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Preface

This study is based on my work with Parks Canada from 1970 to 1981, and as a student at the University of Leicester, Department of Museum Studies and a member of faculty at the University College of Cape Breton since 1981. I would like to acknowledge the support given to me by all three institutions and by the many individuals associated with them who have sustained me in these efforts.

My work has also been based on visits to the Louisbourg ruins since childhood, to many other museums and historic sites as an adult and on a life-long interest in historical scholarship and fiction. For this study and for the personal satisfaction derived from these visits, I owe a debt of gratitude to the staff members and fellow visitors who talked with me and to the many authors and artists who wrote about and illustrated these special places in history.

Abstract


The thesis outlines both the history and the historiography of the fortress and town of Louisbourg during and since the eighteenth-century, and explains the basis for its designation as a Canadian National Historic site in 1928. Emphasis has been placed on the process of research and development after the 1961 decision by the Cabinet of the Government of Canada to reconstruct a significant segment of the original fortress and town as a historical monument, outdoor museum and tourist attraction.

Historical and museological research has been conducted with a view to placing the Louisbourg project into the broader context of historic site preservation and commemoration in Canada and then explaining its presentation to the public. Research, reconstruction and interpretation methodologies and their outcomes have been studied within an interdisciplinary perspective and the research philosophy and its applications have been described and analyzed in detail to document the process of research and development.

The Louisbourg project has also been critically examined within the framework of policies and objectives set by Parks Canada and in terms of its contribution to the Canadian heritage field in general. With the aid of comparisons to other outdoor museums and historic sites in North America and Europe, the lessons of the Louisbourg reconstruction project as a public history model have been analyzed and highlighted.
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Introduction: Louisbourg

Historiography and Museology

In the preface to the internationally best-selling book Sarum: The Novel of England, Edward Rutherfurd wrote:

No place in England, I believe, has a longer visible history of building and occupation than the Sarum region. The wealth of archaeological information, let alone historical record, is so overwhelming that even a novelist, wishing to convey the full story of the place would have to write a book three or four times as long as I have done.¹

Rutherfurd wrote more than a thousand pages in his novel about the Salisbury Plain and what it has meant as a special place in English history. His method was to select accurate information in a personal way and hope that in doing so he "may have conveyed something of the wonder of the place".² In Canadian terms the Fortress of Louisbourg National Historic Site (see Figure 1), even with its much more recent and compact history and a more circumscribed

² Ibid.
though rich historiography, has become a similarly well documented and special place. The requirement for selection in the process of research and development at the project and in the preparation of this study was essentially as Rutherfurd describes, though perhaps not as personal, for the extent of the Louisbourg historical record, as described in chapter one, is vast. In their work the historians, archaeologists, builders and interpreters have selected information and presented their version of the history of the place to the public in the form of a physical and visual reconstruction supplemented by words and illustrations. That was their method and the general public was their audience, just as literature and the general reader guided Rutherfurd’s attempt to represent Sarum. The Louisbourg method and the results are the subject of this thesis, which attempts to describe and assess the project as a case study and model in public history; as comparable to a good historical novel or film as it is to an academic treatise or scholarly monograph.

Another successful author of historical fiction, James Clavell, wrote in the frontispiece of Gal-jiin: A Novel of Japan:

It is not history but fiction. Many of the happenings did occur according to historians and to books of history, which, of themselves, do not necessarily always relate what truly happened... I have played with history - the where and how and who and why and when of it - to suit my own reality and, perhaps, to tell the real history of what came to pass.\(^3\)

Historical fiction, history museums and historic sites, historical restorations and reconstructions, art galleries and even theme parks make an important contribution to the public’s understanding of

particular aspects of the past, though they often distort it. Also, collectively they increase our appreciation for the importance and the significance of history and its manifestations in our present landscape and consciousness, thereby justifying and creating a further market for costly preservation efforts in many countries, a case which has been argued continuously in western cultures since the destruction in Europe caused by the First World War and in the United States by the Civil War of the 1860s.

The Canadian experience is more recent and isolated, largely because of colonial status and regional differences in geography and political culture. Canadian writers of historical fiction and scholarship began to flourish after the Second World War and the museum and historical preservation movement gradually began to take shape after 1950. That progress in what could be termed "public history" reached its apogee in the 1960's in the years preceding and following Canadian Centennial celebrations in 1967, including the World's Fair in Montreal. Research and development at Louisbourg, spanning the years 1961 to 1981, constituted by far the largest undertaking in the Canadian heritage field at that time and was one of the largest of its kind in the western world. This study documents that process at the Louisbourg project and attempts to present it as a model of Canadian heritage preservation, interpretation and public history.

This chapter will present a condensed history of Louisbourg in the eighteenth century and an overview of historical interest and writing about the site since that time, which culminated in its designation as a Canadian National Historic Site in 1928. An attempt has been made to provide the general historical, socio-economic and political context for the 1961 decision to reconstruct and interpret a major segment of Louisbourg and its story to the public.
Louisbourg History

The French town, harbour and fortifications at Louisbourg had a brief but significant history. The eighteenth-century colony of Isle Royale, which comprised present-day Cape Breton and Prince Edward Island, was established in 1713 after Newfoundland was ceded to the British by the Treaty of Utrecht. Additional territorial losses in Acadia left the French with Cape Breton as the best base for their lucrative cod fishery. Louisbourg became capital of the new colony in 1718 and soon developed as the east coast trading centre for all of New France and a strategic military and naval base for the Gulf of St. Lawrence and Quebec.4

Louisbourg's importance was indicated by the decision to build extensive fortifications and sea batteries to protect the town and harbour. Construction was continuous from the early 1720s until the outbreak of war in 1744. New England colonists supported by the British fleet successfully attacked Louisbourg in 1745 and occupied the town until 1749, when Cape Breton was returned to France after the Treaty of Aix-La-Chapelle. The French strengthened the fortifications during the early 1750s and continued to use the port as a base for the French navy, but Louisbourg was again besieged successfully in 1758, by more than 13,000 British troops under the command of Major-General Geoffrey Amherst, again with substantial fleet support from the Royal Navy. The British destroyed the fortifications in 1760 and abandoned Louisbourg after the Seven Years War (1756-63) in favour of Halifax, established in 1749 as the capital of the British colony of Nova Scotia and one of the principal overseas bases for the Royal Navy.

---
Louisbourg is remembered by many as the site of these two important battles, but its historical significance is not limited to military affairs. As a trading centre and base of operations for the North Atlantic fishery Louisbourg was for France what Philadelphia, Boston and New York were for England in the middle of the eighteenth century. Its loss in 1758 was a very serious setback economically as well as militarily to France. Louisbourg, therefore is best understood as a fortified French port on the east coast of North America in frequent and regular contact with the major port cities of France, especially Rochefort and La Rochelle. Its orientation was coastal and European, unlike many of the French possessions in the interior which developed on the basis of North American resources such as agriculture and the fur trade. Louisbourg depended on the sea. Its strategic location on the Atlantic ocean determined its role in direct relationship to France's economic and military interests in Europe and in the rest of North America.

Because of its brief and compact history, Louisbourg has provided the basis for fascinating and varied studies of eighteenth century French culture transplanted to North America. Unlike all other substantial and significant colonial sites Louisbourg has no major continuum into the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, no city built over it. The consequence in historical, archaeological and museological terms has been a unique and extraordinary opportunity to preserve, study and describe the material culture and life of an important eighteenth century community.

**Louisbourg Historiography and Early Museology**

Two hundred years elapsed between abandonment of Louisbourg by the French and British and major development of its
remains as a Canadian historic site, but its historical significance was recognized throughout the intervening period. The ruins were visited and written about continuously by small numbers of informed visitors, and there is an extensive historiography on Louisbourg in scholarship and fiction throughout the nineteenth century (see bibliography).

Active commemoration began at Louisbourg in 1895 with the commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the first siege and culminated in the designation of Louisbourg as a National Historical Site in 1928. The many discussions and actions preceding and following this designation have been documented in a recent study by Louisbourg staff historian, John Johnston, which will be summarized in this introduction to explain the formative influence of Louisbourg on the early evolution of heritage preservation in Canada.

Although the ruins were a fascination to visitors from the middle to the late nineteenth century, there is no evidence of formal arguments or public appeals for preservation of the ruins or for official commemoration of Louisbourg people and events. Though Britain, France and the United States had developed significant heritage preservation movements and extensive museum institutions by this time, Canada as a very young nation had not. A further explanation has been offered, one which underlines the special qualities of Louisbourg as a place in history:

Given the romanticism of the era, the absence of calls to protect or clean up the site is not too surprising. It was precisely the juxtaposition of old ruins with fences, fish flakes [large wooden racks for drying codfish], houses and shops, the contrast of a glorious past with a humble present, that so captivated visitors.5

5 A.J.B. Johnston, "Preserving History: The Commemoration of 18th Century
Louisbourg eventually received its first memorial in 1895, not from Canada but from the United States. A 26-foot high column was erected just outside the King's Bastion ruins to mark the 150th anniversary of the successful New England siege in 1745. Soon there were several expressions of concern for the preservation of the Louisbourg ruins, but they were isolated and largely ignored in Ottawa by a federal government without "the inclination or capability to oversee such sites." This situation started to change in 1919 when the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada (HSMB) was created. But these were formative years for the development of the few natural reserves owned and operated by the Parks Branch of the Department of the Interior since 1885, and virtually no attention was paid to historic sites.

Louisbourg was one of the first historic sites to be considered by the HSMB, but private ownership of the land was complicated, as shown in investigations carried out in 1920 and 1921. The land acquisition by the Parks Branch began in 1921 and under pressure from prominent enthusiasts led by Senator J.S. McLennan, the Branch increased its ownership to nearly 72 acres by 1924. Finally in August, 1926, Louisbourg received its first recognition from the Canadian Government with the unveiling of four commemorative plaques (on cairns) written in English and French.

The efforts of several dedicated and influential people, mainly Senator McLennan and another wealthy industrialist, D.J. Kenney, supported by Sydney lawyer Walter Crowe and New Brunswick physician and curator Dr. J.C. Webster, convinced the Government of Canada to designate Louisbourg a National Historic Site and

---


6 Ibid., p. 65.

7 Ibid., p. 70.
appropriate funds for its development. This was not a widespread preservation movement. The mission was left to a small group of enthusiasts, just as museum development in Canada in the first half of this century depended on the dedication of few and the gradual, reluctant support of government.  

In this context, the development of Louisbourg as a museum and historic site between 1928 and 1940 was at least a moderate success. As in the post-1960 period, this early development was spurred by economic exigencies, the 1929 stock market crash and subsequent depression creating an urgent need for worthwhile public works. Sporadic efforts to stabilize and in some cases reconstruct masonry ruins using unskilled laborers would be judged harshly by modern preservation standards, but the principal objective of creating employment was met and some high and enduring principles of museum philosophy and practice were established in the process.

As part of this effort a masonry museum was constructed in 1935-36 to protect and display objects donated to the site and artifacts recovered during excavations. It soon became an important educational centre for the Cape Breton area and competently met the challenge of interpreting the ruins of the fortress and town for 25 years. A secure and aesthetically pleasing structure, the building has survived to the present day and still plays an important role in the interpretation of a much larger Louisbourg museum and historic site to the public. The following example is intended to illustrate the high standard of museological practice set at Louisbourg in a period when relatively primitive standards of museum theory and practice prevailed in most Canadian museums of similar size and with a similar scope of collections.

Probably the most important and educationally valuable display piece was a model of the fortress and town. Built by the museum's curator, Katherine McLennan, the surprisingly detailed and generally accurate model was based on extensive cartographic research carried out in Paris by Miss McLennan and her father, Senator J.S. McLennan, who wrote a definitive and enduring history of Louisbourg, which was published in 1918 by Macmillan of London. Both the model and the book have survived the test of more than three decades of intensive research since 1961. Until it was refurbished and returned to its original location in the old museum after the opening of the park's Visitor Reception Centre in 1977, the model served as one of the principal means of orientation for visitors to Louisbourg. It succeeded in captivating and educating visitors precisely because it gave visual expression to the labours of historical research and stimulated their imaginations in the process.

The rest of the museum exhibits consisted of attractive display cases containing somewhat randomly selected artifacts, primarily military, simply labeled but not placed in any kind of historical context or sequence. They survived for decades and eventually became a curiosity alongside post-1960 exhibits and displays that were based on focused research, storyline development and carefully written scripts, practices that came to characterize exhibits at the most successful modern museums and education centres, including Louisbourg.

---


10 The model was located in a small exhibit building at the edge of the interior glacis of the King's Bastion, just outside the Old Museum. Visitors would arrive by bus, line up surrounding the model and then receive an introductory orientation lecture from a park guide.
The old museum at Louisbourg was typical of small museums of its era, but superior in the Canadian context. The years of fascination by many and dedication by few left an important legacy for Katherine McLennan and those who followed her. They developed a local and national awareness of an important historic resource in an era when Canada was criticized consistently for its lack of good museums. Its success was based largely on the surrounding ruins, effectively placed into context by the McLennan model. The rugged coastline, the harbour and other natural features, were left to speak for themselves as reminders of important events, but they combined with the ruins to convey with considerable impact, a sense of place and time. That same sense is conveyed with even greater effect today by the reconstruction and surrounding natural and historical resources. It is this quality, the location of historical resources on the actual site of significant historical events, that has given Louisbourg a special place in Canada's national heritage. It had ensured the success of the old museum and has gradually inspired many since the 1930's to recognize the importance of Louisbourg as a historic site. Major development of the site since 1961 has greatly increased the public's awareness of Louisbourg's significance, but that later growth was founded on the important educational benefits of the old museum and the ruins from 1935 to 1960, especially the efforts of the Curator, Katherine McLennan.

Although Louisbourg was widely appreciated for its historical significance, the principal impetus for major site development was socio-economic, not historical or cultural. Any attempt to understand the scope and the pace of the project must begin with that premise. The essential problem confronted in 1959 by government officials was the serious decline of the coal and steel industries in a local economy that lacked diversity. Displaced workers could not be

---

absorbed elsewhere in the region. As a consequence of economic
decline, social changes began to disrupt the communities of industrial
Cape Breton: family members moving to more prosperous regions of
Canada; labour-management relations deteriorating; recreational,
cultural and intellectual activities decreasing because of the lack of
disposable income for the members of the working class who formed
a majority in most towns and in the only city, Sydney.

By the 1950s Canada had developed a strong tradition of
government intervention in the economy. In 1950 the Royal
Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Science
(Massey Commission) began the expansion of the federal
government's role in the cultural and intellectual life of Canadians.\textsuperscript{12}
The gradual growth of this trend in subsequent decades provided the
social and political climate which made possible the decision to
provide federal government funds for major development of
Louisbourg as a National Historic Site.

The Massey Commission in 1950 and government action on
many of its recommendations, principally the creation of the Canada
Council and increased financial support for universities, museums,
galleries and for the performing arts, marked the end of slow growth
in Canadian museums. As Canada matured as a nation with strong
British and French traditions to counterbalance the increasing and
controversial influence of American values and culture, the
importance of government action as an agency of change and growth
was recognized. Also, Canada as a colony and then as a young nation
had lacked the level of philanthropy and support from private
enterprise that so stimulated the growth of large American and
British museums in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. As a
result Canadian museums developed as public institutions on the

\textsuperscript{12} Right Honorable Vincent Massey (Chairman), "Canadian Museums and Art
Galleries", \textit{Report of the Royal Commission on Arts, Letters and Sciences},
Ottawa, King's Printer, 1950.
national and provincial level and as public, tax supported, and generally much smaller museums on the municipal level. Until the 1960s, specifically the years preceding and following Canada's centennial in 1967, the Royal Ontario Museum (ROM) in Toronto, Ontario, was the only large museum with international collections and involvements that was not owned and operated directly by the federal government. Even the ROM relied increasingly on federal funding in the period of growth following the Massey Commission.

The federal government response to the serious economic problems facing Cape Breton and other Canadian coal mining districts was to appoint another Royal Commission in October, 1959, led by the Honorable I.C. Rand. The report of the Rand Royal Commission was essentially an economic analysis of the Canadian coal industry, with particular reference to Cape Breton as the country's largest coal mining district. It warrants close study as an example of how government action on economic problems can affect cultural policy, in this case museological.

The Commission confirmed that economic prospects for the coal industry in Cape Breton were dismal and that a single extractive industry was not a desirable economic base for such a large community. Alternative and supporting economic and cultural activities had to be considered: "a scheme adequate to introduce new wealth into Cape Breton and bring fresh and heightened scenes and an elevation of mind and spirit to its people." In the spirit of cultural awareness inspired by the Massey Commission the report turned first to Cape Breton's natural and historic heritage. Describing the island as a haven of natural beauty, blessed with the

---


14 Honorable I.C. Rand (Commissioner), Report of the Royal Commission on Coal, Ottawa, Queen's Printer, 1959. See excerpts, Appendix 1.
"munificence of nature", the Commission urged the use of these resources to stimulate the tourist industry. Since its completion in the 1930s and particularly during the 1950s, The Cabot Trail in Cape Breton Highlands National Park had already stimulated a steady increase in the number of tourists traveling to the island to view the coastline and natural beauty of the island from the northern elevations of the national park. Turning to historic resources the report focused on Louisbourg in a lengthy passage that must be quoted in full because of its later importance. It describes the turning point envisaged in the evolution of Louisbourg as a national monument:

Moldering on the southeastern coast of the Island is a mute reminder of the wastage of time. Here is the scene of one of the striking events in the historical course of things that has led to the Canada of today. In the early part of the 18th century began the work of building the strongest fortification then existing on the Atlantic Coast of North America and of establishing a community bringing to the New World the architecture, traditions and culture of the French people at the direction of the most polished court of continental Europe. As a revelation of European life of that century and a reminder of the vicissitudes of North America's development, what could be more stimulating to the imagination or instructive to the mind, not only for the people of Cape Breton and Nova Scotia, but of Canada and the eastern portion of the United States, than to look upon a symbolic reconstruction of the Fortress of Louisbourg. Not that each item in the total scene should appear, but sufficient to furnish a comprehensive representation of the material and
cultural forms set up on a strange land inviting settlement. That site marks a salient occasion in the transplantation of a civilization significant to the history of Canada; and to allow it to sink into ruin and obliteration would be a grave loss to the civilizing interests of this country.  

Two phrases are of particular importance in this study of Louisbourg as a museum and historic site. The first is the general vision of a reconstructed Fortress of Louisbourg "sufficient to furnish a comprehensive representation of the material and cultural forms set up ... ", one of several initial statements that provided the philosophical context for general project objectives developed in the early 1960s and adhered to for two decades, despite rising costs and serious objections from proponents of preservation and restoration over reconstruction. The second phrase also makes a statement on the evolution of thinking in the Canadian preservation movement: "to allow it to sink into ruin and obliteration would be a grave loss to the civilizing interests of this country." The two decades after 1959 would see significant expansion of the preservation movement inside Parks Canada and in the country in general, culminating in the establishment of a government funded private agency, Heritage Canada, in 1973. The philosophies and policies discussed and refined at Louisbourg in the early 1960s made a major contribution to the development of the heritage preservation movement. Louisbourg was the first major project of its kind in Canada, and to a large extent Canadians in this field were able to broaden their interest in, and acceptance and support for, historic preservation by reference to the Louisbourg model.

Whether the example is the Citadel in Halifax, the Historic Waterfront Properties, or some of

---

15 Ibid., p. 47.
the restorations and outdoor museums that have flourished since the 1960s, a common theme when work begins is that these towns are catching up with their history, and the Fortress of Louisbourg is often their point of comparison.16

These and other philosophical statements and issues will be analyzed further in succeeding chapters of this study. Emphasis in this introduction, however, is on the national significance, historically and museologically, of the Louisbourg project during its initial phase and throughout its development. Although the principal impetus in 1960 was socio-economic and local, the cultural importance of the Fortress of Louisbourg after 1960 increased to national proportions. The project is best understood in the context of its relationship to Canadian heritage preservation in general and for its impact on the development of outdoor museums and historic sites in particular.

The Rand Commission recommended in August, 1960, that "beginning not later than in the year 1961, work on a scheme of reconstructing the ruins of the Fortress of Louisbourg as an historic site be commenced..."17 In accepting the recommendation the Federal Cabinet of Canada phrased its decision in a manner equally as pertinent to project philosophy and objectives as the earlier Rand report statement:

The Fortress of Louisbourg is to be restored partially so that future generations can thereby see and understand the role of the


Fortress as a hinge of history. The restoration is to be carried out so that the lessons of history can be animated.\textsuperscript{18}

The reference to animation provided another major philosophical direction to Louisbourg as an outdoor museum. It has been quoted repeatedly since 1961 as the principal basis for the development of an interpretation programme at Louisbourg that combines buildings, property features, collections and staff in period costume to produce a cultural landscape, one in which an attempt is made to provide a comprehensive and detailed interpretation of eighteenth-century Louisbourg. Once again, it is important and relevant to emphasize the importance of these early statements in any explanation of the ambitious and costly programmes that followed the initial federal government authorization and project brief for Louisbourg research and development.

\textsuperscript{18} Cabinet Minute, 1961, as quoted in John Lunn et al., Fortress of Louisbourg Interpretive Plan: A Pattern for the 170s, Manuscript on file, Fortress of Louisbourg, 1971, Part 1, p. 1.
Chapter 1
The Project Brief:
Early Research and Source Gathering

Though early efforts to commemorate and develop Louisbourg were inspiring, they provided little specific guidance to project staff during the initial phase of development between 1961 and 1964. Philosophical statements such as those contained in the Rand Report and strategic objectives from politicians and bureaucrats on creating employment and generating local economic benefits were insufficient as a project brief, but they could not serve as the basis for integrated workplans to guide the various disciplines and occupational groups required for such a massive undertaking. That initial task of organizing work was left mainly to engineers hired for the project and they very quickly began to identify research requirements, including schedules contrived in isolation from the professionals in history and archaeology who would have to direct and carry out the actual work. This chapter will outline the early efforts to establish a research programme adapted to the requirements of engineering and construction, investigate some of the specialized methodologies developed in that process and describe the initial data base assembled for the project.

The pressure to create employment and show progress at Louisbourg was extreme, but the National Parks Branch lacked the experience necessary to launch such an ambitious project. A costly combination of consultants and new staff was soon required to
complement existing expertise in engineering, restoration design and construction trades. The mix of professional, technical, and trades personnel assembled for the Louisbourg project was not out of proportion to the scope and complexity of the work required, but they had to develop in a short period of time innovative and direct lines of communication as a substitute for proper planning and coordination of assignments. It would be ten years before a comprehensive planning process was in place to guide decisions. Progress during the first decade of the project depended on a consultative process that was eventually formalized as a committee structure; study of that process illuminates much of what was achieved and not achieved in the early years of the project, particularly by research staff and project consultants.

Initial Research Programme

In the first year or so of the project there was too little time to conduct extensive and thorough research and even less time to report on that research in a comprehensive manner. As an unfortunate consequence, few of the written results of this initial research are publishable. The most important objective of historical research was to supply detailed information for the archaeological excavation and subsequent reconstruction of historic properties selected for development, principally the fortifications and buildings in the King's Bastion. The deadlines imposed by archaeology and construction schedules, combined with the problem raised by the unexpectedly large extent of documentary and cartographic evidence, encouraged the development of different and specialized methodologies. Though the extent of data on eighteenth century Louisbourg has proven to be an invaluable asset to the project over
the past 30 years, it had presented an almost insurmountable challenge to research staff in 1962 and 1963.\footnote{For a listing of manuscripts see Krause, Eric R., Master List of In-House Reports, Fortress of Louisbourg Archives, 1980.}

The earlier commitment to high standards of research inspired by Senator John Stewart McLennan was reinforced by the first general consultant to the Louisbourg project, Ronald L. Way. He was one of few Canadians with broad experience in historic restorations, and without question the most competent, having directed the restoration of Fort Henry in Kingston, Ontario, Upper Canada Village in Morrisburg, Ontario and a number of other smaller historic properties for the Province of Ontario. His experience, however, was in the conduct and management of applied research programmes and he proved to have little interest in or tolerance for pure or academic research. This was a distinct advantage at this early stage of the Louisbourg project and no doubt the principal reason for his appointment. It also helps to explain what was not researched by project staff throughout most of the 1960s, important historical themes and subjects such as: the French navy in the North Atlantic and at Louisbourg, the many differences economically and socially between Isle Royale and other French possessions in North America, trading patterns such as smuggling and how this may have affected the material culture and construction technology of the colony, local relations with native people and foreign fishermen and how they were reflected and manifested at Louisbourg, religion and morality and a whole range of issues in social organization and behavior. Significant research by project historians on all of these subjects did not begin until the second decade of the research and development phase. The influence of these silences became evident in planning decisions and in the nature of many museum and historic site programmes, which will be analyzed in future chapters of this study.
At the time of his service as general consultant to the Louisbourg project, Ronald Way was also the Director of Historic Buildings and Sites for the Ontario-St. Lawrence Development Commission, one of the largest and most active historic preservation agencies in Canada. Review of Way’s research reports and memoranda from 1962 reveal clearly the sense of urgency that prevailed at that time in his new assignment at Louisbourg. The following quotation from the covering letter for a report on the fortifications of the King’s Bastion is typical:

It had been my intention to include in this report, a section relating to the Chateau St. Louis for the information of the archaeologist. Unfortunately, time did not permit this since some of the most important documentary material did not arrive from Paris until a few days ago. I have recommended to Mr. Thorpe [Senior Historian for the project] that he should endeavour to produce immediately a report on the Chateau, to be followed by a similar dissertation on the subject of the Grand Battery.2

The term Chateau St. Louis referred to a substantial building that had stood in the gorge of the King’s Bastion, containing barracks for approximately 500 soldiers, the Governor’s apartments, the garrison chapel, military offices and prison, and quarters for the chief financial officer for the colony. (The name Chateau St. Louis is no longer in use as it does not appear in original plans and documents referring to Louisbourg, but the building was the highest priority in the early development phase, which may explain why project staff contrived a suitably imposing name). The Royal Battery

was also a high priority, though for preservation only. The extensive battery, its barracks and fortifications were not reconstructed, but were partially excavated prior to construction of a modern concrete wall to protect the ruins from erosion by the sea. These and other pressing development priorities were being formulated as the initial research was undertaken.

