from the Centre for Maritime Archaeology at the University of Southampton came to Anguilla to start an inventory of the Island’s UCH. The three-week survey “discovered” seven historic shipwrecks and a number of independent cannon and anchors never before recorded. A 70-page preliminary draft of the survey team’s work is available (yet to be proof-read).

The potential for UCH to augment Anguilla’s tourism product was recognized by a few in the early 1990s. In 1996, Anguilla Maritime Research (AMR) was given a mandate to develop the Buen Consejo Underwater Archaeological Preserve as an underwater dive park as part of their lease of the site (without success\(^6\)). As an anthropologist currently

\(^4\) The author is currently working with the Government of Anguilla to write and implement effective legislation.

\(^5\) One such collection was returned to the Government of Anguilla in 2009 by the FBI.

\(^6\) The area near Junk’s Hole is difficult to access, subject to heavy surf, and not accessible during most of the year. In addition areas of the site are unmapped and there is little information published or available online. The company's website, www.spanishgalleon.ai has been down since 2008. Additional research and a new management plan are needed if visitation to the site is to be considered.
finishing a PhD in heritage management I am concerned and interested in the role of archaeology and heritage in modern communities. From my experience, projects which are not based in the community will struggle. Therefore, while the initiatives here are geared towards tourism, each project is at heart a community project. This is critical to not only prevent the destruction of non-renewable resources and ensure the growth and sustainability of initiatives through time but also to developing a product which Anguillians can stand behind and support with pride.
INITIATIVE 1- SUMMER PROJECT

Aims and Objectives

The investigation of underwater cultural heritage will be organized in conjunction with a training and education program for a group of Anguilla high school students. A pilot program for Archaeological Heritage Tourism be developed and trialled during the project:

1. To teach and certify a small group of Anguillians in local history, underwater archaeology and SCUBA (if not certified) to act as stewards for local UCH

2. In the process, to identify potential UCH sites for Heritage Tourism development

3. In the process, to develop an inventory of the Island’s known underwater archaeological sites (shipwrecks, spot finds, and others)

4. To pilot UCH tourism

Project Description

There are 32 recorded shipwrecks for Anguilla whose accounts have survived; statistically this means that as many as 120 vessels were lost around the island. Sites which have yet to be found include a 1628 Spanish vessel, an 18th-century Lancaster Slave Ship (whose descendants now live on Grenada and St Kitts), and several American merchantmen. A survey to discover and record these and other sites (with the use of a magnetometer) will provide additional data on sites which may be utilised for future research and/or heritage tourism.

This project is divided into phases including training/education, archaeological survey, and UCH Tourism development. Together, the aims of this project are to empower a group of students, preserve and document the island’s UCH and promote an exclusive form of heritage tourism.
Logistics

THE TEAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Role/Responsibility</th>
<th>Minimum Requirements</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Participating Dates 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Head Maritime Archaeologist</td>
<td>Responsible for overseeing all aspects of the project, from design and funding to completion (including record keeping and post-project analysis)</td>
<td>Post graduate degree in Maritime Archaeology with field experience</td>
<td>Off-Island</td>
<td>January-December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Maritime Archaeologists</td>
<td>Archaeologists and mentors to interns.</td>
<td>Post grad degree in maritime archaeology or 2 years field experience</td>
<td>Off-Island</td>
<td>June (7-10 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PADI Scuba Instructor</td>
<td>Responsible for training and certifying all interns up to PADI Advanced Diver (in advance of any work)</td>
<td>In Active Teaching Status with PADI</td>
<td>Anguilla</td>
<td>May (21-28 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 4</td>
<td>Interns</td>
<td>Anguillians to be trained in SCUBA and UCH management, to act as docents for underwater sites and stewards for UCH management</td>
<td>Competent swimmer, no criminal record, minimum 16 years old, with dive insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January-April</td>
<td>Course in Local History and Archaeology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1-16</td>
<td>Open Water SCUBA course as required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 16-22</td>
<td>Advanced Open Water Scuba Course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 20</td>
<td>Deadline June 20th - All Intern Training Done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PHASE 2- ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY

**June 21-Aug 31 (carnival off)**  
Archaeological Survey (locations dependent on conditions)

### PHASE 3- UNDERWATER ARCHAEOLOGY TOURISM PILOT PROJECT

**From July 1 as required to run concurrently, minimum 7 days notice given**  
Nowhere in the world can visitors actively participate and assist in doing underwater archaeology. The pilot program will explore the feasibility of one and three day excursions. Running concurrently with the project, the program would introduce a limited number of paying visitors (max 4 per day) to underwater archaeology on Anguilla under the supervision of the Maritime Archaeologist.