Ronald Way was determined to make the best of this difficult situation. In what was clearly one of the most important and earliest statements of research philosophy for the Louisbourg project, a memorandum on research submitted to the Director of the National Parks Branch, he opened with an uncomplicated precept: "A comprehensive research programme in both history and archaeology is the only basis for an authentic restoration of Louisbourg."3 Though he was committed to a thorough research programme, he was equally aware, as a management consultant to the project, of the need to tailor that research to development objectives:

Both avenues of research must be coordinated to the demands of the restoration programme to which the Government is committed, namely the provision of employment in the Cape Breton area, the product of which will ultimately be a partial reconstruction of the Fortress of Louisbourg and the creation of a visitor attraction contributing both to the education and the economic development of Nova Scotia.4

The memorandum recommended a historical research programme in two distinct phases: an emergency programme to

---

3 Way to Coleman, March 6, 1962, p. 1, contained in Ms. HF-1, Memorandum on Research, Fortress of Louisbourg Archives.
4 Ibid., p. 4.
provide information required for the 1962 construction work; and a "more orderly long-term programme" to keep pace with restoration requirements. (In this and other early project documents the words restoration and reconstruction were often used interchangeably. It would be the early 1970s, largely because of the Louisbourg project and its profile in the Canadian preservation movement, before a clear distinction in terminology was consistently made). The "crash-action historical research" consisted primarily of detailed research and analysis of a limited number of key documents and plans pertaining mainly to the structural features and architectural components of the King's Bastion, concurrent with an effort to acquire additional archival material in France and Britain, and, to a lesser extent, the United States. The long-term research was originally intended to be comprehensive, utilizing archival and secondary sources to provide information for a full range of museum programmes.

As museum programmes were not yet planned in any detail, historical research was concentrated on buildings and fortifications until sufficient progress could be made in gathering source material to allow informed decisions on research and development beyond the King's Bastion and on subjects other than structural history. Very few general studies or historical narratives were conducted during this period from 1962 to 1964, largely because there was no need to duplicate information that could be readily gleaned from published monographs and articles in academic journals and because at this stage of research and development such studies would have been superfluous.5

5 The most valuable published study on Ile Royale was John S. McLennan, Louisbourg From Its Foundation To Its Fall, London, Macmillan, 1918; a thorough and accurate survey history of Louisbourg from 1713-1758.
Historical research on the King's Bastion was focused, specific, and anything but academic. The historical reports and memoranda resulting from that research were concerned exclusively with the structural details of buildings and fortification features. Research and reporting methods were designed to meet specific development objectives which could not be met by a standard historical narrative. These objectives concerned reconstruction and restoration of historic properties and were not yet museological or educational in the general sense, but precedents set in these early reports led to the development of standards, principally in the manner of analyzing and presenting data, that have endured at the project for more than 30 years. Some of these methodologies were neither commonly used nor familiar to most university-trained historians. Their description here is intended to provide a case study in how professionally trained researchers from an established discipline, in this case history, can adapt to the requirements of a companion discipline, archaeology, as well as the disciplines of engineering and architecture.

The first change concerns the framework of questions developed by the historian after selection of the topic and completion of some preliminary research. Historians are normally accustomed to posing general questions as parameters for research and allowing detail and context to develop as research proceeds. For research on the King's Bastion specific questions were posed from the outset. How high and how thick was the parapet of the escarp wall? Were the steps to the barbette masonry or wood? How many and what size cannon were placed on the barbette and flanks of the bastion? What were the dimensions of the glacis slope? Thousands of such questions had to be answered. The impact of the eighteenth-century construction programme on the local economy or of the overall
military policy of the English or New Englanders was not seen as being important at this point.

A second major change involved the chronological limits placed on the studies. Since Louisbourg had a brief history of French occupation (1713-1758 with a four-year interruption during English occupation from 1745-1749), there was already in place a set of very unusual chronological limits on studies of its history. Historical research on the King's Bastion was even more limited, focusing on the period from 1740-1758. Indeed, one of the most important reports included a recommendation to change the general date to which the site would be reconstructed to the year 1745 from a mixture of dates spanning the history of the site up to 1758, including ruins from the 1760-61 period. Ultimately, that recommendation was followed because 1745 was a significant date in Louisbourg history and because it was simpler to reconstruct to one year than it would be to maintain a more evolutionary approach. This new strategy for reconstruction (discussed further, in chapter two of this study, as a planning decision) imposed a further and most unusual chronological limitation on historical research.

Other equally significant changes concerned the manner of presenting evidence and conclusions, as well as the type of source material consulted and subsequently included in reports. Few university-trained historians had experience in the close and detailed study of historical views, maps and plans, material specifications or construction technology. This was the province of geographers and architectural historians, but not academic historians in general. Research on the King's Bastion, however, had to be concerned almost exclusively with that type of source material on technical topics, and this was reflected clearly in the reports. Invariably they included lists, tables and myriad illustrations, principally line drawings and copies of historical plans. In some
reports text was kept to a minimum and there was little or no attempt to provide general context for the information presented.

This transformation to the use of visual source material proved increasingly to be a requirement for project historians; many of those who made the transformation successfully progressed through promotion inside and outside the National Parks Branch to museum-oriented positions at senior levels. Within the project this experience in the use of non-literary source material for research on the King's Bastion provided a transition to later research for curatorial and interpretation objectives, principally in social history. Historians became interested in objects and iconographic sources, enabling them to become more involved in collections research. Though this process of change was rapid in the undertaking of structural research on the King's Bastion, it was a more gradual change in method and attitude when it came to the study and use of archaeological artifacts and furniture and furnishings collections. By 1975, project historians were expected to consult such sources when developing material and social history studies of Louisbourg, studies which were by then required for museum programmes. This emphasis on applied historical research, however, began with the early research on the structural history and archaeology of the King's Bastion.

The final major change in historical research methodology was in the manner of presenting research findings. Project briefs, memoranda, meeting minutes and formal and informal discussions
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6 Examples from this period: Fred Thorpe, Chief, Historical Research and Curatorial Division, National Museum of Man, Ottawa; John Fortier, Director, Provincial Museum of Alberta, Edmonton and now Director of Historic Sites and Museums for the State of Pennsylvania; Dr. Robert J. Morgan, Executive Director of Research and Development, University College of Cape Breton; Victor Suthren, Director of the Canadian War Museum. Since that time there have been many historians and archaeologists who have progressed in the museum and academic fields after experience at the Louisbourg project.
with colleagues from other disciplines were favored over the traditional academic report. The practice developed in haste in 1962-63, but was retained as an acceptable and sometimes preferred method throughout the research and development phase of the project. The method was effective because it was quick and because the specific types of questions asked and the equally specific data consulted allowed researchers to write history in piecemeal fashion. These brief reports were no substitute for lengthy, more analytical research manuscripts, but they met the immediate requirements for information and collectively they provide an excellent resource for documenting the progress of research and development at the Louisbourg project. Because it was acceptable to report on research in this way the practice of writing down the basis for specific decisions on reconstruction features was established early in the project's development and formalized later in a committee system, leaving a large and important legacy in the project archives of minutes, letters, memoranda, project briefs and short reports. This important precedent was again set in the initial historical research on the King's Bastion under the direction of Ronald Way, a practitioner of the art of applied research for many years previous.

Historical Records

The long-term historical research phase, as indicated above, could not be planned in detail until overall project planning (discussed in chapter two) advanced to a clearer definition of objectives to which research could respond. Historians not involved in studies of the King's Bastion soon became involved in a major effort to gather source material for later research. The extent of data was vast. Substantial financial resources and expertise were made available to find, copy and organize it, so the effort continued in earnest until 1966 and sporadically since that time. The methods used are of less pertinence to this study than the results achieved, for an analysis of the extent and the utility of that data base is
essential to an understanding of what has been accomplished in research and development at Louisbourg since 1962.

Primary source material relating directly to Louisbourg can be divided into four broad categories: maps and plans, official correspondence, legal and commercial records and biographical and church records. The project archives also contains copies of royal proclamations and regulations of the Ministry of the Marine, which administered the French colonies, and of numerous journals from the first (1745) and second (1758) sieges. The number of private papers is insignificant compared to public records and there were no newspapers published at Louisbourg, though the completeness of court records more than compensates. In addition to primary sources, the project was able to acquire a variety of rare books published in the eighteenth century, including a complete edition of the Diderot Encyclopedia and other authoritative technical and specialized contemporary literature, all of which has been catalogued and in some cases indexed in the project library.

The following analysis of this database emphasizes source material most frequently consulted by project historians and which has yielded the most useful and specific information for reconstruction, interpretation and education programmes. It does not attempt to assess the source material for general historical research or for its use in studies of New France or the French colonies in general. In other words, the analysis is restricted geographically and historiographically to Louisbourg, the capital of the colony of Ile Royale (Cape Breton and Prince Edward Island) and museologically to historical evidence that supported outdoor museum and historic site programmes.

Maps and Plans

The surviving collection of original and contemporary maps and plans pertaining to the colony of Ile Royale, Louisbourg and the
Island of Cape Breton was fortuitous. More than 500, located mainly in French and British archives, are extant, approximately 100 of which provide specific information on Louisbourg. The town plans and views have been invaluable in the study of properties and structures within the area delineated for reconstruction. Many, perhaps 40-50, would be prized by any European or North American history museum and several of the watercolor plans, views and line drawings are works of art. Numerous examples could be provided, but three will serve the purposes of this analysis.

In 1731 the chief engineer at Louisbourg, Etienne Verrier and his son, referred to as Verrier fils, each drew watercolour views of the town from a ship in the harbour (see Figures 2 and 3). Wharves, streets, waterfront buildings and prominent public buildings were drawn in detail. Not surprisingly, close comparative study of documentary evidence and other plans has identified inaccuracies in the Verrier views, but they are excellent sources for the study of Louisbourg architecture in general and they provide accurate detail on many structures and property features, especially on the waterfront where two entire town blocks and the waterfront facade of three others have been reconstructed. Where would project staff have been without these views? They have been copied countless times for research and design, in some cases half-inch sections of the original blown up photographically to 20 times their size for detailed analysis. The two views and several of the best overall property plans became the starting point for studies of Louisbourg buildings and fortifications and are invaluable for a visual conceptualization of the original harbour and town.

The second example of valuable cartographic evidence is a 1734 property plan drawn to finalize the results of Francois Vallee’s official survey. In addition to delineating all properties in the town, the plan identifies each in a number and letter system that had been adopted early by the project staff to designate planned and already reconstructed properties and buildings. In North American terms it is an outstanding source for the study of eighteenth-century town planning and it is one of the best contemporary indications of just how European Louisbourg was in concept and design. To the project historians and archaeologists it was one of the basic steps in developing an accurate orientation to the colonial town. Full-scale reproductions of the 1734 plan have been measured, overlaid with structures and property features and generally scrutinized and redrawn in numerous reports and reconstruction drawings.

The third example is a 1768 British plan of the town accompanied by a detailed, written survey of all buildings (the fortifications had been demolished by the British in 1760). The plan is useful in the study of town occupancy and architectural evolution and in identifying New England and British structures that had replaced or altered original French structures. The written survey, in conjunction with the plan, is invaluable in its reference to pre-1745 features, as it serves to confirm or deny several important hypotheses about original construction and subsequent alterations, particularly for private properties that are not nearly as well documented as public buildings.

In a typical research assignment these and other key plans and views (see Figure 4 for a typical example from 1730) would be rigorously compared to the remaining cartographic collection and subjected to all possible scrutiny from documentary evidence before conclusions could be drawn and contradictions resolved. There was an element of educated guesswork and outright conjecture in the
progression from original research to final design drawings for reconstructed buildings and features, but the extent of cartographic evidence gathered early in the project’s research effort has allowed a high degree of accuracy for the reconstruction of public buildings and a solid base for comparative study of many private properties, which, in turn, has led to a surprising level of historical precision in the reconstruction of private buildings and features.

On a methodological level it is important to point out that all research and design disciplines used the collection of historical maps and plans extensively. The project archaeologists, architects, and engineers were as familiar with the important maps and plans as historians and on a technical level they relied even more on the specific detail the collection could provide. Unfortunately, the project has not until very recently attracted qualified historical geographers to participate in the interpretation of this exceedingly valuable resource. Consequently, the research on the collection has tended to emphasize evidence internal to colonial Louisbourg, with a concomitant lack of study and interpretation of the natural environment and cultural geography of the Louisbourg area and similar environments from the eighteenth century to the present day.

Official Correspondence

The Louisbourg archives contains copies of nearly one million pages of primary documentation on Ile Royale. The evidence has survived because Louisbourg was a colonial capital of international interest and historical significance and because France and England were sufficiently advanced culturally and institutionally by the middle of the eighteenth century to have established and highly sophisticated archival procedures and resources. The legacy for the Louisbourg project has been a documentary record of remarkable proportions and rare completeness by North American standards. Research on this resource combined with research by archaeologists
on an artifactual yield of equally remarkable richness, has produced an historical record of great importance in the study of colonial North America.

The official correspondence contained in several archival series illuminates virtually all aspects of colonial affairs. Of particular importance in the early years of research were the many progress reports and detailed building specifications for the construction of fortifications and public buildings, usually submitted to the Minister of the Marine by the chief engineer at Louisbourg. These were essential to corroborate structural data, particularly proposals, that appeared on historical plans, elevations and profiles, and they were routinely consulted by the project archaeologists prior to excavation of properties. Construction detail confirmed by archaeological excavation would, of course, form the basis for reconstruction design. These documents were equally important in the filling in of gaps in construction detail left after analysis of archaeological data and preparation of as-found drawings, particularly in specifications for construction materials. Knowledge gained in the use of these sources for research, design and reconstruction of public buildings was later applied to the work on private buildings, for which there was a relative paucity of reliable historical evidence.

In addition to documenting colonial architecture and construction technology, the official correspondence provided a wealth of information on financial affairs, promotions and conflicts in command within the garrison (approximately 600 in 1745; 4,000 in 1758), administrative practices and procedures, political and social structure, as well as a vast and fascinating amount of biographical detail on the people of colonial Louisbourg. The records have been
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used for studies of colonial policy and bureaucracy to a level of detail not normally available for colonial towns in North America. For example, a 1742 document provides a comprehensive list of stores contained in the King's storehouse which has been studied closely in attempts to furnish the reconstructed structure and to explain its role in the provisioning of the garrison and town. The same document contains information on the King's armory which has permitted the development of detailed designs for armory furniture and furnishings. The official correspondence also reveals that the official declaration of war in 1744 reached Louisbourg weeks before New England was aware of the conflict, allowing the Louisbourg military to launch a surprise attack on English possessions on mainland Nova Scotia. Details of the expedition which were chronicled in the official correspondence reveal important and specific information about the colonial town in the spring and summer of 1744, allowing a more accurate portrayal of the site in the reconstruction and costumed animation programmes. For example, Captain Michel DeGannes, whose house on Block 17 has been reconstructed, was a member of the 1744 expedition. The present military animation programme at Louisbourg includes full interpretation of that property in 1744, including the fact of DeGannes' absence. There are numerous instances where such specific information about people and events has allowed a more accurate reconstruction and portrayal of the site, as well as a cumulative insight into the lives of many Louisbourg occupants and how their history can be presented to the public.


10 A.N., Colonies, B, Vol. 78, fol. 386, Maurepas to Bigot, 3 March, 1744.
Legal and Commercial Records

For social history and material culture studies and, to a lesser extent, architectural history, the legal and commercial records are also vital to an authentic portrayal of eighteenth century Louisbourg. Having no recourse to elected representatives, the people of Louisbourg depended heavily on the colonial courts to redress grievances and settle disputes, as well as to legalize the acquisition and disposal of properties and estates. The surviving records are meticulous and remarkably complete, with just several years missing from the early 1720s to 1758. Estate inventories provide the best example of how court records can be used for a variety of outdoor museum and historic site purposes.

Most of the estate inventories provide a complete listing of the contents of the household of the deceased, the incompleteness of some inventories resulting from omission of goods not belonging to the estate but which may have been contained in the house as the possessions of another occupant. Consequently the inventories often provide a precise and in some cases complete furnishings plan for reconstructed houses. The existence of estate inventories dating prior to 1745 for buildings within the planned area of the reconstruction provided the basis in later project planning for decisions on which buildings would be furnished to period and which were designated to contain modern exhibits or services. For example, the governor’s apartment in the King’s Bastion barracks is furnished according to the 1744 inventory of the estate of Governor Jean Baptiste DuQuesnel who died in October of that year, while the Julien Auger dit Grandchamp Inn and House on Block 2 has been furnished according

11 Archives de la France d’Outre Mer (hereafter cited as A.F.O.), G2, Registers of the clerk of the Superior Council of Louisbourg and G3, Notaries of Ile Royale 1727-1758.

12 John Lunn et al, Interpretive Prospectus, Ms. on file, Fortress of Louisbourg, April 1972, pp. 11-14.
to an estate inventory of 1741. Additional research and analysis has often been required, for example, when an inventory had been taken during the winter for a house designated by the project planners to be furnished and interpreted to the summer of 1744 (the focus for interpretation of the site), but the inventories provide in all cases an excellent starting point for the curatorial effort.

With more than 180 Isle Royale inventories available for study, it is possible to consult at least several inventories for almost any socio-economic group, providing an accurate knowledge base for the study of the material culture of any group in colonial Louisbourg, to guide curatorial work. In overall terms, the inventories reveal material culture patterns, such as the use of New England furniture and the common use of pewter and earthenware. Thousands of objects are listed and in some cases fully described in the inventories, which have been used extensively in developing guidelines for the acquisition of furniture and furnishings for the reconstruction project. Estate inventories also provide architectural information, especially those where the route taken by court officials through the house is described in the preamble to the actual inventory. Floor plans and room use for some reconstructed buildings have been based on evidence extrapolated from estate inventories, such as determining the approximate size of a room on the basis of what it contained or the functions it served.

Many of the inventories are accompanied by detailed reports on the sale of effects, allowing comparisons of evaluations in the inventory with the prices for which the objects actually sold in the sale. The tastes and living standards of Louisbourg residents can be determined or inferred, while social routine and lifestyle information can sometimes be gleaned from studying clothing inventories. A

surprisingly few Louisbourg inventories list books, evidence which can support conclusions on levels of literacy but also provide curatorial guidelines on when and where books should be on display. Bulk food lists in inventories provide clues on diet and storage conditions, which can be very useful in planning living history activities for some reconstructed historic properties.

Accounts of auction procedures in sale documents have allowed the scripting of scenarios for the re-enactment of auctions in the costumed animation programme (described in chapter five), and they have provided much of the information base for an important sequence in a documentary film about life in the colonial town.14 Finally, some inventories in identifying relatives and associates can provide leads to other source material that may supplement biographical information, particularly on entrepreneurs whose properties include storehouses and for officers who were involved in commercial activities; in other words, most of the upper class.15

Estate inventories are generally more precise than surviving records of commercial and private transactions between companies and individuals. Nevertheless, the many contracts, sales agreements and recorded verbal testimonies in Louisbourg court records are essential and at times surprisingly specific in the study of such a commercially oriented colonial capital. Virtually everyone in

14 The Parks Canada film was produced at Louisbourg in 1979. Auction demonstrations have been a regular feature of the costumed animation programme during July and August.

15 This approach was used in the furnishing of the Rodrigue storehouse, for which there is no estate inventory. Other sources, however, indicate the commodities traded by Michel Rodrigue, his father and other business associates (see Christopher Moore, "The Maritime Economy of Isle Royale," Canada, An Historical Magazine, Vol. 1, No. 4, June 1974, pp. 41-42). There is also an estate inventory for two Louisbourg business partners involved in trading activity similar to Rodrigue's (see A.F.O., G2, Vol. 2045, folio 103, Inventaire des Solignac et Cabbarus), which provides a further basis for furnishing the Rodrigue storehouse.
Louisbourg society, including military personnel up to the highest levels, was involved in some form of business or commercial activity, so these records can reflect the prevailing social mentality and daily routine of many of its inhabitants and visitors.16

Understanding these historical figures individually and collectively can be painstaking because of the extent of data. In the late 1960s and early 1970s the court records in three important archival series were exhaustively indexed and described in finding aids as a preliminary step in the preparation of a comprehensive Domestic Architecture File. Other series from the official correspondence were included in this major effort to isolate information on buildings and property features. The resulting card file had serious flaws, which deserve analysis here primarily for methodological reasons, but the main point to be made in this description of the historical data base for the Louisbourg project is that too much information was available to be researched in its entirety by each historian working on an individual research assignment.

Research shortcuts had to be developed and systematic methods had to be deployed early to ensure cooperation among research colleagues in various disciplines, research assistants and clerical staff and later with operations staff as museum programmes were opened to the public. Sometimes the methods were efficient but wrong. The problems with the Domestic Architecture File can be reduced to two major shortcomings: one pertaining to its basic purpose, the other to research methods. There is a fundamental precept in good historical research that there is no substitute for consulting the original document. Researchers should seek to get that document or an exact, verifiable copy of it as quickly as possible and

then extract the information required to meet general or specific research objectives. The purpose of the Domestic Architecture File at Louisbourg was to transcribe and in many cases summarize the documents on file cards as a substitute for consulting archival copies of the originals. Omissions were inevitable, particularly in a research programme where objectives were evolving as the project planning process was refined, so most historians merely used the file as a finding aid which barely supplemented the existing finding aids. All important details had to be checked in the original, so it became apparent in anything but preliminary research that the file was no more than an overly complicated finding aid. Incompetent historians or researchers trained differently in other disciplines were unlikely ever to consult the originals.

Concerning the methods used to establish the file, principally the decision to use unqualified research assistants and clerical staff to transcribe and in some cases locate the documents, standards for accuracy were too often compromised. Thorough checking against originals by experienced professional staff could not be included in the process - they were too busy producing reports - and many inaccuracies resulted. To avoid the consequence of including these inaccuracies in reconstruction design, professional research staff eventually had to routinely consult archival copies of the original documents to ensure that design staff were not applying incomplete or inaccurate versions in their work.

The efforts to complete the final stages of the file employed people and the effort can only be justified on that basis, but much effort was misapplied in the process. The risk of unnecessarily increasing the level of historical inaccuracy in reconstruction research and design existed if a less than competent research staff used the file. This brings the design and execution of this particular research initiative into serious question. It should have been designed as a finding aid for the exclusive use of qualified historians.
and archaeologists. Fortunately, when the file was in use during the research and development phase the project employed a well qualified, professionally trained research staff and attempts were made to correct the most serious deficiencies, but any museum or historic site without such research capability could easily compromise fundamentally important standards by failing to properly design and use its research files.

In this and other case studies used in this thesis the difficulty of balancing socio-economic objectives with cultural or heritage preservation objectives will be analyzed. These case studies provide a manifestation of the extent to which Louisbourg as a museum and historic site was shaped by the economic imperatives inherent in the Canadian government's attempt to use the project to alleviate a chronic and vexatious problem in industrial Cape Breton - high unemployment. The application of this government policy was in this instance and in others at odds with acceptable professional standards.

The opportunities to organize, index, reorganize and otherwise exploit the archival data base at Louisbourg to provide employment have been a continuing feature of project planning and development since the extent of that data base was first made apparent to Parks Canada policy makers and to administrative and professional staff in the early 1960s. Most of the effort to organize and describe the contents of the Louisbourg archives have contributed to a successful combination of archival source material and indexing, which ultimately resulted in an extensive, well organized and efficient project archives. Records of commercial and private transactions as described above provide an example of how such source material, as with maps and plans and estate inventories, can be researched for museum and historic site purposes.

Occasionally contracts for private buildings are referred to in some detail in court records, but these references are rare and
usually consist of brief descriptions of maintenance and repair work. Most of the historical information for reconstruction design of private buildings has been drawn from plans of the town and from a general knowledge of typical eighteenth-century French building techniques, knowledge acquired by experienced professional and technical staff from all disciplines on a learning curve that began to take effect in the early years of research and source gathering.

The many property disputes that had been recorded in court records have made a particularly large and very specific contribution to that state of knowledge. Such records are cited frequently in a series of architectural studies produced in the early 1970s and in a series of reports on the town blocks that were ultimately included in the reconstruction plan. Louisbourg residents often constructed contiguous buildings with a common wall on the property line. As in any urban community in Europe or North America, fences and outbuildings were also built along property lines. Inevitably legal disputes arose. A further impetus to this type of litigation was the building code, known as the Custom of Paris, which regulated in minute detail such matters as the height and distance of windows overlooking a neighbour's property. Records of these court proceedings make fascinating reading and provide insights into the transfer of French legal precedents and practices to the colonies, but more importantly for the early years of the Louisbourg project they often provided good descriptions of property and building features. Exploited rigorously by research and design staff, they frequently helped to precisely date features found during archaeological excavation that would otherwise have been subject to vague or altered stratigraphy and confused chronology, as happened on three

17 B. Adams et al, Preliminary Architectural Studies, 31 articles organized in four volumes, Ms. on file, Fortress of Louisbourg, 1971-1972. A series of 13 property reports were written between 1969 and 1975. For a list of these reports see Krause, Eric R., Master List of In-House Reports, Fortress of Louisbourg Archives, 1980, section 8-HD.
separate occasions during research on substantial private buildings reconstructed on Block 4 properties. This convergence of detailed historical and archaeological evidence in a precise and deliberately managed interdisciplinary method prior to property design and reconstruction became standard practice in the first five years of the Louisbourg project, and remained in place throughout the research and development phase. The applications of this methodology are further discussed in chapter three.

Sale agreements were another obvious source of architectural information on buildings. They usually described the type of house (masonry, wood frame or upright log style) and in some cases the external dimensions and number of storeys, but normally only these general indications were given. Succession papers for estates, as discussed above, provided similar information from court records. Both types of documents often give evaluations of buildings and other assets in the estate, which have assisted decisions during planning and reconstruction design on the level of quality to be incorporated in the building. Also, by enabling project historians to ascribe a socio-economic level to the occupants, these evaluations provide guidelines for the furnishing of such properties and for the costuming and comportment of any staff in period costume who would later assist in the interpretation of the property to the public.

Criminal records have on occasion also yielded structural information on buildings, properties and their use. One of the best examples pertains to a Block 16 property, where a theft took place in 1732. A detailed description of the house was given as part of the investigation of the robbery. Some structural information on outside

property features was also given in court testimony, as an occupant of the house, Jean Mercier, discovered evidence of the robbery when he went into the yard at six in the morning to relieve himself, apparently in the open. As valuable as such court records are for information on buildings and property features, their true value lies in what they reveal about people.

Records of crimes and disputes are among the most important sources for social history research because collectively they describe the lifestyles and concerns of all classes of Louisbourg society. They have compensated for a lack of personal diaries and newspapers as they provide specific, interesting and accurate supporting and supplementary information for labels, scripts and narrative texts in exhibits, staff lectures, and guided tours. Research staff who have worked with substantial amounts of this material have tended to develop a curious intellectual intimacy with Louisbourg people. Their lives become familiar and believable because their testimony is on record. Historians normally have access to primary source material on the leading political, military and social figures of eighteenth century Europe and North America, but studying the lower classes in such a stratified society can be impossible, easily overlooked or at least highly subjective if the words and sentiments of the illiterate are not recorded.

Chronologically, demographically and geographically, Louisbourg is a compact society, yielding through court records an easily managed and egalitarian case study in comprehensive social history. For example, through research into court records an extensive and convincing profile of the life of a typical servant or black slave in an upper middle class home can be developed, which provides the basis for portrayal of such people in the park's costumed animation programme.
Biographical and Church Records

For military personnel, especially officers, and some of the equally prominent members of civilian society, biographical records exist to supplement court records in the study of these prominent social groups. The personal dossiers of all of the chief military engineers and many other officers have survived, usually in the form of documentation for promotions and retirements. As with the main categories of military and official correspondence, these records expose some important and many unimportant issues in colonial affairs and they illuminate friendships and rivalries in colonial leadership. Through study of all categories of evidence it becomes obvious that in most years of the French colony's history there was a constant struggle for authority and social standing between the military governor and the chief administrative official, known as the commissaire-ordonnateur. So much is revealed about the authorities, public involvements and practices of these individuals that a relatively clear picture of their private households and personal daily lives begins to emerge. The grand residences and working quarters of both officials have been included in the reconstruction, two very large and complex buildings, parts of which have been interpreted to the public as they are presumed to have been in the summer of 1744 when the sickly Jean Baptiste Duquesnel was governor and the ambitious and autocratic Francois Bigot was financial commissary. As with some of the well documented public buildings reconstructed early in the project's research and development phase, there is very little guesswork in the historical information on these gentlemen as they were later presented to the public.

The same categories of official and military sources and court records, also provide reliable biographical information on the large

20 Archives des Colonies, Serie E, Dossiers Personnels, 1638-1791.
group of merchants, mariners and officers at Louisbourg who were involved in trading operations, particularly when such records are supplemented by shipping registers and commodity lists. More important, however, than the sometimes fragmentary information on the ships and cargoes of individual entrepreneurs is the overall sense they convey of the maritime flavour of the community. Without such records on the port of Louisbourg and the even more profuse records on the principal western and southwestern ports of France it would be easy - and inaccurate - to conceptualize Louisbourg merely as a military post where two important colonial battles were fought; a theme that dominated the Canadian historiography of Louisbourg and Isle Royale before the reconstruction project began. Study of the wealth of data on extensive private trade and the associated international cod fishery quickly leads to a more accurate perception of Louisbourg as a thriving Atlantic port fortified for economic and not strictly strategic reasons. This research has produced a change in thinking that has profoundly influenced the interpretation of Louisbourg to the public in recent years. It is important to emphasize here that the extent and significance of non-military records that have survived in French, British and even some North American repositories leads directly to this fundamental change in perception by historians and ultimately by the public.

Church records have also been invaluable for biography and social history in general. The parish records for all but the first nine

---

21 Archives des Colonies, Serie F1A, Fonds des colonies; Serie FZA, Compagnie de commerce and Archives Charente-Maritime (La Rochelle), Registres et liasses, Louisbourg Admiralty Court.

22 There are several bibliographies on Louisbourg available in the project library. A graduate paper prepared at the University of Ottawa by Christopher Moore is probably the best. The bias toward military events is most evident in Francis Parkman, Half Century of Conflict, Boston, Little, Brown, 1892, Vol. 2.
48 years of the colony's existence have survived. Their information yield goes beyond substantiating the importance of religion in Louisbourg society or revealing the beliefs, rituals and practices for births, weddings and funerals. Studies of kinship, social relations, literacy levels, sexuality and illegitimacy levels, infant mortality, occupation patterns, transience, the effects of climate, incidence of disease, and of prevailing medical practices are supported by statistics and correlative analysis of population patterns from parish records. These records have been thoroughly indexed because they are the starting point for the biographical study of individuals and families within the reconstructed area. Two examples, one specific and one general, indicate the importance of these sources for museum and historic site programmes.

The first example concerns two Louisbourg families related by marriage, the Lartigues and Rodrigues. Joseph Lartigue was a merchant and judge and one of the first civilians appointed to the governing council of the colony, the Superior Council. Michel Rodrigue, a merchant at Louisbourg, married one of Lartigue's daughters. Both Lartigue and Rodrigue had large, extended families and originally lived in houses within what was later to become the reconstruction area of the Louisbourg project. By 1744 Lartigue's family numbered 19, while Rodrigue's totaled at least 12. The precise size of each house is known from historical and archaeological evidence and in Lartigue's case it is known that court sessions were regularly held at his residence on the Louisbourg waterfront. Crowded conditions definitely prevailed in both residences, which suggests full use of all space, probably temporary partition walls,

23 A.F.O., Serie G1, Registres de l'état civil, recensements et divers documents, 1721-1784.
collapsible furniture and limited storage. These have been important considerations in the reconstruction and interpretation of both properties.

The second and more general example is the pattern of intermarriage between officers and wealthy merchant families. Though most apparent in the parish records, the pattern is also clear from court records and official correspondence. More is known about the senior officers and in a general sense all officers, because of the extent of military records, allowing the reconstructed homes of the military to serve as a reference point for the material culture and lifestyle of the equivalent civilian elite. This pattern can also suggest appropriate social encounters between civilian and military personnel that can be depicted in exhibits, publications, and in animation scenarios to bring out the true nature of Louisbourg society. In other words, it serves to reinforce the blend of military and civilian influences in Louisbourg society and to discredit any contention that one group either dominated or excluded the other.

Contemporary Published Sources

The above categories of primary source material provide the principal basis for the reconstruction and interpretation of historic Louisbourg to the public. Published sources have also been invaluable, especially contemporary books, treatises, letters and journals that have been grouped in what the project archives refers to as the rare book collection. Appropriately, the first entry in the collection catalogue is the Diderot "Encyclopédie, ou Dictionnaire raisonnable des science, des arts et des metiers, par une societe de gens des lettres." It has, if anything, been over-utilized by project staff because it contains a wealth of technical information that is relevant only in a general sense to eighteenth century Louisbourg. As a

25 Krause, Eric R., A List of Rare Books, September 1977, Ms. on file, Fortress of Louisbourg.
substitute for original sources, it can be misleading, but as a general
guide to the science, technologies and crafts of the eighteenth
century it is exceptionally rewarding. Used as a supplement to the
primary historical documentation and archaeological evidence it is an
invaluable source of information for reconstruction design. Designs
of building features and furnishings have sometimes been based
directly on Diderot data when original Louisbourg sources have not
been available. It has been the standard reference work for all
technical research in architecture, material culture, and crafts at the
Louisbourg project.26

Numerous additional entries in the rare book collection provide
references to practices in military architecture and engineering, in
French cuisine and etiquette, and for many military procedures and
regulations. Published military codes and treatises have been
particularly useful in the study of garrison routine and inherent
attempts to control the civilian population.27 Several acquisitions
would be prized by many museums; for example, the handwritten
manuscript prepared circa 1737 to document Vauban's "Traite de
fortifications" in three volumes, complete with watercoloured plans,
profiles, and drawings.28 It was purchased for exhibition and not for
research purposes, since there are many reliable published works on
the Vauban system of fortification and also a wealth of primary and
published cartographic and documentary evidence on the Louisbourg
adaptation of the classic bastioned trace. Many other eighteenth
century books have also been purchased exclusively for display in

26 Denis Diderot, Encyclopédie ... lettres, Paris, Briasson, Plates (11 volumes)
1762-72; Text (17 volumes) 1751-65.

27 Three examples will suffice: Blondel, Cours d'architecture..., Paris, Desoit,
1771; Menon, La Cuisinière bourgeoise..., Bruxelles, 1772; Ordonnance du Roy
sur l'exercice de l'infanterie, Paris, 1755. There are approximately 150 titles in
the collection.

furnished homes and offices within the reconstruction area, but these are generally of limited value for research purposes.

Two contemporary written accounts of sojourns in Louisbourg were published: Thomas Pichon's written in 1758 and published in 1760, and an anonymous "Letter of an Inhabitant" written in 1745 and published with a translation in 1897. Pichon's book is generally accurate, but contains nothing new in its descriptions of Louisbourg and the rest of Ile Royale. Its value lies in its analysis of personalities and their reaction to events, not in the author's rather subjective reports on those events, for Pichon was a spy for the English. It is a good source, nevertheless, to convey the wartime mentality of Louisbourg people. Underlying Pichon's version of a series of events is an indication of how the lives of ordinary people are affected by the attitudes and decisions of their leaders.

The anonymous letter is more specific chronologically, focusing on Louisbourg in 1745, and for that reason even more useful to the Louisbourg project than Pichon’s work in describing the impact of a colonial war on a mid-eighteenth century community. Both accounts must be used in conjunction with primary source material, but the flesh they add to official accounts helps to start the process of inquiry on what the people of Louisbourg were thinking about, their ambitions and, in these two accounts, their apprehensions.

Eighteenth century French and English literature provides some of the best sources to support an analysis of the likely behavior and psychology of Louisbourg people and how they lived. The project library has not confined its holdings to academic and technical

---
literature. In acquiring source material the purchasing policy was set in wider parameters. From Rousseau to Voltaire on politics to Montesquieu, Marivaux and Fielding on society, the benefits to be gained from reading contemporary scholarship and fictional novels were recognized. Over the past three decades the Louisbourg project, as with any well financed and professionally directed museum, has accumulated as much relevant secondary source material as staff could locate, and this published literature has been in regular use since the research staff, archives and library were finally moved to Louisbourg in their entirety in 1968.

The extensive effort to gather source material, the teamwork developed in the use of historical evidence, and the combined study of literary and non-literary source material, were the most important characteristics of the first 20 years of historical research by Louisbourg staff. It has not filled our library shelves with scholarly insights and readable historical writing, but it has made a major contribution to the development of Canada's most ambitious outdoor museum and historic site.
Chapter 2

Project Planning 1961-1973

Earlier it was indicated that a long-term historical research programme could not be planned in detail "until overall project planning advanced to a clearer definition of objectives to which research could respond."¹ This chapter will investigate that planning process, including the contributions made by research staff and the mechanisms developed to coordinate the process within the National Parks Branch (later known as Parks Canada). To properly evaluate this process it is necessary to outline at least the financial context for work at Louisbourg from 1961 to 1964.

Financial Context

On March 3, 1961 three proposals were submitted to the Cabinet of the Federal Government of Canada in Ottawa for the restoration of the Fortress, "roughly estimated to cost six, twelve and eighteen million dollars respectively." The Cabinet approved a "crash" programme of one million dollars to be spent by March 31, 1962.² Construction started on July 1, 1961, just two weeks after details of a major restoration project at Louisbourg were announced in the House of Commons. The Cabinet also approved an additional twelve million dollars over a period of "about twelve years". Capital

¹ See above, p. 19.

² Excerpts from Minister's Handbook, September 1963, in Fortress of Louisbourg Archives, project file 53-1, special progress report, unpaged.
expenditures (excludes operating and maintenance costs) of one and a half million dollars were planned for each fiscal year up to and including 1965-66, with $1,670,000 allotted for 1966-67. The Cabinet further stipulated that "a fairly spectacular showing" must be made by July 1, 1967, "the date of Canada's centennial as a nation."

This budget and its inherent annual schedule immediately placed the Louisbourg project into the mainstream of major growth in Canada's cultural institutions in the years preceding and following centennial celebrations in 1967. The spectacular showing was to coincide with the World's Fair at Montreal, Expo '67: Man and His World, which stimulated museum growth in Canada as did similar world fairs elsewhere in the United States and in European countries since the late nineteenth century. Canada's maturity as a nation of three peoples, English, French, and native Indian was often emphasized by Progressive Conservative and Liberal Governments and their bureaucrats throughout this period. The Louisbourg project benefited financially from this political and social climate and from the continuing difficulties in the Cape Breton economy, but the funds were approved before an acceptable planning process for research and development was even attempted.

Financial allotments between 1961 and 1967 increased steadily with the addition of winter works projects and a growing operating and maintenance budget. This pattern continued after the official opening of the King's Bastion to the public in 1967. A recent review of total expenditures (capital and operating and maintenance) on the Louisbourg project from 1961-1985 produced an overall estimate of

---

approximately $75,000,000. The principal points to be made here are that the project was already a well funded, complex reconstruction by 1964 and that it remained so throughout the period of this study of research and development at Louisbourg, a status which has continued since that time. (The current overall annual budget at the Fortress of Louisbourg National Historic Site is approximately six million dollars.) Employment figures further illustrate the rapid growth and major scope of the project in its early years.

Table I

Employment Figures 1961-1964,
(Taken From Report on Progress, June 19, 1964, Appendix F)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Total Strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 15, 1961</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 15, 1961</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 13, 1961</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 30, 1962</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May, 1962</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June, 1963</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 15, 1964</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Serious scheduling problems began to develop early, particularly in the provision of research data to engineering and architectural design staff. These problems persisted throughout the first decade of research and reconstruction, but they were particularly acute in the early and mid 1960s when the research staffs worked in separate locations; Archaeological research took place in Louisbourg and Historical research in Ottawa. The Engineering and Architecture staff were also dispersed - though not to the same extent - because all reconstruction drawings had to be approved by the National Parks Branch in Ottawa after they had been reviewed by the General Consultant, Ronald Way. He spent most of his time in Ontario after the project staff became established in Louisbourg and Ottawa in 1962 and 1963. Way also served as Research Director during this period and was the principal focus of responsibility in attempts to coordinate research and design.

Everyone, especially the large professional staff in the disciplines of Archaeology, Architecture, Engineering and Historical Research, was under pressure to produce significant results at Louisbourg because the project had already attained a high profile within the National Parks Branch and with the Canadian public.

On the local level the project was already a major employer and tourist attraction with economic and cultural potential that was conspicuously high. The challenge to coordinate the various professional disciplines and to apply their results in construction activity was apparent and vexing. By 1963 the problem became serious enough to require a special report on the progress of the reconstruction. The report and the exchange of correspondence preceding it consistently cited research delays as a serious problem. The investigation effort was carried out primarily by Engineers in senior positions at Louisbourg, in consultation with their disciplinary
counterparts in the Halifax, Nova Scotia regional office of the National Parks Branch.

There was an underlying assumption on the part of senior managers, decision makers and even policy analysts in the Parks Branch that Engineers could schedule everything, probably because many of them were former Engineers. This assumption exacerbated what would have been a serious problem anyway, as engineers and their staff contrived work schedules, charts, internal progress reports and budget submissions almost in isolation and abstraction, with no knowledge of historical and archaeological method and little regard for contingency planning outside their own discipline. The early correspondence reveals that the project Engineers delayed the point at which a full recognition and appreciation of the affinity of disciplines and occupational groups could develop.

The special progress report was initially requested on a priority basis in September 1963, by the Director of the National Parks Branch, J.R.B. Coleman. In November instructions were issued by the Project Manager, A.D. Perry, an Engineer, to project staff to report only on work completed. By this time consultants and contractors were very much involved in the reconstruction, however, which probably explains why the report was "not completed or forwarded to Ottawa." The request for a progress report was reinforced in March, 1964 by the Cabinet Minister responsible for the National Parks Branch, Arthur Laing. In a memorandum from Laing's executive assistant to the Deputy Minister, E.A. Cote, the financial context was emphasized: "The Minister would like to have

---

4 Coleman to Perry, Sept. 9, 1963, in Fortress of Louisbourg Archives, project file 53-1, special project report, unpaged.


6 Ibid., handwritten notation on memorandum, Perry to Lunn, Thorpe, Vachon, n.d.
an up-to-date report on progress in Louisbourg with particular emphasis on whether we are getting full value for the money being spent." The resulting progress report was both a chronicle of problems encountered and a record of impressive accomplishments over the three year period from 1961-64. The historical research component of the report addressed the obvious problem of having too little time to conduct general studies of the fortress area and was defensive about research results described as "by-products to assist certain aspects of restoration." Included in the report of work completed, however, was the copying, accessioning, classification and cataloguing of the historical maps and plans; the most important archival source for the archaeological and reconstruction work. Historical research staff organized this collection for use by the other disciplines at Louisbourg and ultimately for use by interested members of the public. Neglecting to organize this collection for use by researchers unfamiliar with historical documentation would have caused more delay in archaeological and reconstruction schedules, thereby lowering the quality and accuracy of the work that had to be completed. Organization of the maps and plans and the further gathering of documentary source material were the most important contributions that the historical research staff could make at this

7 Ibid., Gibson to Cote, March 4, 1964.
8 Ibid., Coleman to Way, copy to Perry, March 12, 1964.
early stage to the collective process of initiating a quality reconstruction over the long term. This early effort to study, analyze and interpret the available historical documentation for use by historians and by those trained in other disciplines constituted the first stage in a multi-disciplinary approach to reconstruction research and design, a sophisticated process that endured for more than two decades and was carried forward in the operational phase of the Louisbourg project. Edward Larabee, Senior Archaeologist at Louisbourg during most of the period covered in the progress report, wrote in a 1971 article on Archaeological research at Louisbourg, 1961-65:

This was part of a larger research program in which we were trying to bring archaeological and historical studies into proper sequence. An ordered dialogue between the disciplines would present the evidence and draw the conclusions for an accurate reconstruction of the Citadel, and would record all the steps by which this reconstruction had been reached.  

"An ordered dialogue between the disciplines": an excellent phrase that sums up the essence of an informal planning and development process that was enlarged and improved after 1964 in a formal committee system to facilitate the dialogue between the research disciplines and the closely allied disciplines of architecture and engineering; a concerted attempt to give more weight to historical and archaeological evidence than to any one discipline's interpretation of that evidence.

One of the major conclusions of the 1964 progress report respecting research was that the staff had to be increased. Close study of the rationale for that conclusion reveals that the author, Ronald Way, was concerned about the capability of existing staff and the prospects for recruitment of additional staff, particularly in historical research. He referred to the "lack of capable staff" and to the failure of "numerous recruiting campaigns over the past two years... to yield acceptable candidates which would have suitable academic qualifications to undertake the work we require at Louisbourg." Later in the report he refers obliquely to an attitude toward research methods and their results on the part of some historians that Way and his senior counterparts in other disciplines found unacceptable. The report raised early in the project's development an important issue in the relationship between historical research and heritage preservation in general and in research methodology at Louisbourg:

Admittedly, the Research Section has been forced to produce reports in a manner which is unusual to their profession, and possibly to their professional ethics, simply because the implementation of this Project on a crash basis demanded this cooperation.... However, an overall appreciation of the Project in general has shown that these demands have proven fruitful and we actually have some restoration for the viewing public.11

The issue was cooperation, in the form of the "dialogue between disciplines" referred to by Larabee. By training and - Way would later argue - by disposition academic historians were accustomed to working on their own or with other historians, rarely

with representatives of other disciplines. Way had long since forsaken university work. With long experience as a practitioner in the field of historic restoration he was used to working with technically oriented professionals and instinctively he knew the kind of detailed information they needed to get on with their job. Many historians did not appreciate this requirement. Most Canadian university history departments were not then interested in public or popular history and they largely ignored the historic preservation movement. Consequently many of their graduates were not prepared for the special demands of the Louisbourg project.

Ronald Way was not alone in expressing these concerns. In October, 1963 the Park Superintendent at Louisbourg, John Lunn, submitted a report on Interpretation at the Fortress of Louisbourg to the Project Manager, Dave Perry. It outlined an ambitious range of programmes, emphasizing the need for research input to implement them. "I am well aware that the major difficulty lies in the exceedingly complex analytical problems that face the Director of Research and his staff." In a supplement to the report Lunn called for research on an urgent basis into such subjects as furniture, textiles, glass, pottery, ceramics and small metal work. He then offered this general comment: "I sometimes think that there is too great a tendency on this project to regard research as ancillary to what is thought of as an engineering matter." He requested the addition of one historian to his staff as a key position in ensuring progress in the interpretive field. "For want of a better word, I have described him as an historian, but the position could perhaps be described with greater accuracy as a Researcher... his main function


will be to do research in those areas that the Research section is clearly not ready to explore itself at this stage of the project.  

Both Way and Lunn raised the issue of how the results of research were presented and utilized, a topic discussed above in chapter one. Already the project's development had reached the point where research contributions to other disciplines and to the planning process were more important than academic reports or scholarly articles in historical publications. By 1965, urgent demands for historical information began to come from these expanded interpretation programmes and increased reconstruction activity, adding to the pressure on the Ottawa research staff to produce specialized reports, to provide access to research collections and to contribute to long-range planning. Once again Ronald Way was asked for a special report:

Since research is the base for restoration, furnishings and interpretation, it is therefore, at present, impossible to adequately plan the reconstruction and interpretation developments and it is necessary that the Department be advised on this serious problem while at the same time giving our recommendations on how this can be improved.

One month later Ronald Way submitted a prescient memorandum to the project manager acknowledging that the picture

---

14 Ibid., p. 7.
15 See above, chapter 1.
16 Lunn to Perry, Sept. 20, 1965, Fortress of Louisbourg Archives, project file S3-3.
concerning research was "a most unhappy one, filled with diverse dissatisfied persons." Quoting Marcus Aurelius that "no man willfully misses truth", Way initially praised his research staff and then focused on the central problem, the dissonance occurring among the disciplines working on the Louisbourg project. "Their day to day performance of their duties makes clear that their loyalties to their "disciplines" transcends all other loyalties."

Research and Development

The lengthy document gave an overview of construction and interpretation projects delayed because of a lack of historical and archaeological information and sympathized with the claims by research staff that insufficient time was available and that research must control the pace of the project. Related issues were raised such as the recruitment and training of research staff, how information was to be conveyed to engineering and architectural staff and the role of each discipline in the overall effort.\(^\text{18}\) Two of its principal recommendations were eventually followed, which significantly altered both the pace and the nature of the research and reconstruction effort and ultimately the quality of its presentation to the public. Before they are discussed in detail, however, the Louisbourg project has to be placed in the broader context of the Parks Canada system in 1965.

Although the system was decentralized with its natural parks and historic sites and monuments growing in every region of the country, a strong headquarters office in Ottawa exerted the determining influence on the establishment of new parks and sites and the preservation, growth and renewal of existing ones. The national museums by this time were firmly rooted in the capital city and national cultural agencies such as the Canada Council flourished.

in Ottawa with a highly centralized bureaucracy and increased funding. That pattern continued under Liberal governments during and after the 1967 centennial under Prime Ministers Lester Pearson and later Pierre Trudeau, who visited Louisbourg in 1971. The decade between 1965 and 1975 was one of unprecedented expansion for national cultural agencies such as Parks Canada and Louisbourg was a significant part of that process. But the major policy decisions were made in Ottawa, particularly in the areas of research and planning.

Not surprisingly the Research Division of Parks Canada was located in Ottawa and worked closely with the other divisions of the Parks Branch. The regional office in Halifax, Nova Scotia was largely administrative and only senior management participated in major decisions at this time, with no staff or major responsibilities in the functional areas such as research. Louisbourg because of its size and scope after 1961 had its own research staff, but they were also located in Ottawa. Archaeological excavations in Louisbourg, for example, were closely integrated with the Research Division in Ottawa and source gathering by historians was directed by the Research Division and coordinated with the National Archives in Ottawa. Project staff and consultants such as Ronald Way traveled extensively and attempted to coordinate the disparate functions, but it was often a frustrating effort as the Way memorandum and other correspondence from this period reveals. The challenge was not just to bring "disciplines" together but to do so in an integrated functional and administrative setting while retaining central control in Ottawa.

Although mature and experienced in the establishment and operation of large national parks such as Banff, Alberta and Cape Breton Highlands in Nova Scotia, Parks Canada had to face the

19 Cape Breton Post, August 2 and 3. 1971, as copied for scrapbook #4, Fortress of Louisbourg Archives.
Louisbourg problem largely as an experiment, and without sufficient
time to plan in a methodical and sophisticated manner. The research
and resource management efforts required for natural parks were
very different from what needed to be applied to historical resources
such as surviving buildings and archaeological remains. There were
few successful models to follow in 1965. Small outdoor museums in
Canada and larger outdoor museums and historic villages in the
United States and Europe were not developed on their original site
and consequently did not have the same requirement for historical
and especially archaeological research. The restoration and
reconstruction of Colonial Williamsburg, capital of Virginia and
contemporary to Louisbourg in historical terms, had been underway
since the late 1930s, and like most American cultural institutions
was financed and operated by the private sector. The United States
Park Service was an invaluable model in many respects for natural
parks in Canada, but that service did not have or intend to acquire
historic sites as large and as complex as Louisbourg. Parks Canada
already had in addition to Louisbourg, extensive historical resources
in Quebec City and Halifax and a growing network of large and
significant military and fur trading posts throughout the country that
were threatened by human growth and natural deterioration. Much
had to be learned at Louisbourg for the benefit of the whole
Canadian system.

The human and financial resources were available for this
effort but they had to be brought together more effectively for the
Louisbourg project and eventually for the entire system of Canadian
historic parks and sites. The major problems centred on research and
planning, and the progress made at Louisbourg deserves to be
studied closely as a case study of how a large heritage agency such as
Parks Canada responds to an individual and exceptional problem
while attempting to maintain the integrity and growth of an
expanding national system.
The scheduling difficulties encountered in design and reconstruction activity at Louisbourg were resolved as more experienced engineering and architectural staff began to work cooperatively with research staff, a process which will be outlined below and fully elaborated in chapter three, but the conflicts to be resolved for the interpretation programmes at Louisbourg were greater and would require a special effort, one that eventually became the model Canada lacked in such undertakings. Study of these efforts and comparison of them with another major Parks Canada planning process a decade later for historic sites in Halifax form the subject matter for the remainder of this chapter. In both cases people were brought together at the original site, not just in Ottawa headquarters, and remarkable progress was made. In the process Louisbourg became a training ground for the entire system of historic parks and sites in Canada and a monument to the frustrations and ultimately the growth and maturity of the national preservation, interpretation and public history movement.

The immediate problem in 1965 was not interpretation planning or overall systems planning. The problem was getting research information to engineers and architects who could, in theory, use it in design and reconstruction. In his memorandum Ronald Way at first favoured handing the raw data to engineers and architects, and this passage needs to be quoted in full in order to reach an understanding of a later qualification that proved to be vital to the nature and progress of work at Louisbourg:

My preference would be to feed the required information to engineers and architects in the form of annotated excerpts direct from the manuscript and archaeological sources. In the case of historical evidence, these direct references could be expediously assembled if we were to employ the system of transferring all information to cross-referenced
The issue inherent in this debate was methodological. Who was to consult and just as importantly who was to interpret the original source material? The historians and archaeologists were determined to protect their disciplinary prerogatives and were equally adamant that proper training and education were necessary in order to work competently with original source material. Both were reluctant to submit data to colleagues without being part of its analysis and interpretation. Ronald Way qualified his recommendation by proposing that "a committee including the construction engineers, the architects and the researchers should meet to discuss and project the information." The key element in this recommendation was the participation of research staff in the design process, later formalized as the Structural Design Committee, which eventually led to their participation in all phases of the design, reconstruction and interpretation activity for the project, including planning.