### PHASE 4- POST SURVEY

**August 31- December 31**  
Report on archaeological investigations including site plans, drawings, and description of any artefact recovered. For each recovered artefact, images, pictures, current conservation status, and future conservation plans will be provided together with a list of any artefacts to be removed off-island for conservation including the location they will be conserved, a budget for the conservation, and a timetable for their return to Anguilla.

Report analyzing the pilot program for Underwater Archaeology Tourism, recommendations for future heritage management, and economic evaluation of sustainability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deadline: September 31</th>
<th>list of artefacts including conservation status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deadline: December 31, 2011</td>
<td>Final Reports Due</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OPTION II- UNDERWATER HUNT FOR 1628 SHIPWRECK (ANGULLA’S EARLIEST KNOWN SITE)

OPTION III- CENTRE OF EXCELLENCE FOR UNDERWATER ARCHAEOLOGY AND CONSERVATION IN THE EASTERN CARIBBEAN
APPENDIX A

LIST OF EXPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost TBD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 1- May 1- June 20</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PADI Open Water Course Materials and Instruction for 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PADI Advanced Open Water Course Materials and Instruction for 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAS Course Materials and Tuition for 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAS Course Instructor- Transportation R/T Flights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAS Course Instructor - Room and Board- 7 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAS Course Instructor Fees (£150/day)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinks and Lunch ($12 per person per day)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Rental (1 month)</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 2 and Phase 3- June 20-Aug 31 (carnival off)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat Rental ($300/day for 8 weeks)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat Fuel ($500/week for 8 weeks)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} Boat ($400/day for 2 weeks)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} Boat Fuel ($500/week for 2 weeks)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Rental (2 months)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Fuel ($60/week for 8 weeks)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment rental for excavation- Pump, Compressor, Dredges, Hose, PVC Pipe, Fittings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment rental for diving- Tanks, SCUBA gear for interns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment rental for detection- Magnetometer (1 week)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies for site recording- Mylar, Tape, Pencils, Scales, Tapes, Batteries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservator- R/T Flights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservator- Food</td>
<td>Rent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set-up of Basic Conservation Lab on Anguilla- Rent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set-up of Basic Conservation Lab on Anguilla- Equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set-up of Basic Conservation Lab on Anguilla- Utilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation of diagnostic artefacts sent off-Island</td>
<td>including insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dive Safety Officer- Fee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dive Safety Officer- Food</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation (2 bedroom apartment for off-island participants)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinks and Lunch ($12 per person per day)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase 4 (Jan 2011- December 2011)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maritime Archaeologist- Room and Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and Stationary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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On behalf of the Anguilla Archaeological and Historical Society, it is with great pleasure that I write the foreword to this book, The One-Page History of Anguilla. I must begin by complimenting Lillian Azevedo on this great publication.

This book is a valuable addition to the growing compendium of books on Anguilla's history. From her background in cultural anthropology and archaeology and as a diligent researcher, Lilli has compiled a text that touches on all the significant periods of Anguilla’s cultural and natural history.

The book will be a valuable resource for those involved in promoting heritage tourism. While it came out of Lilli’s involvement with the Anguilla Heritage Trail Project this book will have a much broader appeal.

It is an interesting and uncomplicated book, giving a well researched and factual account of Anguilla’s history. As such it will be a useful teaching resource for lower secondary students. While the important historical events are documented, the book also expounds on the social, economic and cultural environment in which these events took place, and as such is an ideal social studies text. It is also an easy read for those who simply need a quick overview of Anguilla’s cultural and natural history.

The liberal use of pictures and drawings means it can grab the imagination and hold the attention of children of all ages. It is a must have for all Anguillian homes and all those visitors interested in taking back a meaningful souvenir of their visit.