A second major recommendation in the memorandum concerned the location of the historians in Ottawa, which "can no longer be justified...their disassociation with the realities of the restoration has tended to encourage their predilection to a purely academic approach." Way strongly recommended the transfer of the research staff and relocation of the archives and library to Louisbourg, which was done between 1966 and 1968, after his recommendations were approved by the Director of the National Parks Branch.21 This brought together in one location the various

21 Malis to Cote, October 22, 1965, Fortress of Louisbourg Archives, project file 53-1, p.3-4.
disciplines working on the Louisbourg project and produced a "critical mass" that would benefit Louisbourg and Parks Canada in general in the years of expansion that followed.

Research staff were relocated at a time when the Louisbourg project was entering a different phase of development. Despite the many difficulties, significant progress had been made in design and reconstruction and major areas of the King's Bastion were open to the public, which increased interest in the reconstruction effort and focused attention on the need to interpret even more of Louisbourg's history and its reconstruction. After 1965 Louisbourg staff were faced with simultaneously building and interpreting the historic site to increasing numbers of visitors for six months of the year, May to October, and to interested members of the museum and historic site community all year long. As Louisbourg achieved a higher profile in the museum and heritage preservation movement, encouraged by the promotional efforts of senior staff and the media impact of such a large undertaking, pressure increased to show results on a year by year basis and to justify expenditures within Parks Canada and to politicians, media and to the general public. As much as some staff wanted to work unfettered by these demands they could not do so under the changed circumstances at the Louisbourg project without becoming isolated and ineffectual. This was particularly true for research staff, which was reflected in a very high turnover rate in the decade following relocation to Louisbourg.22

Archaeological and historical research had to adjust to these new requirements while continuing to provide information for the

reconstruction of properties. Relocation to Louisbourg was an advantage for both the reconstruction effort and in the preparation of major displays on the process itself, because the source material and the people who knew it best were now available to the project's interpretation specialists as well as to the reconstruction staff. Two large and popular displays in the King's Bastion demonstrated the new opportunities presented by the relocation and by the gradual shift in emphasis in the research programme.

A display on the first floor of the barracks of the King's Bastion incorporated numerous archaeological artifacts to explain to the visiting public the basis for the reconstruction surrounding them. One of the principal display techniques was to place the artifact from the excavations in the background of a display case with a full-scale reproduction in the foreground. Representative artifacts were readily available from the research collections and reproductions of such objects as cut stones and building hardware were routinely made in Louisbourg shops for use in the reconstruction. Research that had been conducted for reconstruction design was applied directly, simply and effectively in this particular attempt to explain the extensive Louisbourg construction activity to the public and to bring together all of the elements necessary for a successful display, especially the research collections and expert knowledge of them, which were readily and locally available. Throughout the months from May to October visitors could see archaeological excavation underway at various locations within the reconstruction and most of them became as interested in the research and reconstruction process as they were in the original history of the fortress and town. Such displays were able to satisfy this curiosity without seriously disrupting research and reconstruction activity, but the necessity of interpreting Louisbourg's history and its reconstruction to the public was becoming a further distraction from pure and applied research and sustained, focused development.
Another display, the refurnished Governor's Apartment in the King's Bastion barracks, indicated the changing applications for historical research and the pressing need to plan interpretation activity throughout the project. A decision was made to furnish the apartment to the year 1744, just prior to the first siege and bombardment. The Louisbourg Governor, Jean Baptiste DuQuesnel, died in October of that year and a detailed estate inventory provided the basis for furnishing the apartment. The period display was one of the first attempts to interpret Louisbourg interiors, proving to be just as complicated as exterior reconstruction and requiring a similar array of specialized information and staff. It was also one of the first displays to fit into an overall scheme for the interpretation of the site and as such it set precedents and standards for the planning and development of properties elsewhere. It will be studied closely in this chapter to illustrate the changing patterns in research and development at Louisbourg and to explain why interpretation planning became so important, who was assigned the task and how it was carried out.

Although the building was well documented and historical and archaeological research on exterior and interior features was extensive, not all questions with respect to interior partitions, room location and use could be answered definitively with the evidence available. As with any building interior, arrangements evolved through time and even the choice of a specific date and association with one person's household, however well documented, did not ensure precise information on the many details to be included in an authentic representation of the apartment. Just as accuracy was paramount in the reconstruction of building exteriors, so too was authenticity in the furnishing and portrayal of interiors; again scheduling became critical. The public could not be left to wait indefinitely while research proceeded and curators acquired collections. Additional questions such as traffic flow, visitor safety, security and appropriateness of new interpretation media had to be
addressed before designers and other interpretation specialists could begin their work.

In 1963 the Park Superintendent, John Lunn, had requested the addition of an historian to his staff in Louisbourg. At that time the research staff as well as the engineering, design and construction staff reported to a Project Manager and worked in various locations, but they were not directly responsible to the Park Superintendent who was in charge of all other operations at Louisbourg, including interpretation, so the request was reasonable in that context. It also underlined the need to bolster the interpretation effort. The gradual relocation of the research staff and project research files to Louisbourg and the subsequent consolidation of all Louisbourg staff under the direction and authority of the Park Superintendent eliminated the need for a separate research effort, and also made more expertise and resources available for interpretation projects. John Lunn, who remained Park Superintendent until 1975, had an extensive background in museum interpretation, was a competent researcher, writer and administrator in his own right and was determined to bring the disparate elements together for an international preservation showpiece at Louisbourg. Earlier in his career as a British museologist he had visited and studied Skansen in Stockholm, including its costumed animation, and many of the other folk and outdoor museums of Scandanavia and eastern Europe. As a curator at the Royal Ontario Museum he was also familiar with traditional and modern exhibition and interpretation techniques at the major museums and historic sites of Europe and North America, including Colonial Williamsburg.


24 As a member of John Lunn's research staff from 1973-75 I was part of many discussions of his travels and his museum philosophy and practices at Louisbourg, also at later conferences and personal encounters. In August of
Lunn was also a brilliant communicator, having been selected for numerous public speaking engagements in Canada and abroad and ultimately for the prestigious Canada Club speaking circuit. At Louisbourg he was given the opportunity and the resources for a major effort, but not a lot of time. Progress at Louisbourg between 1965 and 1975 was largely due to his leadership and the methods chosen to get the job done. The Governor's Apartment was a microcosm of how he operated.

Among the keys to Lunn's success were his close personal involvement in virtually every facet of the Louisbourg project and the encouragement he gave to all staff, not just archaeologists and historians, to conduct research and become generally informed about Louisbourg's history. The requirements for the Governor's apartment were typical of what would face project staff over the next twenty years in developing period displays within the guidelines set in the original cabinet minutes, principally to provide a realistic representation of eighteenth-century material culture. The biggest and most immediate problem facing interpretation staff was the absence of furniture and furnishings appropriate to the 1740's period that was to be depicted in this particular and in other display environments. After the abandonment of the fortress and town in the 1760's the contents of buildings were either removed or destroyed and very little that survived into the middle of this century could be traced back directly to the colonial town.

The Governor's apartment was only one of many large display environments that would require a major curatorial effort after 1965 to provide the material necessary for a convincing representation of eighteenth-century life, specifically its material culture. By the mid-1960's the project was accustomed to engaging consultants for work that was beyond the capacity of staff in Louisbourg or elsewhere in 1993 I interviewed Lunn over a period of several days as part of the revision stage of this thesis.
Parks Canada, for example the architectural firm of Calvert and Associates for exterior work on the King's Bastion. For specialized curatorial services for interior work on the Governor's apartment and elsewhere in the reconstruction, Lunn engaged another consultant, Jean Palardy. He was a widely acknowledged antiquarian and expert on eighteenth-century furniture in Quebec and France and a close associate of Lunn's. This began a long association between Palardy and the Louisbourg project that was indispensable in building up the collections needed over the next twenty years of outdoor museum and historic site development.

Lunn and Palardy collaborated to complete the furnishing and interpretation of the Governor's Apartment in haste and with the assistance of project staff. The collections were acquired in France where Palardy worked as a collector and dealer for much of the year and in Quebec where he had worked for many years in association with other collectors and dealers as well as skilled artisans who could reproduce what could not be obtained on the antique market. For the governor's apartment he chose curatorial methods that would characterize the Louisbourg project for years to come, principally in the combined use of original and reproduction furniture and furnishings, the eclectic and sometimes impulsive purchasing of large and small private collections and the minimal documentation accompanying many acquisitions.

Palardy and another researcher, Yvette Theriault, studied primary documents concerning furniture and furnishings in the Kings Bastion and produced reports consisting mainly of notations on source material. These sources, such as the Duquesnel estate

25 Fortress of Louisbourg Archives, Ms. by Sandra Ferguson, General Notes on Project Files, 1985, p. 10.

26 Palardy, Jean. Research in France concerning the furnishings of Chateau St. Louis, Louisbourg, Ms. on file, Fortress of Louisbourg Archives, file # AJ-24 and 25, Sept. 1964; Theriault, Yvette. Occupation - Destination - Ameublement
inventory, were used to compile acquisition lists for the purchase and reproduction of objects in 1965, although a comprehensive report on the construction and occupation of the King's Bastion was not completed until 1971. In the interim Palarady relied on his own knowledge and experience and that of his associates to assemble a typological collection representative of the middle of the eighteenth century and earlier, for use in specific displays and for later use as period displays expanded. His work bridged the gap between research information and interpretation by accumulating collections while early planning efforts were underway. Two factors made this possible: the nature and extent of information available on the King's Bastion and the decision to focus the interpretation on the period just prior to the siege of 1745.

The Governor's wing of the King's Bastion was one of the most prominent and well documented buildings in the colony. In addition to the Governor's official residence it contained the garrison chapel, which served as the parish church, the meeting chambers for the governing council and accommodation for junior officers. Numerous official functions took place there and were the subject of official correspondence. As the focal point for military, religious, legal and social activity the wing provided an excellent opportunity to interpret a major cross-section of colonial life, juxtaposed to the simplicity and squalor of the soldiers' barracks in the north wing of the same building. There was no question that the Governor's Wing would be furnished to period, even if there was no estate inventory, and that decision did not require a formal planning process. The choice of 1744-45 as the period for furnishing and interpretation
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du Chateau St. Louis, Louisbourg, Ms. on file, Fortress of Louisbourg Archives, 1965.

was equally obvious since the building exterior was reconstructed to that period. Without a formal planning process the project was nevertheless able to establish workable basic parameters on the foundation of earlier research and development decisions, which allowed interpretation work on the King's bastion to proceed.

While Jean Palardy acquired collections, John Lunn and his staff in interpretation and construction prepared the building for displays. The interpretation methods chosen made good use of current information technology without seriously compromising the period appearance of the building interior, thereby setting an important precedent for future displays. The use of audio tapes on telephone sets obviated the need for written texts and graphic panels which would have been more intrusive. Traffic barriers were constructed of solid pine with period finish and clear plexiglas inserts. This combination of historic and modern materials controlled visitor traffic without overwhelming or seriously distracting from the period decor, and allowed inclusion of display objects that otherwise would be unacceptably subject to damage or theft. The optional audio tapes carried an interesting selection of the wealth of historical information available without confusing or delaying visitors against their will; again without major visual distraction from the collections on display.

John Lunn approved all audio scripts and used his own voice on some of the tapes. He worked closely with Palardy, construction staff and all interpretation technicians in what must have been a labor of love. The result was an effective and popular display that has endured with few changes for more than two decades. As the first major display of a period interior it set important precedents in the use of current information and exhibition technology, in traffic flow and security standards and especially in its respect for the period environment. Despite some conjecture on room location and function, interior arrangements followed the documentation and were accurate
in an overall sense. The collections were impressive and convincing to the public, although inclusion of contemporary Louis XV styles in a colonial context at this precise time was rightly challenged by historians and curators. It was an otherwise excellent beginning and a welcome contrast to a visiting public overwhelmed by the ever-expanding building exteriors in the country's largest historical reconstruction.

Already, the decision to focus on the year prior to the 1745 siege imposed a major and for many a convenient constraint on project planning and development, but one that imposed a character on the reconstruction that does not seem to have been fully debated. The context for Louis XV furniture styles at Louisbourg would have been less questionable a mere decade later because French residents then returning to Louisbourg after at least a four year hiatus in France would be much more likely to bring new and recent furniture and furnishings with them. The early decision in favour of a pre-1745 representation of the historic site gave focus to the physical reconstruction and tied it to a truly significant though artificially precise era, but it denied to the public visual evidence of the equally significant eras of the New England occupation and the second French occupation of the 1750s. Although some of the interpretation programmes have attempted to blend all of the decades of Louisbourg's colonial history in an evolutionary presentation, the actual reconstruction and to a large extent the costumed animation activities - the programmes with the highest development priority, tourism profile and visitor appeal - have been locked into an incredibly narrow slice of history.

The project correspondence and planning documents routinely refer to this major decision as a given that seems rarely to have been questioned, yet this is the very sort of selection process that is critical to all museum and historic site work. There is evidence that serious consideration was given to a more scattered reconstruction,
one that would have 'selected' for research and development a series of substantial and impressive structures, mostly those of the military and civilian elite. Valid reasons were convincingly cited for abandoning that approach and the key mission statements of the Rand Report and early tenets of philosophy and policy were invoked to support a delimited and concentrated reconstruction with depth and realism, one that attempted to portray a full cross-section of colonial society. The same documents in their references to the basis for the reconstruction gloss over the chronology and historical continuity issues and say little or nothing about the potential to portray native Micmac, New England or British structures and people. More of the consequences of this decision will be explored in later chapters, but it is essential to record in this overview analysis of the planning process, that this major constraint on project parameters was apparently approved quickly and blithely.

Task Force Planning

The decision to focus on 1744 and 1745 streamlined the planning process. The project, nevertheless, faced the furnishing and interpretation of dozens of complex display environments, period and modern, as well as a costumed animation programme, expanded visitor information and security requirements and incorporation of modern services in a reconstruction area comprising more than 50 properties and nearly two miles of fortification features. The accelerated and costly effort concentrated on the Governor's Apartment and the King's Bastion generally, could not be duplicated for the remainder of the reconstruction, scheduled for completion by the end of the 1970s. Some of the basic decisions and policies were set into place and a major programme review resulted in Cabinet approval in 1969 for increased capital funding for the reconstruction, while annual operating budgets kept pace with completion of development in such locations as the Kings Bastion.
It was agreed that development should not proceed further, however, without a systematic plan and a special Parks Canada task force was appointed to complete and formally report on that process. John Lunn was appointed to the task force and he and the Louisbourg staff wrote and edited the task force documents approved in 1973. These reports, particularly the Interpretive Prospectus of April, 1972, have guided park development and operation since 1973.28

By March 31, 1973 (the end of the Parks Canada financial year) approximately $16 million in capital funds had been spent on park development over 12 years and by October, 1974 the estimated total cost of completion was set at $23 million. (See Figure 4 for a 1975 view of the reconstruction in progress.) The annual operating budget for the park increased to more than two million dollars by 1975, as new programmes came into operation. 29 The Task Force was asked to make recommendations for the completion of development and to provide the basis for long-range planning. Task Force deliberations were part of an overall Parks Canada effort to rationalize and consolidate the system of natural and historic parks and sites after a decade of unprecedented growth. They also coincided with the decentralization of many Parks Canada functions and services from Ottawa headquarters to five regional offices in Halifax, Nova Scotia, Quebec City, Quebec, Cornwall, Ontario, Winnipeg, Manitoba and Calgary, Alberta. The Halifax office began to play a greater role in the development and operation of the Louisbourg project after decentralization in 1975, but Louisbourg retained its own staff in most functional areas, including research. The planning function and


29 Fortress of Louisbourg Archives, Ms. by Sandra Ferguson, General Notes on Project Files, 1985, p. 15-16.
its professional staff were located in Halifax but it was established too late to play a significant role in the Louisbourg planning process. The job was left to Park Superintendent John Lunn and his staff; the Director, Atlantic Regional Office, National and Historic Parks Branch, Halifax; The Head of Interpretation and the Assistant Director (Historic Parks and Sites), Ottawa; with overall direction and approval provided by the Director, National and Historic Parks Branch, Ottawa. The Head of Interpretation in Ottawa was included because it was essentially an interpretation planning exercise at about the mid-way point of the project's development, not a master plan for the entire project.

The two most important reports prepared by the Task force were the Interpretive Prospectus of April, 1972 and the Recommended and Reduced Postures, Development and Operation and Maintenance, April, 1973. Together they provided the blueprint for future research and development at Louisbourg. As planning documents the Prospectus was largely intended to be conceptual in scope, while the Recommended Postures provided the rudiments of a management plan for the park. The Prospectus will be analyzed in this chapter and compared to other planning documents while the Postures report will be used in the next chapter to study programming after 1973.

The extent of research undertaken during the first decade of the project was evident in the Interpretive Prospectus, written by John Lunn, which was replete with historical information. Current politics, government influence and nationalist sentiments also
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30 John Lunn et al, "Interpretive Prospectus, Fortress of Louisbourg National Historic Park", Ms. on file, Fortress of Louisbourg Archives, report # I-15, passim. The Prospectus was the culmination of a series of interpretive planning reports written and submitted by John Lunn since 1970, which were ultimately synthesized and approved in the 1973 Task Force Interpretive Plan. All reports and related correspondence are available in the project archives.
dominated in the prologue, which set a rhetorical tone that prevailed throughout the report:

There will be some, no doubt, who think of Louisbourg only in terms of the glories of monarchical France or the triumph of British arms. But for most Canadians, Louisbourg stands as a proud symbol, not only of the two great cultures whose interplay made our nation possible, but of the traditions that both have bequeathed to us. Without these disparate traditions and the dialogue stimulated by them, Canada would have few claims to nationhood.

These effusive references to Louisbourg’s historical significance and to the political statements that set the project underway in 1961 were seen as necessary to justify the extensive work completed or contemplated at Louisbourg. As the Parks Canada system expanded and heritage preservation achieved a higher profile across the country, the demand for heritage related activity increased, and within Parks Canada Louisbourg became both an inspiration and a conspicuous drain on resources. Competition for funding increased to the point where a veteran member of the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada, Dr. P.B. Waite of Dalhousie University in Halifax, was reported to have remarked wryly that Nova Scotia was in danger of sinking into the Atlantic ocean under the weight of historic parks, sites and commemorative plaques.31 As the oldest province, Nova Scotia had a legitimate claim to a seemingly disproportionate level of heritage development, but the rest of the country was just as anxious to catch up with their history after

31 Reports of Professor Waite’s remark circulated widely in the Research Section, Atlantic Regional Office, Halifax in May, 1975, at which time the author of this study was a member of the historical research staff.
centennial year celebrations, and Louisbourg showed them what was possible. Within Nova Scotia other significant heritage resources such as the Halifax Defence Complex continued to deteriorate while the Louisbourg project prospered. The social and economic imperatives for the Louisbourg reconstruction prevailed, but the cultural and heritage arguments were beginning to wear thin by comparison to other areas. Consequently little effort was spared in the Interpretive Prospectus to justify continued development and to maximize its interpretive potential.

Concerned about possible funding reductions, the prospectus emphasized in all too familiar terms the need "to provide the visitor with a convincing period experience." Reduction in the number of buildings to be reconstructed had been part of the approved strategy to concentrate on the buildings and fortifications of the King's Bastion, the Dauphin Demi-Bastion, the Piece-de-la-Grave and the town blocks within those features (see Figure 2), "a sufficient area of reconstruction to enable the visitor to feel he has stepped back into a reasonably convincing facsimile of the past - but an area only just sufficient for that purpose - no more. This, in essence, is what is presented herein."\textsuperscript{32} The project brief, rationalized and codified in the prospectus after a decade of development, included a modern visitor reception centre, service roads, and interpretation of historic and natural features outside the reconstruction area; these clearly secondary to "re-creating a segment of 18th century life in colonial Louisbourg."\textsuperscript{33}

As a planning instrument the prospectus was comprehensive in both philosophical and practical terms. Themes and objectives were stated and fully elaborated, always by reference to historical, archaeological and natural resources, all of which were properly

\textsuperscript{32} Lunn, op. cit., p. 2.

\textsuperscript{33} Ibid., p. 6 and appendices.
inventoried in the text and in the accompanying plans and charts. Planning options and implementation strategies were limited by comparison to other historic site and outdoor museum planning documents consulted for this study, but it must be emphasized again that the prospectus was written long after most of the important decisions were made and that it was based on a knowledge base that far exceeded many of the projects that could be formally and systematically planned from the outset.

The best reference points for comparative analysis of Louisbourg planning and development, as presented later in this study, are sites such as Williamsburg, Virginia in the United States, Skansen in Stockholm, Sweden and Ironbridge in Telford, England, where extensive and complex historical resources have been brought together in an outdoor environment. The distinguishing characteristic of the Louisbourg project, in terms of informal planning during the early development phase and formal planning at this later stage, was the extent of research input; so clearly evident in every important document consulted.

Comparison of the Louisbourg planning process with another major project within Parks Canada, the Halifax Defence Complex, reveals that planning at Louisbourg from 1960 to 1975 was less sophisticated and less restrictive than planning at Halifax from 1975 to 1980, reflecting maturity on the part of Parks Canada, a growing public interest in its activities and a determination to learn from the best results achieved at Louisbourg. Unlike Louisbourg the Halifax Citadel restoration project was preceded by a major and highly sophisticated planning effort. An interim concept plan completed by a planning team in 1976 provided a precise and comprehensive
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34 Ibid., p. 33-4

35 Fortress of Louisbourg Archives, Louisbourg Task Force, file #s RB 19 01 - 02, RB 131 01 -02, RB 131 06-12.
resource inventory, an equally sophisticated analysis of visitor projections, site capability, safety and security requirements, all of which provided a basis for identifying interpretive opportunities, requirements and constraints. Alternative concepts were formulated and evaluated prior to selection of a preferred interpretation prospectus. Time was then made available for disciplinary groups to study these alternatives and to consult senior management in Halifax and Ottawa, their political masters and the public prior to any formal request for approval.

By this time Parks Canada was committed to a process known as public participation. For the Citadel project public hearings in the Halifax area provided the opportunity for concerned citizens to review and comment on the concept plan and proposals for its implementation, as part of the preparation of a management plan for the Halifax Citadel National Historic Park. As a result of the many comments made during this early stage, the concepts developed for the Citadel were refined and clarified and important changes were made for inclusion in the management plan. For example, in response to public support for interpretation of the Citadel during Canadian occupation, provision was made for exhibits on the history of the Citadel after departure of the British in 1906 when Canadian authorities assumed control of the site, and for the preservation of many features that post-dated the original fortifications. Broader chronological parameters were set for the Citadel restoration and reconstruction project and for its military animation programme, taking into account the eclectic and evolutionary nature of extant

---


remains and the surrounding city of Halifax. Louisbourg was a constant reference point in these planning deliberations.

The Management Plan for the Halifax Citadel National Historic Park was completed in 1979 and covered virtually every major aspect of park development, operation and maintenance in a document comprising 235 pages of text with accompanying plans and appendices. Little was left to conjecture or dispute as the restoration proceeded and research staff were usually given sufficient time to complete reports prior to construction activity. The scope and the pace of research and development at the Halifax project was less than that for Louisbourg and less has been achieved, but the integration of research with other activities has been consistent and well scheduled, partly as a result of the good and bad experience gained at Louisbourg.

Chapter 3

Programming and Interdisciplinary Work after 1973

Planning and development since 1961 had left a substantial legacy at Louisbourg after task force deliberations and reporting were completed in 1973. Reconstruction of fortifications and buildings in the Kings Bastion were complete and open to the public, the Dauphin Demi-Bastion and Quayside structures were already substantially complete, twenty two other buildings had been reconstructed, ten were in the process of design and reconstruction and work on fences, outbuildings and yards was either underway or planned. During the six month visitor season between May and October, 1973, 138 thousand people visited the remote historic site, even though its reconstruction was far from complete and no serious effort had been made to advertise or promote it as a tourist attraction.¹ Work progressed on the design and construction of an extensive new visitor reception centre, which was to be linked to the reconstruction area by an improved bus transit system (busses were already operating between a temporary reception centre and the Kings Bastion parade square). The visions and images of earlier

planners and supporters of the Louisbourg project were beginning to take shape.

Consolidation of the planning process and confirmation of Louisbourg’s place in the Parks Canada system had been overdue and was welcomed by those involved, but the challenge remained to develop new programmes and to improve existing operations within these newly approved frameworks. Consequently, programming at Louisbourg after 1973, the subject of this chapter, proved to be just as busy and demanding as the planning and development phase had been since 1961. Emphasis in this chapter is placed more on the process than the results or outcomes, which will be further described and analyzed in chapter five. The purpose here is to document that process and to highlight the innovative interdisciplinary work that characterized and distinguished the project as a model for Canadian heritage preservation and interpretation.

The principle of management by objectives had long since been studied and followed by many private and public sector agencies and organizations by the time the Louisbourg project entered its second decade. In an article written for the journal *Museum*, William T. Alderson, at the time Director of the American Association for State and Local History, emphasized the importance of concentrating on objectives without compromising goals and standards: "It is vitally important that one of these objectives be our primary goal and that the other objectives be not only secondary but entirely compatible with the primary one." ² Louisbourg’s primary objective had been clearly enunciated in the Interpretive Prospectus, "to provide the visitor with a convincing period experience." The Louisbourg Task Force subsequently presented two options for pursuing this first objective, a recommended posture that would continue the current

rate of development and operation for at least five years and a reduced posture that would, in essence, halt further development and limit operations programming to those properties that were substantially complete. The reduced posture was not presented as a realistic alternative. The task force report provided a list of the consequences that would be inherent in such a major curtailment of development and stated emphatically, once again with reference to the original political will of the federal government, that the project's potential for interpretation and education and its continuing role in the tourist economy of Cape Breton justified the high level of expenditures incurred since 1961, and warranted even more expenditures in the future. The following quotation from the task force report is included here because it cogently described those consequences and because it provided a timely re-affirmation of the basic rationale for the Louisbourg project:

"The resultant development would not fulfill the intent of cabinet as expressed in 1969:

"that the project will achieve the greatest possible historical impact and also produce the maximum tourist benefits."
"(that it) will rank as one of the most impressive and authentic historical reconstructions ever undertaken and will be an attraction comparable in almost every respect ... with Williamsburg."
"(that it) will be one of the major tourist attractions in Canada and as such will result in an addition of a minimum of $10 million dollars annually to the economy of Cape Breton."
"The only way to achieve these goals is through the concept expressed as Program "B". Program "A" falls far short of fulfilling that concept in every significant regard, aesthetic, historical, and economic."3

The "concept" expressed in the recommended posture was ambitious, which the task force acknowledged in a somewhat subjective tone: "The showing will in fact be superior, for such is the nature of the Project."4 The report also included, under the heading of long range planning and in a category described as "desirable but not essential", a list of additional historical properties and services that could be developed at a 1973 cost of almost three million dollars, an estimate that did not include expenditures for operation and maintenance.5 The project had already reached proportions that demanded substantial expenditures to remain viable, let alone superior, and the task force submissions were obviously intended to justify and sustain the momentum generated since 1961.

The breakdown of forecast expenditures included in the task force report reflected the major changes that were occurring in project development and operation. As construction costs decreased expenditures for interpretation, visitor services and resource conservation increased.6 These changes were also reflected in the

3 Louisbourg Task Force, Recommended and Reduced Postures, Development and O.&M: (Plus Long Range Development Costs), April 12, 1973, Ms. on file, Fortress of Louisbourg Archives, unpaginated.

4 Louisbourg Task Force, Recommended and Reduced Postures, Development and O.&M: (Plus Long Range Development Costs), April 12, 1973, Ms. on file, Fortress of Louisbourg Archives, unpaginated.

5 Ibid., concluding page.

6 The term visitor services was used interchangeably to describe capital programmes such as reconstruction of properties as well as direct services to
recruitment, specialized training and in the management of personnel during the transition from the planning and development phase to a fully operational park. Since the consolidation of all programmes under the direction of the Park Superintendent in 1965, the Louisbourg organization evolved as two separate programmes in terms of budgets and personnel. In theory the capital programme covered strictly developmental activity while the operation and maintenance programme included ongoing activities resulting from development. In practice, budgets and personnel were shared in a flexible organization based on teamwork principles.

In a speech delivered at the 1976 conference of the Canadian Museums Association, Park Superintendent John Lunn talked about teamwork:

"I have lost most of my respect for those curators who are so obsessed by the mystique of their particular disciplines, that they fail to communicate with their institution's educators, interpreters or communicators until after their exhibits are installed. And I will never personally condone the hiring of a curator ... unless I am certain that the curator knows what it means to work as a member of an interdisciplinary team in the process of communication with a museum visitor." 7

In a separate article the Head of Research at Louisbourg, John Fortier, expressed similar sentiments concerning researchers and their role in the research and development process:

visitors, for example guided tours, so expenditures in this area appeared in both capital and operation and maintenance forecasts.

"Every day they have to work with colleagues in different disciplines - architecture, archaeology, engineering, graphics, museology and administration - to solve specific design problems for projects that may cost two or three hundred thousand dollars to construct ... General assertions and quick conclusions may be easy in a seminar, ... but it is surprising how that sense of confidence can disappear when there is a personal responsibility for guaranteeing that the details of a new building or exhibit are accurate before it is built." 8

For both Lunn and Fortier, experience at Louisbourg had demonstrated the need and desirability of teamwork. The job was simply too complex to be pursued by individual units within the park organization, and the working environment at Louisbourg after relocation of the research staff was not conducive to individual or isolated effort.

In many respects the geographical isolation of the Louisbourg project from the mainstream of Parks Canada activities and programmes and from the academic and museum community in general - a condition that was not without historical precedent - was an advantage; especially during the long winter months from October to May when the park was closed to the public. This was particularly true as the Louisbourg organization became even more self-sufficient and mature in terms of research and curatorial collections and in its ability to recruit, train and retain personnel. These circumstances allowed project management to concentrate organizational effort on those programmes that were approved within Parks Canada and at least known if not accepted by the local community, unlike the
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8 Fortier, op. cit., p. 12.
frenzied early years of the project when local members of the public were rarely if ever consulted and community relations were often strained (the subject of community relations within Cape Breton will be treated in chapter seven and in the conclusion to this study).

Despite the scope of the project and the size of the staff, people knew each other on a personal basis and knew that they were working on a very important project. Those who did not grasp its historical significance could not escape its social and economic impact on a small local community of about 1400 people. The working environment and the community setting were suited to focus and teamwork, and park management encouraged this approach. On a formal and informal basis, park managers and professionals, as well as technical personnel and support staff shared and applied historical information and resources in a collective attempt to meet the objectives approved after the formal planning process was finally completed. The organizational structures and methods employed, especially the system of interdisciplinary committees and teams, provided the flexibility needed to progress from conceptual planning to implementation and programming.

This method of blending formal and informal networks in an intentionally designed interdisciplinary setting was not a common characteristic of large, traditional organizations, such as government agencies, in Canada or elsewhere during this period. This type of organization was not well suited to museums and historic sites, although many federal and provincial government sponsored institutions and agencies complied with this basic bureaucratic model. "Organizations run to classical principles, ...are rarely flexible,

9 There is a wealth of literature that could support this statement on conventional organizational behavior during the period of this study. A good general reference is: Allen R. Cohen, et al (eds.), Effective Behavior in Organizations: Learning from the Interplay of Cases, Concepts and Student Experiences, Homewood, Ill., R.D. Irwin. 1980.
creative, or responsive. They can be distinctly mechanistic and as a result fail to foster the types of innovative and adventurous environments museums need."\(^\text{10}\) The development and use of this sort of blended and flexible organization at Louisbourg attracted attention within Parks Canada, was applied to the development of other historic sites in the system and served as a new model for local, provincial and national historic sites and outdoor museum villages in general.

**Park Organization**

The formal network consisted of a park organization that was typical of government agencies, hierarchical at the management level, strictly linear in its reporting relationships at the supervisory level, and task oriented at the technical and labouring level. Section Heads in Research, Administration, Engineering and Works, Interpretation, and Operations reported to the Park Superintendent, who reported to the Regional Director of Parks Canada in Halifax. Section Heads met together with the Superintendent on a regular basis, usually once per week, to deal with routine administrative concerns and contingency planning, to prepare for special requirements in the budget cycle and to coordinate events and assignments that involved more than one section. Within sections unit managers and line supervisors met with their Section Head, usually on an as-required basis, to follow up on decisions made or tabled at the senior management level, to coordinate and review work within the section and to assign and discuss responsibilities and tasks emanating from the park’s system of committees and teams. That system of affinity planning and programming, described in detail later in this chapter, was expanded in 1974 to cover

programmes other than structural design. A special committee of labour and management, usually chaired by the Head of Administration, handled problems arising within the various union locals and usually kept these separate from regular programming.

Unlike most museums in Canada, the park had no board of directors as such to determine policy and oversee park programmes. The Superintendent was accountable to Parks Canada executives in Atlantic Regional Office, Halifax and through them to the senior executive levels of Parks Canada in Ottawa. All Superintendents met at an annual conference that concerned, among other matters, policy and programming at the national level. The conference was one of the best ways for Superintendents to remain abreast of major changes in policy and to ensure that appropriate changes were made in park programmes at the local level, so while they were not formally or directly involved in policy formulation beyond their own parks they were able to influence that policy through such mechanisms as the annual conference. This was particularly true for the Superintendents of the larger parks and sites like Louisbourg. Similarly, the Section Heads at Louisbourg were accountable through the Superintendent’s office to their functional counterparts in Halifax and Ottawa and they also met together at least annually to review respective programmes, but major decisions and changes in programming were made at the park level or at the executive levels in Halifax and Ottawa.

As one of the largest parks in the system by the early 1970s, Louisbourg was able to establish and carry out its own programming within the parameters set by the Task Force and under the authorization of Parks Canada executives. This arrangement left a large measure of control to the Park Superintendent and equally large scope for creativity and initiative by Louisbourg project staff. Many of the achievements in programming after 1973 can be attributed to the park’s capacity to function without a board of
directors, without the necessity of raising funds outside the Parks Canada system and with the maturity to maintain its status as a national monument and tourist attraction. The system of committees and teams established to organize interdisciplinary work within the Louisbourg project and to provide a forum for new ideas had helped to get some of these new programmes established and to coordinate them properly when the serious scheduling problems occurred in the early years of research and reconstruction.

Committee and Team System

The first committee to be formally created, the Structural Design Committee, had brought together a variety of park managers, professional and technical personnel and support staff to make some sense out of the contributions made by various groups: consultants, private contractors, specialized staff from elsewhere in Parks Canada and interested members of the local museum community and the general public. The success of this committee and its sub-committees or teams gave the Louisbourg project a distinguished reputation within Parks Canada and in the museum and professional community at large. The process produced results that were obvious in the actual progress of the reconstruction and in popular and scholarly reports on that progress. Because of that success new committees were established to cover areas of activity, such as Interpretation, that were expanding.

The four interdisciplinary committees established and functioning by 1975 were: Structural Design, Exhibits Design, Furnishings Design and Period Presentation. Each had a particular role to play in park development and operation, but there was some overlap as the following description of their activities will attempt to indicate. Some of that overlap resulted from difficulties in organizational terminology, such as the use of the term visitor services to cover reconstructed buildings and their services in the budget forecasts, but also to identify programmes such as living
history and guided tours as a staff activity in personnel forecasts. Also, the terms interpretation and education were used broadly and properly to describe activities that cut across several organizational units and were the concern and responsibility of all staff. Much of the overlap occurred, however, because there were conflicting views within the Louisbourg project on how new programmes should develop. These conflicts were normal for such a large undertaking and they inevitably led to heated exchanges and wrangling during committee and team meetings, just as they did in other forums such as the section heads meetings. Without the committee system, however, some important ideas and issues would not have been discussed and debated to the extent that they were - such as in the early decision to focus the entire reconstruction on one year - and communication and progress could otherwise have been left to the inevitable vagaries and slow pace of the bureaucratic structure.

From the outset, meetings of these interdisciplinary committees and teams were well documented because a high priority was placed on research evidence as the basis for decisions. The minutes of their proceedings have been retained in the project archives. Apart from making fascinating reading, they provide an excellent source for charting the course of project development and they have served for the past 25 years or so as a continuing and required reference point for updating and verifying park programmes. Part of the rationale for the committee system was to provide a mechanism for future change in programmes as new research evidence and interpretations would develop, but also to ensure that any change would take into account previous decisions and the basis for them, and that these changes would be further and similarly documented.

The first committee established, the Structural Design Committee, set precedents and standards that were followed closely by later committees, so much attention will be devoted here to case studies in the functioning of structural design committees and teams
as a method to explain the whole system. The Period Presentation Committee provides equally illustrative case studies on how the committee system has influenced park development and operation in recent years, so emphasis will also be placed on its activities and its influence on research and development at Louisbourg. Together these two committees have allowed the project to maintain momentum and adapt to new information and resources despite many changes in the formal organization of the park and in the personnel available within the Parks Canada system.

Structural Design

The earlier difficulties of bringing together the research disciplines of history and archaeology with the design and construction disciplines of engineering and architecture were ameliorated by the eventual relocation and consolidation of all disciplines at Louisbourg, but the need for some mechanism to coordinate their efforts was still apparent. Much of the work on the King's Bastion had been contracted to architectural and construction firms and the results were not entirely satisfactory to more experienced Louisbourg staff. Unlike the early 1960's when Louisbourg and Parks Canada had little experience in restoration and reconstruction of historical properties, the years after 1965 saw a gradual and deliberate increase in expertise at Louisbourg and throughout Parks Canada. As Louisbourg began to receive national and international acclaim for the quality of its research and reconstruction, even higher standards were set; exacting standards that some contractors were reluctant to meet. Also, progress in the restoration and reconstruction of properties elsewhere in Parks Canada and by heritage agencies in most provinces gave the Louisbourg project the incentive and rationale to lead these efforts as the largest historical reconstruction in Canada. By the late 1960's the Louisbourg project had matured and was ready to set and meet its own high standards with its own staff and physical resources. To do
so required a concerted effort to bring the various disciplines together to work on common goals, which the Structural Design Committee was established to set and carry out.

The Structural Design Committee was responsible for the design of all historic structures, not just buildings but outbuildings, yards, fences, streets, wells, wharves and, of course, all fortification features; as well as modern services and features that had to be concealed within the reconstructed properties. The terms of reference and the composition of the committee reveals that it was more important than the formal park organization as a vehicle for development at Louisbourg. The committee operated on two levels, the full committee level and the team level. The link to park management was established in full committee, chaired by the Park Superintendent and usually attended by all Section Heads. Their signing authority on all final drawings and specifications was required before reconstruction could proceed. In addition to ensuring this authority, full committee meetings provided a forum for discussion and debate of research findings, reconstruction methods and scheduling. Decisions were not always reached without time-consuming debate and occasional rancor, but the committee meetings, attended by representatives of all disciplines as equal voting members, produced results that could not have been achieved within the formal park organization.

Only concept proposals and final designs were brought to full committee. Design teams, chaired by the Restoration Architect, brought the properties in any given year - sometimes several years - through progressive stages of research and design on their own, with reference to full committee as required and only to inform park management, to resolve major disputes or to secure approval for preliminary work that could be carried out while design proceeded. Every step in the process provided for full discussion and debate, leading on many occasions to heated arguments and hasty exits. The
work of all disciplines was documented in the minutes of team meetings, which were circulated to all team members for necessary revision and sometimes unnecessary comment. They would then be presented to full committee for information and approval purposes. Not everyone was happy, but the system worked better than any organizational device or mechanism that could have been devised by any one discipline.

By this time the project had ample and often bitter experience with prolonged disputes within disciplines and among disciplinary groups in research, engineering, architecture and construction design. Failure to resolve these disputes had contributed to the serious delays referred to in chapter two of this study. This new committee system was essential, therefore, to coordinate the disciplines and to take advantage of the experience and expertise accumulated and the mistakes made since 1961. The following case study is intended to illustrate in detail how the system functioned.

In the above chapter on project planning it was indicated that property designations within the reconstructed area followed the same pattern established in the official survey of the colonial town in 1734.11 The first properties to be researched and reconstructed were the fortifications, buildings and related structures in the Kings Bastion, the Dauphin Demi-Bastion, the fortification wall along the quayside of the town and the buildings and features in Blocks one and seventeen which lay between the two reconstructed bastions. Eventually work progressed to the remaining properties in Blocks two, three, and four along the waterfront and in the île du Quay which protruded into the harbour near the eastern end of the reconstruction, then to Block 16 adjacent to the King's Bastion parade square. (See Figures 2 and 3). The buildings and features on Lot A of

11 Fortress of Louisbourg Archives, Historical Plan, 1734-4, dépôt des Fortifications des colonies (Partie du Plan du Louisbourg ou on a représente en couleur jaune Le Projet pour le revêtement en maçonnerie du Quay).
Block 4 near the eastern end of the waterfront are the subject of this case study.

By 1970 research programming was so integrated with design and reconstruction that topics and schedules were set almost exclusively by the dictates of the large and mature reconstruction programme, which was entering its second decade. Historical research on buildings and properties immediately preceded archaeological research and in some cases was concurrent with the archaeologist's preparations for the field season. Archaeological excavation was barely months ahead of reconstruction and in some cases archaeologists and their field crews worked in one section of a property while the reconstruction of buildings progressed elsewhere on the same property. Historians and archaeologists attended structural design committee and teams meetings on specific buildings and properties while they conducted their research; research reports often were not completed until after the structures under study were reconstructed. This pace of development placed a premium on interdisciplinary cooperation, especially on Block 4 where reconstruction began while the project was at its peak in terms of research, design and reconstruction expertise.

Historians were normally assigned to conduct research on all of the buildings and properties on a town block and to report on that research within one year. In the case of Block 4, research on Lot A had to be conducted on an urgent basis in 1972 prior to archaeological excavation of one of the buildings on the property, the Delort storehouse; a substantial and complicated structure scheduled for reconstruction beginning in 1973. In theory the historian would complete the research and ideally the report before the first archaeological field season. In practice the historian and archaeologist collaborated closely during the research phase and attended design meetings within weeks of commencing their
Excavation of the Delort Storehouse was underway before research for the entire block was assigned and structural design committee and team meetings began as soon as the archaeological field season was completed. Historical research for the remaining structures and properties on Block 4 was assigned in early 1973, by which time as-found field drawings of structures and features on Lot A were being prepared by reconstruction design staff in close collaboration with archaeological research staff, and these drawings were used immediately as the subject of design team meetings.

Invariably research staff left these meetings with a list of detailed questions to be investigated by consulting the evidence gathered up to that point. Days, sometimes weeks later, tentative conclusions would be brought to design team meetings, analyzed and if found to be valid they would be incorporated immediately into hasty sketches and preliminary designs. The system worked at its best when postulations based on historical evidence were confirmed or denied on the spot by archaeological evidence, when an archaeologist answered questions posed by an historian and vice versa and when the restoration architect attempted to bring all the evidence together - literally and visually on the spot - in the form of more sketches and measured drawings with the assistance of design staff.

The design of the Delort storehouse provides a good example to illustrate this point. The historical evidence, especially the maps and plans from the 1718-45 period established the exterior dimensions of the building, confirmed by archaeological excavation, and that the roof had two slopes, suggesting a one-and-one-half storey structure.
along its entire length. The archaeological excavation, however, also revealed considerably more deposits of building materials, particularly brick infill from the walls, on the northern half of the storehouse. The final design approved by the structural design committee after considerable deliberation at the team level provided for a two-storey building at the north end of Lot A, joined together with a one storey structure near the south end of the property. Details such as door placements were determined almost entirely by archaeological evidence from the foundations of the storehouse, while windows at the north end and north-eastern corner of the building were based primarily on historical views drawn in 1731, on historical references to the use of the building and on the basis of the known commercial activities of its owner, Guillaume Delort, prior to 1745. This amalgam of direct historical and archaeological evidence, combined with knowledge of eighteenth-century architecture and construction techniques, allowed the structural design committee to guide an accurate design and reconstruction of yet another important building in the colonial town. This could only be accomplished by interdisciplinary work at the design team level.

Not all structures on Block 4 were designed and reconstructed with such confidence and accuracy. A substantial building on Lot D proved to be much more difficult; and illustrative of the vexations encountered throughout the reconstruction process at Louisbourg. Between 1733 and 1735 a large L-shaped structure was built running north to south along the eastern boundary of the lot and east to west along the Rue du Quay near the waterfront. Only after close study of historical maps and plans and a variety of documentary sources could conclusions be drawn on the functions and usage of various sections of the building, which had to be reconstructed to appear as it stood prior to the 1745 siege. Very little definitive evidence was available on the structure, which was obscured by the Île du Quay buildings on the historical views of the town. The extensive commercial and residential use of the building in the early
1740's and the equally extensive building materials excavated from the site indicated a substantial wood-frame structure of two storeys. Documentary and archaeological evidence also allowed precise location of chimneys, fireplaces and some walls and staircases, enough to infer the general layout of the interior and the placement of exterior windows and doors; then the educated guesswork started.

Historical plans clearly showed one ridge line along the middle of the roof while the documentary evidence referred to a mansard roof. Research had established that the English plans of the town and many of the French plans were not as comprehensive and detailed for Block 4 as they were for the fortifications and for the town blocks where public buildings stood, and that for any area of the fortress and town there were contradictions within the historical evidence that could not always be resolved by reference to archaeological evidence. The roof of the Santier-Vallee inn, storehouse and residence was a case in point that tested the accuracy and efficacy of the design team process. After prolonged analysis of the historical evidence available and lengthy collaboration among the various specialists involved the structural design team recommended a mansard roof, which the full committee approved and which was eventually included in the reconstruction of the building. Most of the design team members and park management were in favour of the decision because there was irrefutable evidence of mansard roof construction at Louisbourg and because the reconstructed Santier-Vallee building would allow this particular though atypical architectural form to be represented, even if the evidence for its original appearance on the Block 4 building was dubious. The committee was also influenced by the historical report which concluded on the basis of the available evidence that the storehouse section of the building probably had a mansard roof. The restoration architect was ambivalent, however, having found references in eighteenth-century architectural studies to the term mansard as applied to describe a certain space configuration within a
conventional roof; that is, a typical two-slope roof similar to the style documented on historical plans for the majority of Louisbourg buildings. In the end the weight of evidence was deemed to justify a mansard roof, but only on the north to south wing of the building which was completely obscured on the historical views, was often drawn in carelessly and with occasional contradiction on the Historical plans, and was seldom referred to in the documentary sources. This was neither an idle decision nor a hasty judgment. It was the best possible interpretation of the evidence and it was typical of many decisions that had to be made by the structural design committee when time expired for further research and reconstruction was about to begin.\textsuperscript{13}

The progress facilitated by the structural design committee led to the creation of new committees as new programmes were established and existing programmes, mainly in interpretation, received more attention. While most of the project's energy was devoted to the reconstruction of buildings and to the completion and opening of the King's Bastion during the first decade, other programmes were either carried out in isolation or they were delayed until staff could be assigned to them. This was clearly reflected in research activity which was concentrated almost exclusively on buildings and properties until the reconstruction programme was sufficiently advanced to allow a shift in emphasis. In the early 1970's research staff started to work as closely with their colleagues in interpretation and visitor services as they had with their disciplinary counterparts in engineering and architecture since 1965. The committee and team system, therefore was extended to coordinate their efforts and to ensure that the results of new

\textsuperscript{13} This statement is based on the author's participation in design team and full committee work for the reconstruction of buildings and property features on Block 4, 1973-76.
research were applied as rigorously as they had been in structural design.

**Exhibits Design**

Modern exhibits installed within reconstructed buildings were the responsibility of the exhibits design committee. This committee also developed displays at the modern visitor reception centre, in small exhibit pavilions at strategic locations where major historical structures were researched but not reconstructed, and near the ruins of historically significant individual properties outside the reconstructed area. This committee was not responsible for the building interiors that were furnished to period, or for the material requirements of outdoor features such as streets, gardens, wharves and military installations. Because the exhibits design committee and teams worked primarily with modern materials and techniques, research staff were less involved in the process, except when historical evidence was required or major intrusions on the historical environment were contemplated, in which case the Period Presentation Committee and park management were sure to be involved at the full committee level. (Examples of this interplay of committees will be provided later in the conclusion to this chapter).

The usual approach to exhibit design was to identify a subject or theme, designate a space where it could be interpreted and then to conduct an investigation of pertinent historical information and artifacts that could be considered in the committee and team deliberations. Teams were chaired by the Curator of Exhibits, but most decisions were referred to full committee because the exhibits staff was small and isolated, because most of the exhibits had to take into account the accumulated knowledge and expertise that carried over from structural design and because park management took a particular interest in interpretation efforts that reached the
visiting public directly. Also, the overlap of responsibilities among committees and staff units was best resolved at the full committee level where an attempt could be made to balance various period and modern interpretation methods.

All of these concerns made the work on exhibits design difficult and challenging and usually led to change and compromise at the committee level, often very late in the design process and sometimes during the installation phase. The problem was peculiar to Louisbourg where so much was invested in the reconstruction of a period environment and so much was expected in terms of visitor understanding and comfort. There was simply no opportunity for conventional exhibit design within the reconstructed area, so experimentation became necessary and normal, just as concealment of modern services had become in the structural design process. Several case studies are necessary to underline the extent to which the Louisbourg project was developing unique interpretation methods in exhibits design.

An exhibit on eighteenth-century building construction and techniques at Louisbourg was installed in the Carrerot House on Block 2, a two-storey structure on a corner lot near the centre of the reconstruction area. Two major constraints led to innovation. To preserve the period exterior and the views from two streets, only period features and objects, mostly reconstructed or reproduced, were placed near windows and doors. Also, signage identifying the building and designating the exhibit was limited to a very small and inconspicuous label on the Rue Toulouse entrance door. All other labels and scripts were confined to the central interior of the Carrerot House where they could not be seen from the outside of the building.

A second constraint ensued from the exhibit theme, which called for exposure of construction techniques, in this case wood-framing, on the interior but not on the exterior of the structure. To
achieve this important interpretation objective the interior framing and floor reconstruction was left open and exposed at the south-west corner of the structure as part of the exhibit. Visitors could see and appreciate these features and the surrounding interpretation in the middle of the exhibit, but not from the exterior vantage points on the Rue Royale. This was not conventional exhibit practice for museum or historic site interpretation.

An exhibit on another important theme, the Louisbourg garrison, was installed in the Duhaget House, near and in view of the King's Bastion, with its related military facilities such as the reconstructed barracks, officers' and governor's quarters and the garrison chapel. The same constraints encountered in the Carrerot House applied to the Duhaget location, in that the building was on a busy street within the reconstruction and the theme selected in this case called for information on the officers of the garrison, since Duhaget was a captain in the colonial marines. Again modern devices could not be viewed from the exterior and the exhibit employed similar methods to conceal them. But the challenge was to show in this particular location at least some glimpse of an officers life at home, without furnishing the house to period; an obvious interpretation objective to be met at several locations elsewhere in the reconstructed area. The combination of specialists on the exhibits team ultimately designed and installed a blend of period and modern materials in a precise and deliberate fashion, in what was termed a neutral zone on the second floor of the building. This innovative approach respected the period character of the house and its military theme while conveying information to visitors via modern media in a comfortable setting; certainly more than Duhaget had ever experienced.

Experience with the Duhaget House exhibit led interpretation staff to propose a series of theme lounges in period buildings to complement modern exhibits and to blend with strictly period
environments. This was a major and welcome change in interpretation design at Louisbourg in the late 1970s, and one that clearly demonstrated the benefits of interdisciplinary work on exhibit design teams and committees. The effort was led by exhibits design staff with the encouragement of park management, but its acceptance by research and visitor services staff in full committee deliberations allowed all specialists to make their contributions on their own terms in the interest of accommodating twentieth-century materials and visitors to a reconstructed eighteenth-century environment. The happy results were a decrease in staff friction and a reduction in complaints from visitors about exhibit fatigue and general discomfort during prolonged tours of the reconstruction. Theme lounges also helped to support the work of Furnishings Design and Period Presentation committees and teams by conveying information and providing visitor amenities that could not be incorporated into period environments.¹⁴

Furnishings Design

The Furnishings Design Committee was responsible for reproduction furniture and furnishings required for exhibits and period environments. The park's collection of originals could not supply all requirements and the conditions for conservation and use of original historical objects in an outdoor museum setting necessitated a major effort to research, design and manufacture a wide range of reproductions as substitutes. Some had been commissioned in France and Quebec during earlier curatorial work on the King's Bastion interiors and were copied directly from originals in museum and private collections. Similarly many of the objects and documents reproduced under the auspices of the Furnishings Design Committee were based directly on originals in the park's research

¹⁴ Additional, first hand experience in exhibits design in both research and management positions at Louisbourg between 1973 and 1981.
and curatorial collections. The majority of reproduction designs, however, have been based on an amalgam of archaeological, documentary and iconographic evidence from eighteenth-century source material, once again requiring interdisciplinary teamwork and approval procedures within the committee system. The results range in size and material composition from the largest calibers of reproduction cast-iron artillery to pewter and faience household wares, and in complexity from intricate costumes and fine furniture to simple wooden drumsticks. A few examples of work on military objects and domestic furniture serve to illustrate how furnishings design functioned.