Kenn Banks, OBE,
President
Anguilla Archaeological and Historical Society

Above: Anguilla is a 34km² island located in the Lesser Antilles
Frontispiece: Historic Wallblake House photo c/o Steve Garlick
Timeline of Anguilla

2000BC Amerindians settle Anguilla. At one time there were more than 19 Amerindian villages on Anguilla.

1493 Columbus discovers the Leeward Islands. Early observers write of Anguilla, “It was filled with alligators and other noxious animals.”

1650 The English land and begin family farming without a Royal Charter.

1656 The ‘Caribs’ attack the new settlers, killing most of the menfolk and making off with the women and children.

1687 Governor William Willoughby arrives from Barbados with new settlers; Anguilla’s only crops are salt and tobacco.

1698 Spanish and French pirates attack.

1699 Captain Kidd visits Anguilla.

1744 Deputy Governor Arthur Hodge invades St Martin.

1745 The French in reprisal come with 700 men in various small craft. At Crocus Bay Captain Hodge defeats the French.

1796 On the 26th November, two French war ships, La Valliande and Decias land their troops at Rendezvous Bay, on November 27th. In a final stand at Sandy Hill, the Anguillans attack and pursue the French, who retreat and attempt to embark their troops and wounded.

1807 Prohibition of slave trade.

1824/5 Great Britain annexes Anguilla to St Kitts and Nevis. Anguillans continuously protest the decision which made Anguilla administratively dependent on St Kitts. Petitions are sent to Great Britain in 1825, 1837, 1935, 1958 and 1966 but are ignored, eventually leading to the Anguilla Revolution in 1967.

1834 Slavery is abolished.

1850 Anguilla labourers dig and dive for phosphate on Sumbbrero Island, leading to a higher standard of living.

1860 Many free slaves return and settle the abandoned estates. Anguillan schooners become famous throughout the Caribbean for their craftsmanship.

1880 Famine. There is prolonged drought, repeated crop failure and a lack of seeds. Livestock perish.

1967 Revolution.

January 26th Colonel Bradshaw, St Kitts’ Chief Minister threatens that Anguillians will have to eat another’s bones and that he will turn Anguilla into a desert.

July 11th Referendum in favour of secession.

December 4th British delegation consisting of 2 MPs comes to Anguilla, set up interim administration for 1 year.

1969 March 11th FCO minister arrives in Anguilla. After confrontation, R. Webster demands that Mr Whitlock leave the Island immediately.

March 19th 2 British Frigates land 250 paratroopers accompanied by 50 London metropolitan police officers without incident.

September Paratroopers are replaced by the Field Squadron and Royal Engineers.

1976 12th February Constitution of Anguilla signed in London.

1980 December 19th Anguilla formally becomes a British dependency. Today the Island remains a UK Overseas Territory.
History
Around 400 years ago, Anguilla was discovered by humans travelling by dugout canoes and rafts from South America's mainland. These earliest settlers were pre-ceramic, meaning they did not make or use pottery but utilised stone-age technology. Raw materials including volcanic stones and finished artefacts were imported complete and/or crafted locally.

Around 200AD a new culture emerged on Anguilla together with pottery forms and the development of chiefdoms. Known variously as Taino or Arawak, these people named the Island Malliouhana (as in the Hotel).

**Trade**

They imported raw materials including volcanic stones from which they fashioned spirit stones known as zemis, which they exported throughout the Lesser Antilles.

**Spirituality**

Believing that humans originated from caves and the world was divided into three spheres, (caves where humans came from, subterranean waters where the ancestors dwelled and the sky where gods lived) they carved and painted images of their deities including Jocaba and Jalaclca (The god of the sea and cassava, and the rain god [as in Cay Jalaclca]). Today, preserved examples can be found in the Fountain Cavern (Scal Bay) and at Big Spring (Island Harbour).

**What they ate**

The Amerindians were a fisher-planter people. In addition to bringing cotton and tobacco from South America, Amerindians also introduced cassava and manioc (used as flour) which they cultivated on small plots of land cleared from what was then forest. Today the iguana is the largest indigenous land animal. The absence of large land animals when the Amerindians lived on Anguilla made the Indians rely on the sea for over 90% of their animal protein. They fished both fish and pelagic species including tuna.