One of the first designs approved by the Furnishings Design Committee was for reproduction artillery. The few origmal cannon that were available to the Louisbourg project were so damaged and corroded that they could not be mounted on the batteries of the reconstructed fortifications. Determining the quantity and location of the guns was not difficult because annual artillery lists were included in the official correspondence that survived from the eighteenth century, and a comprehensive report on Louisbourg artillery had been prepared by a project historian.\textsuperscript{15} Decisions on the type and on design detail, however, involved additional research, measured drawings of original guns and archaeological fragments, and close study of engraved plates from the Archives Nationale in Paris and from the Diderot encyclopedia.\textsuperscript{16} Some of the same sources were used as the basis for the design of gun carriages and equipment such as rammers and sponges, all of which had to respect original material and workmanship while conforming to modern safety standards. The design drawings and specifications received close scrutiny from full committee because they were the first efforts in

\begin{flushleft}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{15} T. LeGoff, "Artillery at Louisbourg", Manuscript Report Series, No. 50, Ottawa, Parks Canada, 1967. \\
\textsuperscript{16} AN, G 5 series, and Diderot, op. cit.
\end{flushleft}
an attempt to incorporate the same standards for research in furniture and furnishings design as had been followed for the research and design of buildings and properties.

Other reproductions went through a similar process of research and design, except when original objects or fragments were not available as a basis for design, which was often the case for the many wooden objects that had to be reproduced. For these designs extensive use was made of the Diderot encyclopedia and of the project's picture file of eighteenth-century visual art. Detailed specifications were worked out at the design team level in most instances, usually by illustrators and craftsmen and not by the researchers who had originally found the source material. Eventually a wider range of specialists became familiar with the iconographic source material available at Louisbourg, and the dialogue between designers and producers and the inherent learning curve approached the level that had been in place for structural design. The results were better reproductions and a more expeditious approval process.

As the collection of reproductions steadily increased and the need to work with producers outside the park required modification and in some cases outright rejection of objects reproduced, the need for a separate standards committee to monitor the production, use and sale of quality reproductions became apparent. With the creation of this new committee the work of furnishings design teams and full committee could be limited to the completion and approval of drawings and specifications. Also, a separate material research and design unit was established in the research section to work on reproduction requirements. Their work on designs and with craftsmen inside and outside the park was validated by the Furnishings Design Committee, but required less scrutiny as the reproductions programme expanded and matured. Staff in this unit and members of furnishings design teams worked closely with the Standards Committee and with the Period Presentation Committee to
coordinate the presentation and use of reproductions by visitor services staff.

The material requirements of visitor services staff in period environments increased dramatically in the late 1970s as additional historical properties within the reconstruction were opened to the public. The Louisbourg project would have had difficulty keeping pace with these demands even if the period displays were merely static as in most outdoor museums, with security and interpretation staff and volunteers dressed in modern clothing. With Louisbourg's commitment to "animating" the lessons of history by developing a full programme for the costumed animation of military and civilian life in the fortress and town, the supply problem became acute. For several years the extensive reproduction costume and accessories requirements for the military and civilian animation programme were beyond the project's capacity. The project simply could not provide authentic reproductions for all requirements. Despite this programming dilemma and in keeping with its sometimes conflicting mandates for preservation, interpretation and tourism, the project research and design staff with the help of other specialists in the Operations section persevered within period environments with a changing mix of competence, compromise, ingenuity and occasional guile; providing for visitors a relatively convincing programme of living history each summer, while staffing inadequacies and furniture and furnishings depletions were either resolved or ignored by project management and staff. Ultimately the presentation to the public suffered. As was the case with the reconstruction of buildings and properties in the late 1960's, gradual progress was made and the public began to see more than a construction site with a series of empty sets. And again in this renewed effort, the system of interdisciplinary committees and teams was the principal organizational mechanism for concentrating work on the project's new priorities in period presentation (See Figure 5).
Period Presentation

The Period Presentation Committee was responsible for everything that was done and shown in period environments, the most important interpretation programme. The scope of activities and displays to be researched, developed and operated was daunting, as indicated by the following list of period environments and furnishings requirements compiled for a major programme forecast and operations review in 1978:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period Environments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fauxbourg House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fauxbourg fish stages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dauphin Demi-Bastion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lartigue House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artillery Storehouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrison Bakery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armorer's Forge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer's Laundry and Stables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King's Storehouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Le Perelle Magazin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodrigue House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De La Valliere Magazins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L'Epee Royale Inn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandchamp Inn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandchamp Magazin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bigot House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugas House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaumesjour House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delort Boutique</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Delort Magazin
King's Bastion Prison
Cannoniers School
Sergeants Barracks Room
Drummers Barracks
Junior Officers Room
Governor's Apartments
Governor's Stables and Dovecote
King's Bastion Barbette and Flank
Parade Square
Lime Kiln
Yards and Gardens
Animal and equipment storage areas

King's Bastion Guardhouse
King's Bastion Adjutant's Office
Cannoniers Barracks
Soldiers Barracks
Chapel
Karrer Officers Room
Governor's Carriage House
Barracks Bakery
King's Bastion Casemates
Superior Council Chamber
Ice House
Streets

Furnishings Requirements

Heating
Cooking and serving glassware
Cooking and serving wood
Cooking and serving ceramics
Seating (upholstered)
Tables
Chests
Buffets
Beds
Wall decor, paintings, prints

Lighting
Cooking and serving iron, copper
Cooking and serving pewter, silver
Baskets, miscellaneous containers
Seating (other)
Desks and workbenches
Commodes
Armoires, vaisseliers, bookcases
Linens and textile furnishings
Rugs and tapestries
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mirrors, Clocks, watches</td>
<td>Religious goods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous equipment</td>
<td>Reading and writing supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous bulk stores</td>
<td>Pastimes and special interest items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small cooperage items</td>
<td>Crates and bales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swords, polearms, accoutrements</td>
<td>Loading and moving equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardening supplies</td>
<td>Animal husbandry items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries animation supplies</td>
<td>Weights and measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannon and shot</td>
<td>Cannon carriages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artillery implements</td>
<td>Muskets, bayonets, pistols, shot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles</td>
<td>Artisan tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>Barrels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet, grooming and cleaning supplies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous accessories, tobacco jars</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chart listed 9,356 types of objects required for 63 different period environments at an estimated initial cost of one and one half million dollars.\textsuperscript{17} Many items such as reproduction costumes, weapons and tools would have to be replaced on a regular basis each year at additional cost, and new objects would have to be researched, designed and produced as period presentation teams and committees developed and approved new activities and displays. It was obvious that period presentation requirements would keep the Louisbourg project in a developmental phase for years beyond the operations review of 1978, the year in which the project was supposed to be substantially completed.

Several months after the operations review Parks Canada decided to defer indefinitely full development of some reconstructed properties at Louisbourg, principally on Blocks 3 and 4 where most

\textsuperscript{17} Fortress of Louisbourg Archives, Project file, Furnishings Requirements-Period Environments, 1978 operations review.
buildings would be reconstructed to the exterior only. This decision reduced the number of interiors to be developed by period presentation teams and committees, but still left an enormous task to be pursued over the next decade with fewer staff and smaller budgets. The results were a substantial decrease in the pace of development and a shift of emphasis to the consolidation of programmes already in place, including period presentation.

With reduced development came a substantial reduction in research staff and a corresponding increase in visitor services and maintenance staff. The project's commitment to research activity, however, did not change with this reorganization of working units, which was based in part on the conscious institutionalization of interdisciplinary work in the committee system, particularly in period presentation. Whereas research activity had been confined largely to the Research Section, through their representation on the Structural Design Committee and its teams, research for period presentation was shared by the new Historical Resources Section (combining staff in research, curatorial and exhibits services) and the expanded Operations Section with its increased number of qualified research and interpretation specialists. Even the committee chairmanship, appointed by the Park Superintendent, was open to senior staff in either section although it was usually held by the Head of Operations. One category of the committee's work, the preparation, approval and use of period presentation inventories, shows how the committee and its teams could cut across organizational lines of authority to meet goals that were common to both sections, and in the process could achieve objectives that were set for the entire project.

These period presentation inventories listed, described and verified, by reference to historical sources, all of the activities, events, historical personnages and objects appropriate to each period presentation environment. They provided the historical and modern
contexts for static period displays and live animation, and in sum they provide a basis for the interpretation of the architecture, material culture and living conditions of the colonial fortress and town; a cultural landscape case study and a representation of a major segment of eighteenth-century Louisbourg. It was an important assignment and one that had to be carried out expeditiously. As with historical and archaeological studies conducted during the first decade of research and reconstruction, there was no time for academic indulgence and very little time for presenting the results of basic research.

The main impetus for the preparation of the inventories came from the Head of Operations, William O'Shea, as Chairman of the Period Presentation Committee. He was an experienced member of staff, having served as Visitor Services Officer under Park Superintendent John Lunn. Though not a member of the project's research staff he was well qualified academically as an anthropologist to lead this effort, and as the manager of the staff that had to deliver living history programmes directly to the public he was acutely aware of the urgency that prevailed. As Chairman of Period Presentation he was able to enlist the support of research and curatorial staff outside the Operations Section and then directly apply the results. Once a format for the presentation of conclusions and evidence was established and approved the work proceeded on a priority basis within the research section and on period presentation teams that involved all concerned specialists. Within several months the most needed inventories were ready for approval by full committee and, as with the reconstruction drawings and technical specifications previously approved by the Structural Design Committee and the Furnishings Design Committee, the results were in a format that could be put to use immediately by the people who had to implement the interpretation programme.
On the surface it might have seemed that the workloads for research staff were manipulated to meet goals set for operations staff, and if only a traditional hierarchical organization had been in place that accusation could have been made and proven, and in the process important work could have bogged down in the classical bureaucratic shuffle of responsibilities. Louisbourg's flexible organization and more particularly its system of interdisciplinary teams and committees allowed working units to adjust workloads and share common goals. In this major effort to produce period presentation inventories, formal organizational lines were blurred and at times staff were not sure whose instructions to follow. They were more likely to get their marching orders from a period presentation meeting than they were from a section heads meeting or a supervisor, but in short time the conflict and confusion cleared and the important work was done. William O'Shea later became the first Head of the new Historical Resources section, largely as a result of his leadership and participation in these interdisciplinary committees and teams and in the application of their work.

The preparation of period presentation inventories was just one example of how programming was carried out at Louisbourg after 1973, and the Period Presentation Committee was just one of several organizational mechanisms devised to make the transition from planning to development and from development to operation. The benefits of interdisciplinary work on the conceptual or intellectual level were transferred in this process to the level of practical application, and the efficacy of institutionalized teamwork was demonstrated on many occasions. The results of that process, comparisons of Louisbourg with other historic sites and outdoor museums, the position and influence of the project in preservation, interpretation and public history and the lessons to be learned from Louisbourg research and development are the subjects of the remainder of this study.
Reference was made in chapter one to the many unpublished manuscripts that resulted from historical research by staff during the early research and source gathering stage of research and development, and emphasis has been placed throughout this study on the varied methods used in the conduct and in the presentation of the labors of research by project staff and by contractors.¹ The preceding chapter concluded with an analysis of period presentation inventories as a further means of bringing together evidence from various sources for very practical purposes for use in interpretation programming, presented in a format other than the standard manuscript report. Many manuscripts were, of course, completed during the research and development phase of the project. This chapter will attempt to provide an overview of historical research studies in three major categories: architectural, military and socio-economic.

¹ See above, chapters three and five of this study.
This overview and synthesis of topics concentrates exclusively on what has been written by staff and contract historians over the first two decades of the project. Although some publications will be included in this overview, they are not considered for the purposes of this study to be more important or more valuable than the many unpublished manuscripts. As the end products of extensive research, little of which could be published and little of which was written for publication, the manuscript reports are considered to be of equal interest for the purposes of this study, whether they have been published or not.

An example, however, of how such focused and often technical research activity could be brought together for general interest and publication purposes was provided in a special 1974 issue of a popular Canadian historical magazine. This particular example is chosen here not because it is typical of the historical research programme at Louisbourg but because it provides testimony to the extent, complexity and maturity of the programme as it and the Louisbourg project entered its second decade. As with the work on period presentation inventories mentioned in the last chapter, the collective efforts to produce this special issue reveal the teamwork principles and practices in place at the Louisbourg project at this important juncture in its development as a research centre and as a historic site and outdoor museum.

The opportunity for the historical research staff at Louisbourg to collaborate with McMaster University and an established Canadian publisher on a special issue of Canada, was greeted enthusiastically because there were few such opportunities at that time to write for other than park programmes and internal Parks Canada publications. The demands of project research for development programmes left little time for reorganizing notes and files or to write for other than the original and limited purpose intended, usually to provide information for a specific building or exhibit. The extent of research
activity in the expanded Parks Canada system meant that very little of the total system output could be selected for publication in its own publication series. Consequently the research staff by the early 1970's was working with not only a substantial data base, described in chapter one, but an increasingly large backlog of manuscript reports and shorter essays and articles that were seldom read by other than project staff. This could be a frustrating experience for historians trained to write for a wider readership, and eager to reach the public with new information and insights on Louisbourg. Although challenging and distracting to such a busy research staff, the special Canada magazine issue, nevertheless, had its own special appeal for those involved.

Few of those historians involved realized how relatively easy it would be to put together the five articles comprising the June, 1974 issue of Canada.2 Within several weeks the articles were written and edited and the remaining few details of final editing and printing were left to the university editor and publisher, working in close consultation with the Senior Historian at Louisbourg, Dr. Robert J. Morgan. The issue was informative illustrated with photographs, contained original research and was by far the best selling issue of the magazine in its several years of existence. It did not represent a resounding achievement in academic or popular history, but it was a moderate success by most standards. The important point for this study is that it could be brought together so quickly and with so little disruption to the regular research programme. The established teamwork mechanisms in place for such work as structural design and period presentation made it easy to apply the same approach to
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this assignment and they help to explain the results, but a fuller explanation lies in an analysis of what stage the historical research programme had reached by this time.

The characteristics and standards referred to in earlier chapters, notably the high degree of commitment eventually accorded to the research disciplines, the large and well organized project archives and the innovative methods used for reporting the results of research, remained in place throughout the 1970's. A new resource was added by the early 1970's, one that helps to explain the expeditious preparation of the Canada magazine issue and, more importantly, one that constituted an accrued asset that enhanced the capabilities of the historical research staff in its support of project development and operation. By 1970, the Louisbourg staff was beginning deliberately and consistently to research not just primary and secondary sources on Louisbourg topics, but the reports and research files of previous researchers on related topics; prepared not just by historians but by current and former staff members and contractors in all of the disciplines employed by the project. In effect they were researching research, most of it very well done in the first place and not in need of repetition, but readily available for revision and re-interpretation.

From the outset of project research and development it was standard practice for research staff to deposit their research notes and files in the project archives after completion of the research assignment and report, and the archival staff was continuously updating records, reorganizing files and creating new files to make research more efficient. The eventual result was an extensive historical archives on the project's own work; a well organized, physically compact and readily accessible historiographic record.

Because of Louisbourg's isolation, visiting researchers, students and the general public rarely used the archives or the library, which
had the salient effect of leaving project research, as well as curatorial and interpretation staff without some of the delays that were normal for facilities that had to provide an inquiries service to large client groups and the public. Also, Louisbourg's brief history of just half a century and the project's concentration of its reconstruction and interpretation programmes on just the 1740's, added further to the ease with which many research assignments could be circumscribed and carried out. The Canada magazine issue was one example of how these factors combined with the prevailing teamwork ethic to allow a focused and efficient research process, one that has left a voluminous legacy of archival records, reports, manuscripts and publications.

The major disadvantage of this system was a lack of public input and peer criticism from outside Parks Canada. Even the Canada Magazine issue was not independently assessed by academic or public history scholars before publication, just by project research staff and McMaster University Press. The research process and its results received ample scrutiny within the project and also from the Parks Canada system as the years progressed, but detached and independent review of Louisbourg research and development, especially by academics in related fields, was too rare in the early years even though it was regularly solicited at conferences and in journals when papers and articles were contributed by staff and former staff. Again it must be emphasized that the Louisbourg project was without equivalents in Canada and that growth in the museum and heritage field had lagged behind the United States and Europe. Consequently, until the 1970s most academics in Canadian university history departments were not aware of or interested in historical preservation projects, by which time the Louisbourg research programme was well established on its own within Parks Canada and only beginning to receive anything like serious attention from such outside professional or academic groups. In any event, Parks Canada and museum research colleagues as well as the general public and visitors to the reconstruction were by then regarded as
more important to the project and to the heritage preservation field in general than university based academics. In this process, however, isolation prevailed over peer review and important opportunities for objective and constructive criticism were missed.

Research assignments after 1970 always included an early study of what had already been written on related topics and of the principal source materials used by colleagues. These efforts, discussions within committees and teams and surprisingly little time in the archives and library could give new staff historians and contractors an unexpectedly early sense of what the most important sources were for any given topic, and the chances were very good that the source material in question was already indexed. All staff in historical research became familiar with the major documentary series such as the official correspondence, the parish records and court records, usually within months of undertaking a major assignment, and they could then fully participate in the critical mass dynamics of the reconstruction and the increasingly important interpretation process. This was especially true of the work on iconographic source material such as the more accurate and detailed of the historical maps and plans.

Another example of a hastily but effectively prepared publication from the early 1970's will reinforce the above points as a transition to the main purpose of this chapter, which is to provide a general description and analysis of historical reports at the project from the period 1961 to 1981. The Canada magazine case study attempted to show that it was relatively easy to bring together historical writing on Louisbourg when the opportunity suited the current research programme. The following example attempts to show that bringing raw historical evidence together with little or no interpretation and analysis was even less complex and more expeditious, but not completely without merit. In 1972 an entire issue of the Bulletin of the Association For Preservation Technology
was devoted to selections from eighteenth-century Louisbourg cartographic evidence. The issue was well presented and well received, consisting of photographic reproductions of selected historical maps and plans with a brief introduction by the Head of Research at the Louisbourg project, John Fortier. To many it must have seemed that a great deal of work had been devoted to this special issue of a relatively obscure publication. The reality was that almost any member of the research staff and certainly the senior members of the engineering and architecture staff had a similar collection of working photographic reproductions and equal knowledge of the cartographic collection. It was the most important source used in the work of the structural design committee and it was assumed that staff who worked on structural design assignments had studied the collection closely and knew it intimately, whether they published about it or not.

The point to be drawn from the above example is that much of what was known by research staff was applied internally and often exclusively to project objectives. Most of that knowledge has been written and rewritten in the manuscript reports, essays and articles of historical research staff and contractors, and only scattered selections of it have been published by Parks Canada or in academic and popular publications, hence the emphasis in this chapter on unpublished material. So much has been written since 1961 that any detailed categorization by subject matter would be too difficult to organize in a brief overview such as this chapter attempts to provide. A recently compiled master list of reports by Louisbourg staff and contractors in all disciplines contains more than one thousand entries. Critical review of all manuscripts would require a series of


dissertations, each covering a major category, or a lengthy series of review articles. This chapter merely attempts a cursory review and sampling of historical writings under the three major categories chosen.

**Architectural Studies**

Architectural studies were produced in three phases, starting with early research work that was concentrated on fortifications and on public buildings, mostly in the King’s Bastion area. These were the best documented buildings in the colony, with fully detailed historical plans, progress reports and material specifications. The accuracy of the plans was particularly rewarding and copies were usually included with the historical reports, which were strictly structural in emphasis, also detailed and necessarily turgid. There was very little comparative study in the architectural studies of the fortification features because the trace of the Louisbourg system of defences was irregular, due to the particular terrain and climate of Louisbourg, which made it unique in North America. The only close comparison that could be made was to the fortifications and to the public buildings in Quebec city and to some of the smaller fortified positions in the remainder of New France, but these comparisons were not considered to be essential to an early start on the reconstruction of Louisbourg fortifications and public buildings, due to the extensive documentation available on Louisbourg.

Some of the historical reports contained references to archaeological information obtained from the first excavations at Louisbourg and all reports were intended to brief archaeologists prior to new excavations. The main concern of these reports was to establish precise dimensions and material specifications for buildings and features as a basis for reconstruction. In this phase research assignments were not concerned with the people who built the structures or lived in them. No doubt there could have been more
emphasis on function and on important associations with people and events, but the reports had to be produced quickly with very specific questions to be answered. They were simply intended to get the reconstruction going and there was too little time to provide broader context or to write historical narrative. Approximately 60 reports were produced in this initial phase and most were short and to the point. They do not make interesting reading, but cumulatively they provide a good architectural survey of the fortress and town.

The second phase of architectural reports involved more general research on properties, including streets, public areas and yards, and the people who inhabited and used them. These reports were more substantial and provided a more complete sense of how buildings functioned and were placed in a landscape that was both natural and altered by human occupation, how interior arrangements and patterns of use developed, and of the work that took place during the process of building these structures. They also included reference to some of the social activities that took place in prominent and well documented buildings such as the Engineer's House and the Governor's apartments. There is as much emphasis on structural detail as there was in the earlier architectural studies, because they had to meet the purposes of reconstruction, but they were also embellished by references to people as the basis for interpretation of those same properties to the visiting public.

By the mid 1960's the historical research staff had the time and the confidence to produce comprehensive property reports organized by town blocks. Most, particularly those for the block one area where the public buildings for the colony were concentrated, were based on thorough documentation of both structural detail and social activities. The later block reports prepared in the 1970's were able to include fascinating personal anecdote on the inhabitants, many of whom had a proclivity for taking each other to court over assumed and very often proven crimes, property disputes and all
manner of troubled, at times trivial interpersonal disputes and interrelationships. In many cases these reports could also include rich detail on such features as door and window location, on fireplace location and room function, particularly if the estate had been officially inventoried and subsequently sold at one of the regular public auctions reported in the court records.

Always the historical plans and the views were important sources and selected copies of them were normally provided as an appendix to the report. Some of the better historical plans also included detailed drawings of fence lines, outbuildings and gardens, although these were sometimes stylized and in many cases contradictory. In general the property reports produced in this phase of the project's architectural research provide an excellent cross section of the reconstruction area and of the general social life of the Louisbourg community. Court records allowed, as stated earlier in this study, an historical perspective on all sectors of Louisbourg society, not just the elite. Interesting patterns of intermarriage and economic activity began to emerge after the basic material and structural information on the buildings and property features had been provided, which eventually stimulated further research on such topics as staff were able to expand social history research.

The third phase of architectural research involved the production of a series of preliminary architectural studies in four volumes, all written in 1971-72. The first volume summarized the earlier research on the major building styles at Louisbourg for private buildings, which were by then the focus of reconstruction activity after the work on fortifications and public buildings was well advanced. The other volumes concentrated on individual building techniques. The information available was so specific that individual studies of the following features were made possible: sod roof construction, stairs, doors, windows and dormers, roof coverings, paint, interior finishes and paneling, partitions, floors, ceilings,
heating and cooking facilities, built-in and installed furnishings, even sinks and drains; with a final volume on outbuildings and exterior features, including gardens, fences and gates. They were based mainly on information contained in a domestic architecture file prepared after the major studies of well documented public buildings were completed, and the information and structural analysis could then be applied to private or domestic buildings. The colonial town was well documented and these reports took advantage of that good fortune to support a high degree of accuracy in the reconstruction.

Military Studies

There were fewer studies of the Louisbourg military by historical research staff and contractors, because such studies were not required for the actual reconstruction of properties and they were not essential for general interpretation programmes, because so much had already been written and published about Louisbourg military events and personalities. Most of the studies conducted, however, were, as historical narratives, superior to the architectural reports. In the categories researched, good published literature was available. Many writers of fiction and non-fiction since the first and second sieges of Louisbourg had an interest in the fortress and town primarily as a battlefield and military base and not as a community with a civilian population. Research staff could draw on a better balance of primary and secondary source material than was the case with architectural studies. In many instances they brought the same high level of motivation and enthusiasm to military subjects that so many generations of writers had. Military subjects and their interpretation to military specialists and to the general public were intrinsically more interesting to many researchers than the details of buildings and properties. This was particularly true of strategic analysis of the military during both sieges and of the biographical
studies written by staff and contractors, which were required for interpretation projects as opposed to reconstruction.

Studies of Louisbourg's fortifications were a necessary component in strategic analysis of the sieges, but the architectural studies of the town and harbour defences had focused on their physical characteristics and on the various changes made after construction began in 1718. The architectural studies, nevertheless, included a sound grasp of fortification theory, specifically the Vauban system, and they were useful in finding source material for studies on such related subjects as the flags, colours and general characteristics of the various regiments and on the strategic movement of their troops during both sieges. These subjects were given an early priority in the historical research programme even though staff were urgently required for structural and property studies, which reveals an appreciation for and a commitment to the interpretation process and, more importantly for this study, a realization that extensive research would be necessary to support interpretation programmes.

Several historians and an archaeologist familiar with historical methods were assigned military topics in the mid-1960's that ultimately resulted in comprehensive and published studies of the sieges and of the Louisbourg fortifications. The archaeologist, Bruce Fry, and several Louisbourg colleagues in archaeological research were not only committed to interdisciplinary studies but capable of conducting them on their own and within a network of colleagues in Europe and North America that had conducted work for the Louisbourg project. One of the best examples of interdisciplinary

writing from this stage of project research and development was a report on Louisbourg guardhouses by archaeologist Charles Lindsay, whose familiarity with archival source material exceeded that of most historians on staff. Lindsay was a technical expert in his own field, archaeology, but also an excellent writer of historical synthesis. His Louisbourg Guardhouses manuscript, submitted to Ottawa in 1971 and ultimately published by Parks Canada in 1975, not only reflected competence in both disciplines, but also set a high standard for interdisciplinary studies throughout the Parks Canada system.6

Two of the staff historians from this period, Raymond Baker and Margaret Fortier, were equally well qualified for interdisciplinary work, particularly in museum interpretation and education, and their reports were among several that started the process of producing readable 'popular' history as a transition from the technical and turgid studies that were required in the first five years of the project. Eventually the interpretation programme at Louisbourg was well supported by interesting and illustrated studies of military facilities and activities, of the soldiers' role in the civilian labor force and the officers' role in the commercial activities of the colony, replete with profiles of individual soldiers and officers and their costume and comportment; all subjects that interested the general public and for that reason were required for the training of research and interpretation staff. In a progression to broader social history the military was studied and presented as a part of Louisbourg society, not just as people who carried weapons and fought battles. There was no attempt to lessen the historical significance of the sieges and of the military personnel who participated in them, but there was a conscious attempt in military studies to include material on the civilian population and in many cases to emphasize its role in military events. Similarly, studies of
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6 Charles S. Lindsay, "Louisbourg Guardhouses", Occasional Papers in Archaeology and History, No. 12, Ottawa, Parks Canada, 1975, pp. 47-100.
the Louisbourg military during times of peace placed military personnel in this broader context of the social and economic life of the colony, and on the impact the military and civilian sectors of society had on each other. This has led to an interpretation programme that does not present either group as separate.

Although approximately twenty five reports were written on military topics and numerous smaller reports and memoranda were written and filed in the archives, little attention was devoted to studies of the harbour or to naval studies in general. The topic was well covered in a general way in published literature, again focused mainly on the strictly military aspects and not on the impact that so many French and British ships and naval personnel had on the town on a seasonal basis throughout its brief history.

As noted in the introduction to this study, the historical and international importance of the two sieges and of the French and British military presence in the North Atlantic, often at or near Louisbourg, produced a military orientation in individual, intellectual perspectives and in the writings of generations of historians, many with a central North American and European historiographical bias. The Louisbourg historical research programme drew on this historiographical tradition but developed its own perspectives on the history of the colony, particularly the military, and began to see Louisbourg on its own as an historical entity and not just in association with Europe and French and British possessions in the interior of North America and in the West Indies.

The task of studying Louisbourg as a distinct and homogeneous society, not just as a military base, induced the research staff at Louisbourg in the 1970's to shift its emphasis to socio-economic studies after the architectural and military studies were either completed or well advanced. The interpretation programme required this type of information, which meant that the research staff could
step back from the demands of the physical reconstruction of the fortress and town to study Louisbourg society in that broader context.

Socio-Economic Studies

Approximately sixty reports by staff and contractors on socio-economic topics were written in the first two decades of the historical research programme. Such a broad category could obviously be construed in various ways to produce different numbers and there is overlap and arbitrariness in how this study has organized the subjects of manuscripts in the three categories, for example the inclusion of town property reports in the overview of both the architectural and socio-economic categories. The method chosen as the basis for this chapter has been selective, to highlight reports regarded as representative, lengthy and directly supportive of project objectives, and to disregard the many entries in the master list of reports that did not emanate directly or indirectly from the historical research programme. Emphasis has been placed on examples of historical research that were or could have been applied in the reconstruction and interpretation of Louisbourg, a method which is for the purposes of this study subjective and highly selective, as much of the work on museum collections must be.

These studies of Louisbourg's society and economy revealed that the basis for the whole colonial enterprise at Louisbourg was open for debate, that it could have been based more on the commercial realities of the French and British Empires and such important trade commodities as the cod fishery, as it was on the military rivalries that resulted in two sieges. The themes could be easily brought together and debated by historians, usually with a strong measure of academic indulgence, but that left interpretation staff in training programmes to reduce and to translate - in English and in French - what was presented in many reports as technical
detail or academic argument. The published historical narratives in fiction and non-fiction and some of the staff and contractors' reports did give the interpretation programme much of what they needed to explain and interpret such a complicated story to the public.

There was a requirement, however, after a decade of mostly specialized studies, for major change in the design of the historical research programme. This new stage of project development produced new objectives and a concomitant shift in emphasis by historical research staff in subject matter and in method, to historical writing that could be used in the effective interpretation of Louisbourg to the general public, not just to interdisciplinary colleagues. This process was gradual but deliberate and it was based on the organizational dynamics which prevailed at the Louisbourg project in the middle of the 1970's, as they have been described in the preceding chapter. The nature of the change was apparent in the subjects assigned to historical research staff.

The following topics within the socio-economic category were covered in at least one report and for some topics in many reports in the first fifteen years of the historical research programme:

Colonial Administration

History of the Louisbourg area after 1760

Population and property reports on Louisbourg

Population and property reports on other settlements within the colony of Isle Royale

Military and civilian costume
Professions and occupations

Commodity imports and exports

The list of topics from the mid-1970's adds the following topics that were more clearly intended for interpretation purposes:

Louisbourg servants and gossips

Laws and regulations within Louisbourg

Merchants and military officers

Family life, social status and contrasting life styles

Animals and their husbandry

Jewelry, table manners and studies of food consumption

The cod fishery of Isle Royale

Life in Louisbourg's public places

One of the best examples of a research project specifically designed for the interpretation programme was Christopher Moore's work on aspects of civilian life in the town. Moore had worked as a staff historian at Louisbourg in the early 1970's and was one of the leading proponents of both a broader based approach to the study of Louisbourg's history and a popular or public orientation and style in
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historical writing. He wrote this particular manuscript as a contractor in 1977. Brief reports on the following subjects were included: Public Auctions in Louisbourg; Law, Order and Street Life; The Louisbourg Fishing Property; Harbour Life and Quay Activities; Festivals and Celebrations. All provided information needed in the costumed animation programme then being developed at Louisbourg and they also provided a sound basis for the preparation of interpretive literature and training materials. The manuscript, although never published in its original form, constitutes good popular history.

What was occurring by the time these studies were underway was a fundamental re-interpretation of Louisbourg and its place in history, an exercise in historiography on a small scale by a mature research staff that knew the importance of communicating effectively to the public and had more than enough information to do so. The historical research programme was transformed to produce socio-economic studies that could be used by interpretation staff and that could lead anyone interested in the history of the site to the archival and library resources required to investigate almost any aspect of its history.

Many of the socio-economic studies emphasized the general nature and the well studied manifestations of the class structure of France and England in the eighteenth century at colonial locations such as Louisbourg. The best of them focused directly on the people and on the events that occurred at Louisbourg. Any synthesis of those studies, all of which are available in manuscript form and in an extensive published literature, would lead to a better and fuller appreciation of Louisbourg as a fortress and town, as a base for the cod fishery and as a naval port and commercial centre. This study contends that the best of those reports have led to new historical analysis and to a scholarly and popular understanding of Louisbourg as a society and an economy based on commercial as well as military interests. Some of the publications that have resulted from research
by Louisbourg staff and contractors have also led to a better understanding of Louisbourg's geography, its architecture, and its place in military and economic strategies and social realities. They have also led to a better understanding of the people who lived in that historically important, albeit historically ephemeral community.

Publications

"The historiography of Ile Royale during the French Regime has advanced immeasurably over the past few years." That statement was made in 1972 by the History Division of the National Museum of Man after a series of papers on Louisbourg and the colony of Isle Royale had been presented in a special symposium at the annual meeting of the Canadian Historical Association, the results of which the museum agreed to publish. Of the six papers received and recognized by the museum and the historical community four had been presented by historians who were current or former staff members or contractors for the Louisbourg project. The titles again reveal the broader spectrum of historical research, with lengthy papers (more than thirty pages) on the New England occupation of Louisbourg and on the myth of Louisbourg as a mighty fortress, and shorter papers on the Royal Navy at Louisbourg (only six pages), the impact of Louisbourg on the economy of Massachusetts, on Louisbourg and the economy of New France and a precis of a lengthy study on the politics of constructing fortifications and public buildings at Louisbourg. At this and many other academic and museum conferences Louisbourg staff and contractors were beginning to make a significant contribution beyond the Louisbourg project itself. Published proceedings and compilations of conference
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8 Canadian Historical Association,"Papers and Abstracts for a Symposium on Ile Royale During the French Regime", compiled for the annual meeting of the Canadian Historical Association, June 1972.
papers, particularly those sponsored by agencies such as the Canadian Museums Association and regional history or heritage groups, are an important source of information on research and development at Louisbourg and how it could be applied elsewhere. At the same time as the Louisbourg staff expanded and matured and began to be recognized in the academic and museum community, the Dictionary of Canadian Biography was being written. Because so many staff members and contractors contributed biographies to volumes two, three and four, covering the years 1701 to 1800, the dictionary is one of the most important sources of published information on Louisbourg and the colony of Isle Royale and on the British and New England officers and merchants who figured prominently in its history. The dictionary also contains biographies and introductory articles on broader topics written by academics who were taking a more particular interest in Louisbourg as a result of the reconstruction project, which reinforces the importance of this publication for the study of Louisbourg history and the importance of the Louisbourg project in influencing scholarly activity and commemoration.

As indicated earlier in this chapter it is difficult to survey individual studies by Louisbourg staff and contractors that have been published without conducting a study separate from this dissertation and at least as lengthy. The method employed here is one of subjective, almost random selection and seeks merely to highlight a limited number of publications in an attempt to reflect the evolution in historical writing described earlier.

The two sieges are arguably the most important events in the history of Louisbourg. The first siege, because it involved New
England land forces and because by all accounts it was unorthodox, has been of more interest to the readers of academic and popular history and historical fiction in North America. The first siege also figures more prominently in the reconstruction and interpretation of Louisbourg, which focuses on the years leading to the first siege in 1745. Mention was made earlier in this chapter of military research topics assigned to historians who were well qualified in the practice of museum interpretation. One of those historians, Raymond Baker, wrote a report of the first siege as a research assignment in 1965. The manuscript was later edited and published by Parks Canada, its title: A Campaign of Amateurs: The Siege of Louisbourg, 1745. Two issues are significant for this study, that a very good account of the first siege was published and that it was published by Parks Canada.

The largest category of publications by Louisbourg research staff and contractors is with the various series of research bulletins, manuscript reports, occasional papers and monographs issued by Parks Canada since 1961. The Baker report on the first siege was published as an occasional paper in 1977 and examples of the other types of publication will be provided in this brief sampling. As with the Louisbourg historical research programme developed within Parks Canada, the publications programme of the National Historic Parks and Sites Branch expanded and matured throughout the 1970's. The best of the publications on Louisbourg, especially military and socio-economic studies, were issued in the 1980's but based on research conducted in the first two decades of the project.

A representative selection of Louisbourg reports was published in Parks Canada's Manuscript Report Series. Reference was made
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earlier in the overview of architectural studies to the various reports on town blocks within the reconstructed area. Most of these were reprinted with minimal editing for the manuscript series. Other subjects covered include artillery at Louisbourg, innkeepers and cabarets, the population of Isle Royale, and commodity imports; studies that tended to present raw statistical and technical data with very little analysis and interpretation.

It was also mentioned earlier that a comprehensive study of Louisbourg's fortifications had been conducted by an archaeologist, Bruce Fry, employing historical as well as archaeological methods and source material. That study was also published by Parks Canada in two volumes as one of the first in a new series of monographs issued as Studies in Archaeology, Architecture and History. The historical analysis was presented in text and illustrations, mainly photographic reproductions of selected historical maps, plans and views in one volume while the technical data from excavations and its analysis, profusely and expertly illustrated, were presented in volume two. Like the Baker report on the first siege it is one of the basic studies required for the understanding and interpretation of Louisbourg as a fortress and military base.

In this chapter and in previous chapters much emphasis has been placed on the importance of illustrations in staff reports, manuscripts and publications, almost all of which have been reproduced or printed in two-colour format. In 1979 the Park Superintendent, John Fortier, collaborated with a professional photographer, Owen Fitzgerald, who had worked on a contract basis for the Louisbourg project, to produce a book of well integrated text.

Fry, op. cit.
and beautiful color photographs of Louisbourg. The text was based on years of research by Fortier and others, but was written in a popular and highly readable style, bereft of academic and technical detail. The photographs were selected on the basis of their quality and to support the text, much like a good exhibit or display. The book was similar to and drew upon some of the work being done at that time in the park's interpretation and visitor services programmes, which Fortier directed, and was a very good example to research, interpretation and visitor services staff of how to best present the aesthetics of the reconstruction in their proper historical context.

Some reports were able to combine illustrations with technical and statistical data in a readable narrative style, especially when extensive editing and review took place outside the research units at Louisbourg, either within Parks Canada or with an independent publisher. An example was a report on the cod fishery of Isle Royale, written by B.A. Balcom in 1979 and published in Parks Canada's monograph series in 1984. Its historical synthesis brought the many studies of the North Atlantic cod fishery, one of the most important staple economies in the western hemisphere in the eighteenth century, to bear on the community of Louisbourg as a land base for an important activity in that economy, the drying and export of cod. The many statistics drawn from a variety of files in the primary documentation on Louisbourg and smaller Isle Royale fishing settlements are presented in tables that do not unnecessarily disrupt the historical narrative. The illustrations consisted mainly of photographic reproductions of historical maps and plans and of engravings from a major three-volume study of the fishery and its
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technology, published between 1769 and 1777. This was one of the few non-military subjects for which such extensive and high quality engravings could be copied as illustrations, and this study makes judicious use of them. As the introduction to the report states with respect to the special demands of the Louisbourg project: "The most important of those demands is undoubtedly that the report be of practical use to the Park's reconstruction or animation programme".

Some of the historians were eager to publish aspects of their research in short articles, later to be brought together in essays or monographs. Parks Canada's Research Bulletins were a good vehicle for research in progress and many Louisbourg entries appeared in this series and as short articles in a variety of historical and museum journals and periodicals. The titles in the late 1970's and early 1980's again reflect the shift to socio-economic research, as in the case of two such articles published by Kenneth Donovan, one a Research Bulletin under the title of "Paying One's Own Way: Dining and Drinking in Louisbourg Inns and Cabarets", the other a lengthier and highly analytical historical essay with the title of "Tattered Clothes and Powdered Wigs: Case Studies of the Poor and Well-to-Do in Eighteenth Century Louisbourg". Such studies gave the scholarly community and the public historical perspectives on classes of people and on individuals in Louisbourg society that would not normally be presented in published historical writing, for example in such established publications as the Dictionary of Canadian Biography.


16 Ibid., p. 2

An example of historical writing prepared specifically for the interpretation programme but published as a monograph in the Parks Canada series was A.J.B. Johnston's study of the summer of 1744 at Louisbourg. The study was assigned so that interpretation staff would have in one booklet a conceptual framework for Louisbourg and a daily log of world and local events during the season and year highlighted in presentations to the public in the reconstruction and animation programmes. The result was not just historical overview and a compendium of factual information, but a fascinating account of what could have been known and probably did concern the inhabitants of the town at that time. As such it has served as one of the best training aids for interpretation staff. Much of the promotional and interpretive literature for the park in the late 1970's focused on the theme Louisbourg: A Moment in Time, and this study gave the context, anecdote and historical sequence that allowed staff to elaborate on the theme with accuracy and with a sense of history in general terms.

Johnston was one of the few staff historians or contractors who could write effectively in scholarly as well as popular prose. His study of religion and morality at Louisbourg, originally written as a staff report in 1978, was later expanded, edited and published by McGill-Queen’s University Press, an example of the academic respect accorded to Johnston and to some of the general studies conducted in the Louisbourg research programme. The study was, of course, needed for the interpretation of such an important group in colonial society, less so for the reconstruction of properties since the garrison chapel was the only religious building within the


reconstructed area. It is also an example of a major research assignment not dictated by the physical reconstruction of properties, but by the requirement for a full investigation and interpretation of an important sector of the Louisbourg population.

The final study in this sampling is of a publication resulting in part from the historical research programme is a book by Christopher Moore, one of the historians referred to earlier in this chapter for his work on aspects of civilian life in the town. In 1982 his book, Louisbourg Portraits: Life in an Eighteenth-Century Garrison Town, was published by Macmillan of Canada, became a bestseller in Canada and won that year's Governor-General's Award for non-fiction; one of the most prestigious literary awards in the country. Moore used the relatively simple method of developing five case studies of Louisbourg personalities, none prominent in previous historical writing, to study the social life of the town. His superb writing is not borrowed from other publications but is based almost entirely on primary sources copied for the Louisbourg archives and for the Public Archives of Canada, sources now available to academic and public historians largely because of the Louisbourg project and the efforts of its research staff:

"Such sources made Louisbourg Portraits possible. By attending to them I have not had to invent a single character, episode, or event. Louisbourg Portraits is history: there is no line of dialogue that is not taken from a document, and I have not had to transpose events in time or place. Events described in Louisbourg Portraits happened; the people to whom they occurred existed; and the records have long been available to scholars." 20

The Fortress of Louisbourg archives has preserved copies of those records and of the original records pertaining to research and development at Louisbourg since 1961.21 That resource and the accumulated historical writings on Louisbourg, published and unpublished, remain to be used by future generations in the re-interpretation of the history of Louisbourg and its reconstruction.

The remainder of this study will describe how Louisbourg was interpreted and presented to the public in the late 1970's and early 1980's and will compare the results with a selection of other outdoor museums and historic sites elsewhere in North America and in Europe.

21 See Inventory of Holdings and Master List of Reports and Memoranda, Fortress of Louisbourg Archives.
The historical reports written during the development phase of the Louisbourg project, with the exception of several of the special narratives on military subjects highlighted in the previous chapter, were intended to contribute technically and specifically to historic site and outdoor museum programmes, from initial archaeological investigation through design, reconstruction and ultimately to the interpretation of Louisbourg to the general public. Concurrent with the preparation of reports, historians and archaeologists provided information and developed interpretations of evidence on various committees and teams in the activity areas described above in chapter three. This chapter will describe and evaluate the results of that process in terms of complete historic site and outdoor museum programmes that were operating and open to the visiting public near the end of the research and development phase in 1981.

Reconstruction of Historic Properties

The decisions on which properties would be reconstructed, as discussed in earlier chapters, were determined primarily on the basis of how much historical information was available and by the various interpretation objectives set for the project; principally the attempt to create a convincing precinct of the original fortress and town.
Approximately one-third of the town fortifications and one-quarter of the town site properties within the original fortification trace have been reconstructed, comprising more than two miles of fortifications and 50 military and civilian buildings with associated features and yards. The resulting assemblage is decidedly European in its overall appearance, especially by comparison to other French and British colonial possessions in North America from the same period.

The cumulative effect is a striking contrast to the nineteenth and twentieth century properties that surround the reconstruction, and the usual impact on visitors and staff includes a curious sense of isolation from modern life. There is in those who actively decide to experience that break visually and psychologically, a discernible change in their sense of time and place and a heightened awareness of life in another era; much like the evocative visions and insights many visitors experience in old or ancient European cities and towns or in the ruins of ancient communities and cultures. All of the senses and the intellect can be affected and despite the limitations of any attempt to bring the past to life, a very real and serious attempt can be made to 'experience' history.

It is the physical reconstruction of properties in a concentrated area that seeks to produce this living history effect, reinforced by period furnishing and costumed animation. The conventional and modern museum interpretation methods employed in the visitor centre and in other didactic exhibits and theme lounges throughout the reconstruction are not intended to produce or reinforce this special experience and they sometimes detract from it. A visit to Louisbourg is intended to begin and end educationally and visually with a panoramic view of the entire reconstruction, and once within its depth and texture the visitor begins inevitably to draw contrasts with the modern age and to develop at least some insight into the segment of the past that Louisbourg represents. That segment, as pointed out in earlier chapters, is chronologically a very thin slice of
history, but it has within that limitation a remarkable breadth and complexity.

The accompanying aerial views of the reconstruction in 1989 which are shown later in this chapter and the historical views included in earlier chapters of this study, give some indication of the interpretation and education possibilities inherent in a reconstruction of such scale, proportion and density. Its completion and its evolving presentation to the public formed the essence of Parks Canada's response to the initial brief from the Federal Government Cabinet in Ottawa, a response brought to realization in the early 1980's after two decades of extensive research and development on all approved properties. The process of property development culminated in their exterior and interior completion, the concurrent operation of many properties and the planned and systematic preservation of the entire site. The reconstruction combined with the various interpretation programmes that followed to give three dimensional expression and visual impact to the labours of historical and archaeological research.

The overall impression of the Louisbourg reconstruction is - by design - authentic to the mid-eighteenth century French land use, property standards and architectural styles imported to the colony of Isle Royale, particularly evident in the fortifications and in the waterfront buildings which were depicted in detail on the various historical views. Viewed today from the exterior, these reconstructed properties and features, incorporating whenever possible stabilized original features, convey an appropriate reflection of Louisbourg as a fortified naval base, commercial port and colonial town. (See Figures 6, 7 and 8)
The interiors, however, were adapted to a variety of uses, and compromises to authentic period presentation had to be introduced. Even within period environments such imperatives as visitor safety and traffic flow sometimes necessitated structural changes that were not authentic to the period and did not follow specifications that were documented by historical and archaeological research. For example, the dining room in the reconstructed Chief Engineer's Residence, which originally had only one doorway, includes a second doorway to accommodate modern visitor access and traffic flow, and the floors for the second storey of a number of period environments had to be strengthened to safely hold numbers of visitors far greater than those who would have occupied the original space.

Such compromises within reconstructed buildings were kept to a minimum, constructed in period style and appearance and are largely inconspicuous to visitors. Similarly, the modern services such as electrical and heating systems and fire prevention equipment were concealed, often ingeniously, behind period features and facades. As much as has been possible, what the visitor sees in period environments inside and outside the reconstructed buildings is an accurate representation of what is thought by research and interpretation staff to be the original appearance. The result is a comparatively realistic cross-section of eighteenth century architecture and material culture in an outdoor museum setting, one that is best appreciated and evaluated by studying the general art and architecture of the period as well as the local research conducted by project staff. The vast majority of visitors do not even attempt that comparative analysis or scrutiny, however, so they often develop misconceptions of history because they do not question or criticize the reconstruction, thereby failing to see it as just this generation's attempt to recreate the appearance of Louisbourg's past. They are usually so impressed by the depth and magnitude of the historic properties that they believe all of the reconstruction to be
absolutely accurate and authentic history, and this has often been encouraged by effusive and sometimes poorly trained staff. The many small compromises with history become easily overlooked in period presentation environments just because everything looks old and historical and because obvious modern accretions have been avoided or obscured.

The same rules for presentation of interiors did not apply in buildings designated for modern exhibits or services, except for theme lounges which, as explained previously in chapter three and again below, sometimes included an amalgam of modern and period furnishings. This approach had been designed to minimize confusion between period and modern environments. Some buildings were reconstructed to the exterior only, not to be opened to the public on a regular basis, which allowed such modern requirements as large transformers, fire trucks and modern building materials and supplies to be concealed within. On Town Blocks three and four and on the Ile du Quay at the eastern end of the waterfront, buildings that were not designated to contain modern services were reconstructed and finished to the exterior only, the interior left vacant and closed to the public. This compromise was made as the result of major funding cuts after 1978, which had the salient benefit of allowing project staff to concentrate and to consolidate efforts to furnish and otherwise interpret properties west of blocks three and four, without detracting from the overall impact of exterior reconstruction and cultural landscape interpretation.

On the exterior of buildings within the reconstruction area, underground water and electrical systems ensured that streets, yards and open spaces retained their period elevations and appearance, always after archaeological excavation was completed. Every attempt has been made to clear away traces of nineteenth and twentieth century occupation within and immediately surrounding the original fortress and town. This was also the rationale for the
location and inconspicuous construction of the administration, staff, storehouse and workshops complex, as well as the visitor reception centre and staff accommodation which were miles away from the reconstruction area, once again to preserve and not to intrude upon the period appearance and atmosphere presented to the visiting public. As a result of these painstaking and at times extraordinarily costly efforts a convincing period setting was created which has served as the basis and the starting point for the park's interpretation and public history programmes.

This exceptional resource has been used for comparative studies by the rest of the Parks Canada system and by other historic sites and museums, for historical films and special events and for numerous books and articles in fiction and non-fiction. It has also inspired a higher standard for research, accuracy and authenticity for historical presentations outside the Parks Canada system that have developed since the Louisbourg project matured in the 1970's. Each individual property at Louisbourg went through the same, painstaking process, usually taking as much as eight years to complete from initial research to reconstruction and then to eventual interpretation and maintenance, and the same standards continued to prevail as additional research, re-interpretation and visitor use have required changes and repairs in the years after certain properties were opened to large numbers of the visiting public.

Research and development for the reconstruction of the DeGannes House and property on Block 17 provides a representative case study of the various stages in the process from concept to reality. Historical research began in 1968-69, one year prior to scheduled archaeological investigation. By this time all research staff were located in Louisbourg, which allowed for more consultation between historical and archaeological researchers and the formation of a structural design team in 1970-71. Approval by the full structural design committee was received and reconstruction began
in 1972-73. The capital or development programme had reached its peak in terms of resources and expertise by this time and the main DeGannes structure was completed in that year, with landscaping and furnishings design scheduled for the following year. Additional curatorial research and special training for staff was also completed in 1973-74 and the property was ready for opening to the public during the 1985 visitor season. This seven-year process was typical of Louisbourg research and development in the 1970's, in contrast to the early 1960's when schedules were not so readily coordinated.

As each reconstructed property was completed and opened to the public, opportunities were enhanced for the full representation of all military, public and vernacular architectural styles; a detailed and comprehensive typology of colonial Louisbourg's material culture. The addition of costumed military and civilian animation and special living history scenarios and events began to present an increasingly realistic glimpse of Louisbourg's military and social history.

Thematically, however, the reconstruction has been incomplete in its overall impact because of the superficial inclusion of shoreline fishing properties and associated buildings, features and technology. The textual and visual information on this important international commodity and on the ubiquitous presence of fishermen and cod in and around the local area was available in exhibits and literature and indicated in several reconstructed properties, but this is not enough to convey a balanced presentation of the theme. As discussed in chapter three, the period presentation of reconstructed properties and costumed animation is the principal interpretation medium. The fisheries theme has been largely relegated to secondary and supporting media, in contrast to the fortress theme which is reflected with such obvious impact in the miles of reconstructed fortifications. This historical omission in interpretation is exacerbated by the lack of project research on naval history at Louisbourg, which hampers even the secondary interpretation of the international cod fishery.
and marine life at the coastal community and colonial port. In such an extensive historical reconstruction this constitutes a major aberration in thematic interpretation which has only recently been addressed.

An American Museologist and Professor of Museum Studies wrote in 1980: "...what open-air museums are all about is theater.... Living history provides actors for the sets and, in its developed phases, drama as well."1 The 'set' at Louisbourg is the physical reconstruction of historic properties in sufficient accuracy and proportion to support a full range of interpretation programmes for all but one major historical theme. Collections and properly trained and motivated members of interpretation staff are all that is needed to bring the Louisbourg of the eighteenth century to life and in the process to provide a measure of realism for interested visitors.

Historical Collections

Any set needs props. The historical collections accumulated at Louisbourg in the 1960's and 1970's covered the entire spectrum of eighteenth century material culture and social strata; from paintings and tapestries to muskets and cannon, from coarse earthenware and pewter to ceramics and precious metals and in costume from simple fishermen's woolens to the silk and laces of the upper classes. The material requirements for period presentation environments were listed by category in chapter three of this study and the process by which they were acquired was described. An attempt was made by curatorial staff to follow the material culture and interpretation guidelines set by historical and archaeological research, but the realities of the collectors' market in Europe and North America, combined with reduced curatorial budgets in the later years of the

---

circumscribed and constrained efforts to assemble a more comprehensive typological collection that could cover all historical contexts. Gaps had to be filled by purchasing and manufacturing reproductions based on originals, on archaeological artifacts and on the specifications provided by material research and design.

The result is a vast collection of largely ordinary, typical and at the time of the research and development phase, readily available military and domestic objects from the mid eighteenth century and earlier, both originals and reproductions, suitable for display in an outdoor museum environment. Very few original acquisitions were either rare or costly on the antique and collectors market, but the total collection of commonplace objects was purchased or reproduced at enormous cost (probably exceeding two million dollars). Since the opening of the King's Bastion the expanded furniture and furnishings, arms and armaments and costume collections have been augmented and spread throughout the period environments and in other interpretation programmes to complement and enhance the impact of the property reconstructions.