**Where did they go?**

The latest carbon dates recovered on Anguilla date from the 1500s. By the time the English created a settlement in 1650, the Indians had either been removed by the Spaniards to slavery in Puerto Rico and Hispaniola, or more likely, they had died in their villages at Sandy Ground and Rendezvous Bay. Amerindians lacked natural defences to common European ailments. Diseases including influenza, measles and typhoid devastated populations and there is no evidence that anyone was living on Anguilla when it was discovered by Europeans.
**Fountain Cavern**

**What is the Fountain?**

The Fountain is a limestone cavern containing two freshwater pools and is a natural habitat for bats and other species. Carved and painted onto the cavern’s stalactites are Amerindian glyphs and carvings.

**Location**

While Amerindians did not live in the Fountain and archaeologists believe it was purely a ceremonial centre, there were several nearby villages, including a large settlement on Shoal Bay East.

**Amerindian Beliefs**

Caves were ideologically important to the Taino who believed that all humankind originated from a cave and that the spirits of their ancestors slept inside during the day and came out as bats during the night. Inside the Fountain Cavern on Anguilla, archaeologists in 1979 discovered more than a dozen petroglyphs.

The largest and most impressive by far was a larger than life stalactite carved in the likeness of the Taino supreme deity Yocahu Bagua Maorocoti. Translated from the Arawak language, the name roughly means ‘the spirit of the cassava and the sea which has no masculine forebear’. According to legend, Yocahu had a mother (who was the goddess of fresh water) but no father. The golden years of Amerindian Anguilla lasted until the 15th Century. According to the traditional view, two forces contributed to the decline and depopulation of Anguilla and the region in general. From the south, a Carib-speaking group of Amerindians expanded into the region from about AD1200 and at the end of the 15th century diseases were introduced into the region by European explorers. By 1518 a smallpox epidemic which spread from Santo Domingo to Puerto Rico decimated the few remaining Amerindians in the region.

*Yocahu, Amerindian deity. Painting by Penny Slinger*
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End Notes

i *Intangible Heritage* as defined in this work includes oral traditions, memories, traditional arts and rituals, languages, values, spiritual beliefs and knowledge systems.

ii Selecting an area for in-depth study during the first two years of this research involved a process of elimination. After a cursory examination, larger islands, defined as those with more than 80,000 people, were excluded. As a single English-speaking researcher the larger islands presented too much ground to cover in-depth. For the same reason, islands where English was not the spoken language were excluded. After six months’ preliminary research into the region, the benefits of focusing on a single island were realized. From a focused perspective I have been able to gain a deeper understanding and appreciation of the situation on the ground. Also, I have been able to practically test a hypothesis developed during the course of this research.

iii As reported in June 2013 to the author, the three guns were not in-fact stolen but removed to deeper water by a local diver who did not want them taken and removed off-island.

iv The term *leeward islands* describes the sailing course taken by most sailing vessels when the islands were sighted. Impelled by the trade winds, ships from Europe encountered Barbados and the windward islands on their way west and rounded off their voyage home with the Leeward Islands including Anguilla, Montserrat, Antigua, Barbuda, St. Christopher (hereafter, St. Kitts), Nevis, and the Virgin Islands (Meditz and Hanratty 1987).

v Archaic-period sites are found on the interior of the Island (including the Valley) while later settlements were clustered around the coastline.

vi The presumed ceremonial vessel was less than 2 metres long and found alongside human remains in 1997 by cave diver Rob Palmer.

vii The primary money making activity of the Spanish in the Island Caribbean following 1510 had been animal rearing. Traditionally, livestock were left to fend for themselves on local roots, herbs, fruits and berries; in Cuba by 1514, there were an estimated 30,000 hogs (just three years after their introduction).

viii The sugar-producing British Leeward Islands of Nevis, St. Kitts, Antigua, Montserrat, Saba, and Bermuda produced 403,394 £ sterling in sugar for the period 1715 through 1718 compared to 382,576 £ sterling produced in all the North American colonies (Hubbard 2002: 61). Like Barbuda and Tortola, Anguilla by 1700 was too barren and rainless for tropical agriculture. Beginning in the 1720s a few planters began to buy up and convert the provision grounds and cotton estates to sugar. As the land was converted, larger numbers of slaves were imported to work the fields and many small land holders departed. The islands demography shifted from roughly equal numbers of black and white inhabitants or 1:1.53 (pop. 1,452) in 1720 to 1:2.5 just four years later (pop. 1,260) (Census Information IN Mitchell 2009 Sugar Arrives). Slavery in the New World has been recognized as one of the most horrific chapters in New World history. Anguilla is slightly different from many of the Leeward Islands in that the period of sugar cultivation was relatively short and the soil was deficient. While tour guides on Anguilla have sometimes used this fact to tell visitors that Anguilla’s relative poverty made slaves and owners more or less equal and slavery less
inhumane on Anguilla, this is unlikely. There are few or no reports of manumission (freeing of
slaves) during the period when sugar was commercially viable (Mitchell 2009 Sugar Arrives).

Despite the absence of much arable land, Anguilla during the middle of the 18th century converted
from growing cotton to sugar cane. Sugar had been established on Nevis, Barbados and the other
Caribbean Islands since the 1640s. Nearly a century after sugar’s introduction to the Caribbean
cotton remained the crop of choice on Anguilla. Anguilla lacked the capital investment to make
sugar profitable until around 1730.

Salt was a vital component of the trade, a necessary ingredient for curing Atlantic Codfish for
export from North America. Anguilla, whose inhabitants were too poor to buy much, were outside
the main trading networks.

‘Abject poverty’ on the Island was so severe that the Governor of the Leeward Islands twice
recommended that the Island be completely evacuated (in 1832 and 1843). As a British official
wrote in 1840 ‘Why attempt to nurse up a society such as this which could never yield any fruits
advantageous to the Empire at large and to themselves?’ When crops failed from drought or
hurricanes, the island suffered greatly. During a severe drought in 1891 3,500 persons out of a total
population of 3,699 were given assistance ‘to save them from actual starvation’ (Petty 2008: 54).

These boats’ masts were about 25 feet long and traditionally made from Soursop wood. The
mainsail was made from eight-ounce ‘duck cloth’ and their jib from seven-ounce ‘duck’ (Carty
1997).

August Monday commemorates the Emancipation Act passed by the British House of Commons
which freed all slaves in the British Empire on August 1, 1833 and remains the most popular
holiday in Anguilla.

In giving directions, Anguillians will refer to the East as Up and West as Down. As the wind
typically blows from the East, travelling East is upwind and West is downwind. On the North Coast
of Anguilla, on either side of Road Bay are two hills, named North Hill and South Hill. According
to Mr Mitchell they are so named for the approach to the bay by ship. As one sails towards the Bay
from the West to enter the harbour, the Hill to your right is south by compass direction and hill to
the right is north. Similarly, pointing to a wall in the house, an Anguillian will refer to its compass
direction (i.e. the West wall). In 2010, in advance of Hurricane Earl’s arrival, hourly updates were
announced on the radio regarding the storm’s progress and strength in latitude and longitude.
None of the Anguillians seemed to pass notice but a resident who had moved to Anguilla from the
United States expressed his frustration by asking whether they [the broadcasters] did it that way on
purpose. He asked, ‘Do they think we’re all sailors?’ (Informant32).

Local perceptions of the past differ greatly from my own and other members of the local
historical society. As a cultural anthropologist, I perceive maritime culture on Anguilla as an
adaptive strategy that Anguillians have used to survive difficult times; namely, the utilization of
maritime technology and boats to overcome ecological and economic limitations. I also argue that
the continuation of boat building and boat racing on Anguilla is symbolic of Anguillians’
perseverance. Each year during August Monday celebrations, Anguillians participate in a symbolic
re-enactment of the departure and return of Anguilla’s men, a seasonal migration which provided
the economic stimulus for life to continue on Anguilla. As a member of the local historical society I
see the few remaining buildings and artefacts on Anguilla as a finite and threatened heritage which
will disappear forever unless preserved. This is a preservationist attitude which emphasizes the
fragility of sites including the Fountain Cavern in Shoal Bay and Wallblake House in the Valley. I
see heritage management as a solution for preserving the physical remains of the past for future
generations. Often, this view will emphasize the importance of heritage as a thing or commodity
whose value is unrecognized by the public and who must be ‘taught’ to appreciate it before it is lost
forever. This view may be at odds with local attitudes and can be condescending, leading to mutual
feelings of exclusion.

xvii After the survey’s end, ‘Dougie’ Carty showed the author site (A-06) off Dog Island.

xviii Some accounts report that the vessel was lost on the 9th of July (Unsigned Letter dated at St.
Eustatius, July 21, 1772 IN Stapells-Johnson) and this date is repeated in the 1996 site report. Other
accounts (Letter to the General of the Squadron, July 14, 1772) record that the ship was lost on the
8th but several officials remained onboard until the following day. ‘The day of July 8 dawned with
an air of serenity among those aboard as the skiff and little boat were lowered into the water. By 10
in the morning the first passengers and missionaries managed to step onto the shore of Anguilla.
As so it continued throughout the day. This, excepting Urcullo, his officials and some crew who
were busy drinking and looting cargo and did not finally disembark until the afternoon of July 9
(translation from Spanish AGI Contratacion 1426).

xix For more information, see E. Whitfield’s MA thesis researching the collection of religious
medallions removed from the site (Whitfield 2005).

xx According to crew member (munitions man) Bill Utley.

xxi ‘Although large iron nails and bolts were still being produced for use in the bottom of vessels
operating in cold or temperate climates where shipworm was not a problem, by 1850 copper and
copper alloy fastening were widespread below and around the waterline’ (McCarthy 2005: 91).

xxii Two small guns in Sandy Hill Bay were used by a fisherman as a mooring for years until an
American brought them to the surface and displayed them outside his house. Without
conservation, one has since disappeared and the other rusted beyond conservation.

xxiii One Sandy Ground fisherman told the author that it was some of the best tuna he had ever
tasted while another witness reported that the crew had been celebrating New Years and were
drunk when the ship ran aground. In 1975, Chinese New Year was on February 10th (five days after
the wrecking) so it remains possible but unlikely that the crew was celebrating so early!

xxiv The individual has since placed it in a steel drum filled with water in an effort to remove some of
the chlorides. However, the drum is not large enough to contain the entire gun and part of the
artefact is out of the water.

xxv Sometime during the early 18th century the main port shifted from Crocus Bay to Road Bay in
Sandy Ground. The Bay which is adjacent to the Island’s largest salt pond would have facilitated
the loading and off-loading of salt. The location of the main port would again shift in the 20th
century as the salt industry waned. As traffic increased between Anguilla and St. Martin, a port in
the Forest developed as the Island’s commercial port. Today, the Island’s ports of entry are Road
Bay for commercial or cargo shipments and Blowing Point for ferry traffic between St. Martin and
Anguilla.

xxvi During a lecture on the Island of Nevis on June 25, 2011 where the challenges identified during
this research were described, an audience of approximately 15 Nevisians agreed that ALL these
challenges were present on Nevis.
The Government of Anguilla was extremely supportive of my research and many departments contributed greatly to the success of this project. The author believes that while the informant’s views may have been valid in the past, the Government of Anguilla has shown a great willingness to cooperate and make steps towards change.

There are reports that individuals recognized the glyphs in the 1960s. However, no steps were taken and this report therefore uses the later date 1979 for their discovery.

Two examples are: 1) in 1996, when Anguilla Maritime Research (AMR) gave $25,000 towards a National display of artefacts from El Buen Consejo and was subsequently awarded a 20-year lease of the site and, 2) in 2011, when a developer donated $35,700 to the National Trust as an MOU was signed by the Government allowing him to develop property adjacent to The Fountain.

However, putting it under a single umbrella might discourage many of the groups and individuals who were involved in the creation of the project to stay active. The creation of an independent organization whose aims focused on facilitating collaboration between organizations could prove interesting. To encourage cooperation, however, it would need to discourage competition and ‘turf wars’ between groups with similar mandates.

The AAHS has attempted to rectify this problem but their progress has been frustrated by many of the challenges described in Chapter 4.