**Interpretation Programmes**

Throughout this study the importance of period presentation as the principal medium of interpretation has been emphasized. The reconstruction and curatorial efforts of the 1960's and early 1970's were intended to provide the basis for a glimpse of military and civilian life in the fortress and town during the 1740's, not just a living history spectacle but a serious, contextual and well-researched interpretation programme utilizing properties, objects, people, plants and animals - a cultural landscape - to fully present the history of colonial Louisbourg. In an article on history museums written in 1980 Thomas J. Schlereth, then Director of American Studies at the University of Notre Dame, concluded that:
Most visitors to a history museum, unlike visitors to an open-stack library, have little idea of the vast amount of historical evidence stored and cared for in history museums. They do not see all the collections. But they should be able to see more than they do now and they should have access to using that material culture evidence that is part of their past."²

Schlereth refers to this landscape as " an amazing historical document " and refers to the classic study, The Making of the English Landscape , by W.G. Hoskins who aptly describes land and its artifacts as " the richest historical record we possess ".³ Louisbourg, through its period presentation programme was very much a part of this attempt to convey a sense of history and a visualization of a past landscape to the general public, and not just to specialized living history enthusiasts and scholars. In this and in other interpretation programmes Louisbourg was part of a larger effort to preserve, present and in the process popularize Canadian history.

There is an important distinction between attempts to create a cultural landscape and the more limited and selective method of presenting a " period room ", as practiced in traditional museums in the United States and Europe, particularly Scandinavia, since the late nineteenth century. Edward P. Alexander, Director of Interpretation at Colonial Williamsburg, in a 1964 article about period rooms, links their development to the decorative arts and argues that Colonial Williamsburg and other comprehensive presentations of historic


³ As quoted in Ibid., p. 266.
environments were the exception. At Louisbourg and at other historic sites and outdoor museums, period rooms could be placed simultaneously in both a larger and a more specific historical context, and could be better understood in relationship to their human and natural environment. What made Louisbourg special and different from most other major historic sites and outdoor museums was that this reconstructed environment was on the same location as the original and, unlike Colonial Williamsburg which was also on its original site, Louisbourg has not been subsequently surrounded by a modern city. This isolation from the modern world has given the Louisbourg interpretation programme an exceptional opportunity to present history in its original context with minimal distraction.

The first period environments at Louisbourg were static displays, that is they were without live interpretation by costumed animators. In the interiors of the King's Bastion, taped commentaries filled out the wider historical context for visitors in the late 1960s, while research and interpretation staff planned and experimented with live animation. By the early 1970's the historical research effort was shifting away from structural and technical subjects to social history. Studies on costumes, comportment and behavior benefited from the same level of detailed and specific information that was available for structural design, and period presentation teams and committees were busy analyzing and incorporating this data in the further development of period environments. Military and civilian animation added a new dimension to the interpretation programme and began to meet the original objective of the project to "animate the lessons of history".


5 See Introduction to thesis.
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Military animation (see Figures 9 and 10) was based directly on primary and secondary historical accounts and portrayed a poorly equipped and inadequately trained colonial garrison, avoiding the usual pageantry and precision paraded in many historic sites elsewhere in North America, often inaccurately, to impress tourists. Soldiers at eighteenth century Louisbourg were as likely to be working on construction of the fortifications or as labourers in the town as they were to be on guard duty, and they often got drunk. Also, their officers were as concerned with their commercial involvements and with selling liquor to their soldiers in officially sanctioned canteens as they were with military affairs and the regimentation of troops in their garrison. The historical record also reveals that all ranks of the military were closely integrated with their equivalent classes in the civilian population. The soldiers' daily routine, therefore, has been depicted in association with servants and domestics in the town's reconstructed houses and public houses (inns and cabarets), and not confined to musket drills and cannon firing ceremonies. The result is a more realistic reflection and accurate representation of military life as it has been described in historical accounts.

Civilian animation (see Figure 11) is even more diverse and also attempts to represent everyday life, especially the lower classes at work, juxtaposed with soldiers and fisherman engaged in activities that were commonplace in eighteenth century Louisbourg and well described in court records and contemporary accounts. Cooking, serving and cleaning predominate and these activities allow the project to carry out routine housekeeping and security for historic properties as part of the interpretation programme. Special events
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such as the re-enactment of auctions in the street, regular and sometimes special and ceremonial meals in official and domestic settings, musical performances and games provide the opportunity to portray the upper classes in the costumed animation programme, and in the process to give visitors vignettes of life in all classes of colonial society.

The animation programme and period presentation environments in general focus on the early 1740s and draw on a wealth of information available in primary and secondary sources for the years preceding the first siege in 1745. As they did with structural design, historians participated directly in the period presentation teams and committees as the animation programme developed, ensuring again that interpretation was based on direct historical evidence wherever possible and informed appreciation of eighteenth century customs and manners.

Period food services were developed in the late-1970's as quasi-period presentation environments, where most but not all of the guidelines for authenticity applied, including the requirement for historical research input during the development phase. Concessions were made, however, in the incorporation of modern food services equipment in spaces concealed from the public, in eighteenth century recipes that had to be adapted to modern health regulations and the availability of food supplies, in serving arrangements that had to take museum visitors into account as patrons, and in the hiring and training of staff who would appear in period costume.

Four food service outlets were developed in historic properties that served similar functions in eighteenth-century Louisbourg: the Garrison Bakery, Hotel de La Marine, L'Auberge Seigneur and the
Cafe Destouche. All four were contracted to outside agencies, initially the Cape Breton Development Corporation because of its involvement in tourism and eventually to the Fortress of Louisbourg Volunteers Association, essentially on lease arrangements under Parks Canada control.

The Volunteers association eventually became the preferred contractor because it was established as a non-profit society sharing objectives with the park, making it more sympathetic to park policy and hence more likely to pursue the same interpretation objectives. The beneficial result has been the provision of important services to visitors in environments that blend with period presentation, usually without seriously detracting from the principal interpretation themes and objectives set for the reconstruction.

Interpretation themes were not formally set until final preparations were underway for the opening of the modern visitor reception centre in 1976, though they had been implicit in planning documents throughout the 1960's and in the 1973 task force report. The well documented and at times complicated history of the fortress and town left many interpretation staff with too much information and without a manageable conceptual or thematic model to organize their thoughts and perceptions about Louisbourg's history. To avoid the factual errors and historiographical misconceptions that had been conveyed to the public, many of them gleaned in the park's own training programmes and scattered exhibits, a simpler six-theme model was established and approved to guide interpretation and training. In addition to serving as a conceptual model for staff and the visiting public the themes encouraged more effective extension programming and promotional activity.

8 See above, chapter 2.
All six themes were to be interpreted in an introductory manner in the reception centre using small static displays with very few artifacts, supported by an extensive slide show in a four-section audio-visual theatre, and in more depth within the reconstruction using the various media, including audio-visual techniques in the modern exhibits and theme lounges. There was no attempt to allocate specific themes to any given media, except in a negative sense in the various period environments where modern techniques, especially audio-visual, were not to be considered and where the underlying assumption was that all themes would be represented in a cumulative period presentation. The methods used in period environments, period displays and animation excluded all other methods in order to achieve the desired impact of the reconstruction.

The themes remained the same from 1976 until their consolidation in training manuals in 1981, but the changing sequence in which they were listed reflected changes in how research and development had evolved over the two decades, how interpretation staff variously perceived the history of Louisbourg and ultimately how the site was explained to the public as the interpretation and visitor services programmes evolved.9 When first established, the military themes led the list, with prominence accorded to Louisbourg as a Fortress and Louisbourg as a Naval Port. By 1981 the sequence was as follows:

LOUISBOURG AS A CAPITAL
LOUISBOURG AS A FISHING BASE
LOUISBOURG AS A TRADING CENTRE
LOUISBOURG AS A FORTRESS
LOUISBOURG AS A NAVAL PORT
LOUISBOURG AS A COMMUNITY

9 A Louisbourg Primer: An Introductory Manual to the Fortress of Louisbourg National Historic Park, Ms. on file, Fortress of Louisbourg, passim.
Years of social history research by project historians were having the desired effect as a balanced view of Louisbourg's military, architectural, economic and social history emerged. Interpretation programmes were then developed on the basis of this important historiographical progress, which served to simplify and validate Louisbourg history as explained to visitors and to make it more accurate and interesting. Consequently, the authenticity of the reconstruction and historical collections was less compromised in its interpretation through secondary exhibits, theme lounges, publications and other educational programming.

As early as 1963 the need for comprehensive interpretation programming at Louisbourg was recognized: "Interpretation needs to be done here on a greater scale than anything previously attempted at any National Park or Historic Site in Canada."

What the Park Superintendent, John Lunn, meant by interpretation and what most Canadian museums practiced at this time was the traditional display, with cases containing natural specimens or historical collections which were explained by labels and scripts, often supplemented by models or audio-visual aids. Period rooms and at Louisbourg larger period environments were not yet paramount in the minds of designers and writers, and Louisbourg did not yet provide the resources to develop period presentation fully. Also, the required consolidation of interpretation themes for the Louisbourg project was not attempted until task force deliberations in 1972-73 clarified project objectives, which then required more focus in interpretation programmes. Consequently, stated themes and objectives, the critical first stage in interpretation planning and implementation, were not available to guide programming until the mid-1970's.

10 "Interpretation - Implementation ", John Lunn to A.D. Perry, 9 December, 1963, p.2, Ms. on file at the Fortress of Louisbourg.
Scattered exhibits on sometimes disjointed subjects and themes characterized the interpretation programme in its first decade, while research, design and reconstruction of historic properties proceeded. These temporary exhibits were concentrated in temporary exhibit buildings, including an old schoolhouse that served as an interim visitor reception centre, outside the reconstruction area. Their design, preparation and installation rarely involved research staff. Most of these temporary exhibits were replaced after 1975 by permanent exhibits in the new visitor reception centre and in designated period buildings within the reconstruction. Except for several excellent scale models of fortification features and some occasional use of historical views and quotations, these were poor exhibits and they help to explain why the reconstruction process itself became so popular with visitors as the 1960s phase of the project progressed. This early interpretation work served an important museographical purpose, however, because it allowed the development and retention of technical staff who became more skilled with practice and more familiar with Louisbourg’s natural and human history as a basis for later work with research staff on a renewed exhibits programme.

The Louisbourg project and Parks Canada in general had changed its exhibits philosophy by this time, as articulated in an approved Parks Canada Policy in 1979:

The interpretation program for a national historic park will be based on the historical resources at the park and the themes of Canadian history which they illustrate.... Modern interpretation techniques may be used to give park visitors historical background, detail and perspective.11

11 Parks Canada Policy, Parks Canada, Ottawa, 1979, p. 31.
Modern exhibits were clearly intended to support and not to overwhelm the presentation of historical resources in their original context, which confirmed and validated the approach taken at Louisbourg to emphasize and rely upon period presentation as the principal interpretation method. This debate on media selection was not confined to Louisbourg and Parks Canada. On museographical practice, specifically the use of audio-visual media, Josef Benes in a 1976 article published in an American museums journal wrote:

"Museums will not, therefore, be turned into shrines of modern technology but will retain their own style of presentation in which audio-visual media will play only an auxiliary role, a role which will nevertheless increase the educational effectiveness of exhibits. This is a fundamental principle." 12 In another article written in 1979, M.B. Alt, then Head of Visitor Resources for the British Museum of Natural History, drew the debate into general museological focus with the following statement:

The objects versus-story controversy has become something of a hoary chestnut in the museum world and the arguments are sterile. Those with more open minds put this polemic to one side and start from the premise that audio-visuals may enhance the museum experience; that is, they are legitimate and appropriate media for museums to use in certain circumstances. 13

---


The consensus at Louisbourg was that those circumstances were very limited and at the least confined to areas outside the period environments. Where did that leave the exhibits programme? Already the research and exhibits design staff had to work within the difficult space and view planes limitations of reconstructed buildings and in accordance with period presentation guidelines. The new Parks Canada philosophy and its interpretation policy reinforced the requirement that all exhibits blend with period environments and support approved themes, yet still discharge the responsibility of conveying information to modern visitors using modern communication techniques. The research and curatorial collections available and selected for inclusion in exhibits helped in efforts to provide the three-dimensional and graphic materials necessary in the design of background exhibits, and the team and committee system ensured that research staff were involved in this supportive interpretation role as they participated in decision making throughout the process. Archaeological artifacts and period prints, drawings and documents were usually included, always selected in accordance with exhibit storylines, and graphics consisted mainly of reproductions of eighteenth century iconographic source material. Even case designs utilized period motifs and were custom-built by staff preparators. Modern lighting, labels and scripts and the local production and use of audio tapes clearly distinguished these thematic exhibits, didactic displays and signage from period environments, but usually without overwhelming or seriously detracting from them. At the same time these exhibits were able to provide some of the general information necessary to place Louisbourg’s history in the wider context of North American and European history. As well, they were useful for staff training because they brought together in convenient locations information that interpretation staff needed to know.

Exhibit environments also provided the opportunity to provide visitor comforts and amenities that could not be incorporated into period environments. As the reconstruction expanded in the late 1970's museum fatigue and information overload became serious problems. Theme lounges were developed in strategic locations where comfort and passive communication prevailed over active interpretation, and where contrast between period and modern visual and psychological impacts was neutralized. Modern and reproduction furniture were mixed together and optional readings and relevant films were made available to those visitors who wished to inquire further on specific topics and themes. Where numbers have permitted, interpretation staff in modern dress have been made available to answer questions and encourage visitors to relax in comfort.

Interpretation staff in modern dress have also provided guided tours in special geographical areas and on specialized subjects, such as fortifications and architecture, again as an option to visitors who normally prefer to tour on their own and at their own pace. A self-guiding ruins walk through the historic area which was outside the main reconstruction area but within the original fortress and town, utilized ground level interpretation signage and has been popular with visitors since its completion in the early 1980's. It has been successful as an adjunct to the reconstruction because it is not so demanding on the senses and the mind and because it allows a clearer view of natural resources such as vegetation growth and coastal formation and erosion. The standard school tour packages for students and teachers and special tours for such groups as historical societies have always been a part of the park's interpretation programmes, and have, of course, included distribution of current

---

15 See above, p. 100.
interpretation literature.

Research and interpretation literature has been made available to the public in theme lounges and at a retail sales outlet operated for Parks Canada by the Volunteers Association in the visitor reception centre. Most of the titles fall into the category of popular history and a number of them were prepared by Louisbourg staff historians to support interpretation and staff training programmes. Illustrated interpretation brochures, information sheets and tour leaflets have been prepared almost on an annual basis and widely distributed to visitors to assist their visit, and a comprehensive and illustrated guide to historic properties was prepared in 1980 for sale to visitors. All literature is made available in both official languages, but are usually written in English and then translated into French, which has caused minor problems in communicating context and terminology. These problems are minor because such literature plays a secondary role in interpretation at Louisbourg, serving merely to introduce the reconstruction and to convey practical suggestions to maximize the educational effectiveness and physical comfort of a visit.

The same literature has also been sent in advance to schools, tourist agencies and tour operators to prepare visitors for the opportunities and complexities of the Louisbourg reconstruction and its interpretation. As the project progressed from development to operation as a historic site and outdoor museum, more was expected of the park from the visiting public and particularly from tourism agencies, and from entrepreneurs who looked to Louisbourg as the major tourist attraction in the area and as a boost to the local economy.

16 See above, chapter 4.
The popularity of Louisbourg interpretation programmes improved at considerable financial cost throughout the research and development phase of the project and helped to determine how many people visited and how long they stayed, which were principal factors in the generation of revenue for the tourism sector. Visitation levels increased steadily and eventually leveled off in the early 1980s at about 150,000 annually in a four month season, despite Louisbourg's isolated geographical isolation and very little marketing and promotion. As one of the leading heritage attractions in North America, developed at considerable cost to the Canadian public, the Louisbourg reconstruction had to be operated and continuously maintained to the same high standards set during the research and development phase, including the commitment to research and interdisciplinarity that has characterized the project since 1961. The range of interpretation programmes based on that research and development process and its inherent balance of period and modern techniques has allowed the Louisbourg reconstruction to find its place among the leading historic sites and outdoor museums of the western world.
Chapter 6

Louisbourg and Other Historic Sites and Outdoor Museums

Earlier chapters have documented that Louisbourg programmes in interpretation and public history have been inextricably tied to the project's high level of commitment to both historical and archaeological research. This research and consultative process had been systematically developed and sustained within Parks Canada throughout the research and development phase at Louisbourg and was also followed in all concurrent and subsequent operations and maintenance activities. The last chapter described and analyzed programmes completed by the early 1980s, by which time the Louisbourg project had become one of the largest historic sites and outdoor museums in the western world, highly acclaimed in the Canadian museums community because of its high research standards and related accuracy of reconstruction. This chapter will more critically evaluate the Louisbourg project within its own and Parks Canada's resource criteria, compare the results to three other large outdoor museum projects which have been undertaken over the past century, and attempt to discern patterns of research and development that have changed according to time, place, and culture for each and according to resource constraints and opportunities for all four.
The reasons for choosing Skansen, Williamsburg and Ironbridge for comparison purposes need to be explained. All three are similar in scale and sophistication to the Louisbourg project and there has been sufficient published literature on each to investigate their research and development process. That literature has revealed that all three experimented with new methods throughout research and development and that they were not content to limit programming to established and traditional museological norms, much as Louisbourg had to establish its own paradigms and adapt others. The three institutions also mark key periods of 'making history' - they are the products of certain ideological and economic factors. As major projects with high profiles in the museum community and in the public eye, they became embodiments of key stages of museological development.

The three are also different from each other and from Louisbourg in origin, geography, chronology, culture, politics, resource provision and tourism market; contrasting factors sufficient to reveal the impact of socio-economic forces on institutional and organizational character and behavior. Finally, the availability and accessibility of professional staff in all three locations allowed for extended study visits and consultations for thesis purposes, a participant observation research method undertaken to supplement secondary research.

The principal method for analysis and evaluation has been qualitative and only minimally quantitative, because none of the four at the time of study (completed at Ironbridge in 1987) employed standardized visitor surveys and only Williamsburg provided evidence of substantial visitor research - even Williamsburg's data was heavily weighted toward visitor expenditure patterns, not general behavior characteristics. The qualitative assessments in this chapter have attempted to focus on the extent and the standards for research, the manifestations of that research in terms of historical accuracy in programmes developed, and finally the comparative effectiveness of each projects' presentations to the public as they...
were personally observed during study visits. Though the method is based on secondary research and staff interviews, it is primarily and deliberately experiential as a product of my own twenty five years in the museums and heritage field as a student, public historian and research manager prior to these focused study visits to Skansen, Williamsburg and Ironbridge, always with Louisbourg and later the thesis in mind.

On the methodological level it is important to emphasize the need for these purpose designed, intense and thorough study visits. Published literature, especially scholarship, is not as extensive in the field or discipline of museology as it is in more established academic disciplines such as history and archaeology, although this paucity has been compensated for during the past two decades by publications in closely allied fields such as ethnography, material culture, folklore and public history. Museological research, therefore, must be supplemented by research in related fields and by study visits to collections, museums and historic sites. In any event there is no substitute for first hand study of collections and their various interpretations and also for focused discussions with Directors, their staffs, and the visitors to their institutions.

Skansen Open Air Museum

Most published literature on the origins and development of outdoor museums begin with a description of Skansen, Stockholm, in the 1870s and a sketch of the career of its founder, Artur Hazelius, a pioneering Swedish folklorist and educator. Hazelius was a brilliant educator as well as a linguist, folklorist, and oral history pioneer. As a devotee of Sweden’s national heritage as expressed in nature and in the works of many cultures, he studied all classes of urban and rural society and the new urban equivalent; its distinct vernacular architecture, material culture, flora and fauna, and the performing arts. Perhaps most importantly of all, he was a tireless field worker
who was as comfortable in the remote farm villages of Sweden as he
was in the meeting rooms of powerful politicians, academics and
professional groups in Stockholm.

At Skansen he began to assemble representative buildings, in
some cases entire farms along with the animals and the rural folk
who ran the enterprises, in an outdoor museum overlooking the
commercial and institutional center of the city. On a rolling hillside
site he relocated, constructed or reconstructed a curious blend of
educational and recreational resources that would eventually
comprise 150 buildings within a 75 acre area. Included were an
extensive craft complex, a park containing his own version of a
botanical garden, zoological gardens and a children's zoo, period and
modern restaurants and a tavern, and finally an extensive outdoor
performing arts centre which was near a strategically located
viewing station overlooking the city of Stockholm and its beautiful
archipelago. This unconventional mix of outdoor museum resources
was popular from its inception and still attracts more than two
million people annually, many of them repeat visitors from the
Stockholm area who cherish Skansen as a refuge from the usual
vicissitudes of a large city. This is largely because Skansen occupies a
very specific phase in the idea of being Swedish, as a focal point for a
renewed national consciousness.

Richard W.E. Perrin in a book on outdoor museums wrote:
"Sweden's Skansen, Europe's first outdoor museum... is and remains
[a proto-type and outstanding example of all that is worth emulation
in the continuing development of the outdoor museum concept
throughout the world. "1 It would be difficult to emulate Skansen and
it is doubtful that the same admixture of programming could work
effectively in other geographical or socio-economic settings. Certainly
it would not in Louisbourg, where there has not been a significantly
large market for the performing arts and where a zoo would be

1 Richard W.E. Perrin, Outdoor Museums, Milwaukee, Milwaukee Public
absurd and out of context in juxtaposition to the form and context of the reconstruction. What Perrin and other authors praise so highly in the Skansen model and what could and should be emulated widely, including at Louisbourg, is the emphasis on everyday life as a subject combined with enjoyment as a method of learning about it.

At Skansen most visitors can relate to the simple, commonplace settings and they have fun while receiving their educational messages. It is a different but friendly environment and not at all threatening in its contrast to the modern age that surrounds the site. It could be argued that the complex is not a very challenging intellectual experience, a role carried out by other Stockholm museums such as the Nordiska Museet, but this simplicity is part of its appeal and appropriateness as a folk or popular museum. All museums have the potential to provide a non-coercive, free and democratic learning environment, because they have special opportunities that rarely exist in formal school systems, at least in Canada. The lesson to be learned from Skansen is that it is possible to take full advantage of that unstructured and almost recreational museum education, which genuinely entertains while it teaches. With the associated Nordiska Museet as the intellectual heart of the museum, Hazélius was able to encourage a special kind of popular educational partnership with Skansen.

Edward Alexander, in one of many articles he wrote on living history emphasized that "exploring a historical village should be fun". Most writers in their descriptions of Skansen operations at Stockholm try to capture the free and eclectic nature of its admixture of heritage properties and activities, and they usually conclude that however Skansen is defined, it is a uniquely Swedish reflection of folklife through several centuries. It is impossible to discern a sequential or chronological storyline or topical summary, but somehow a reasonably coherent impression of history is conveyed.

2 Alexander, op. cit., p.65.
There is no question that the complex is confusing on first encounter, as are most large museum operations that are introspective of one culture, particularly to visitors from a different culture. There is a peculiar educational advantage in Skansen’s diversity, however, one that Louisbourg also enjoys: the visual and psychological contrast with almost everything that surrounds it. The official Skansen guidebook described the complex as: "... a green, car-free oasis in the middle of the city. There are magnificent views in every direction." Opened in 1891:

"Skansen... was long before its time, and one proof of the vitality of his [Hazelius'] ideas is the fact that Skansen open-air museum is still run in accordance with them."  

It is because of this open educational tradition that Skansen has for the past century endured as a leading recreational and learning centre of great importance in Stockholm.

Museum resources at Skansen and the manner in which they are presented to visitors reveal a research and development programme that has concentrated on ordinary folk, their properties and their work and entertainment. It has obviously been highly focused and eclectic in many of its manifestations. As such it leaves general context on the history of Sweden to be pursued at the Nordiska Museet where exhibits provide a more comprehensive sense of community life through time. This has allowed Skansen to serve as a folklife educational project and tourist centre, successful in many respects, and as a respectable research centre. As an outdoor museum with buildings gathered from many different areas of Sweden, however, it lacks the in situ authenticity of Louisbourg, the architectural verisimilitude and historical impact of Williamsburg and the rich and varied industrial and cultural landscape of

---

Ironbridge. Skansen, nevertheless, is comparable as a cultural landscape and at least as stimulating as the other three outdoor museums.

In a review of Skansen after 90 years of operation, written by senior staff and published in Museum in 1982, the institution is aptly described in rather modest terms as a national educational resource, whereas most published literature on Skansen and the work of Hazelius acknowledge the site in stronger terms as constituting a major museological and educational innovation, and they consistently praise its founder as a genius in the field. These assessments are no doubt based partially on the recognition that the principal museum research and development phase occurred in the late nineteenth century, when few museums in Europe had anything to display or to say about the common folk. As traditional and largely conservative institutions the main European museums perpetuated the social control of the ruling elites, including their power and privilege to select and display their own version of natural history and art. Progressive social history research and the resulting interpretation of the lower classes at Louisbourg was part of a general movement in the 1960s and 1970s, but at Skansen in the 1870s it must have represented a radical departure from established museological norms, just as Sweden and its society at that time contrasted with the other countries of western Europe and North America near the end of the industrial revolution. Of the Hazelius conception the Skansen staff in 1982 wrote:

He wanted to create a symbiosis between culture and nature, an environment where Swedes for generations to come would be able to see how their forefathers had laboured to cultivate the land with the help of - but also in battle with - the forces of nature.
In its conclusion the same authors wrote sanguinely and sensibly about the enduring place of these Skansen and Hazelius inspired values as the project approached its second century:

The future will surely show that, in an age of keener competition, it will be important for Skansen to preserve this special character and thus, by its very uniqueness, remove all need to compete.\(^4\)

The original Skansen staff need not have been concerned about museological competition in what they were doing, at least not from western Europe and North America. Only Scandinavia emulated the Hazelius model in any way in the early part of this century. The rest of Europe and North America, including Canada, would wait many decades before devoting significant museum resources to the history, collections and to the contemporary life of the common folk. The Skansen staff were not competing with rivals, but with prevailing notions of just whose history warranted study and national support, and in this the Stockholm creations eventually provided an inspiring starting point for folklife studies and outdoor museum presentations throughout Europe and North America, including at Louisbourg.

The Louisbourg project and Parks Canada in general, even with its manifold resources could not completely follow the Skansen model in the provision of educational fun and entertainment for visitors at Louisbourg. As a consequence there is little respite at Louisbourg from the many lessons of history to be learned in the reception centre, within the reconstruction and throughout the natural resources of the park. That is not yet seen as a primary part of the local Parks Canada mandate. Education and extension programming are, however, within the stated objectives of Parks Canada in general, albeit as secondary to in situ preservation and

interpretation. In these areas, particularly in the enrichment of education and interpretation for children, there is much to be learned from Skansen that could be applied at the Louisbourg project.

Louisbourg has natural resources in abundance, largely ignored by visitors who are not sufficiently encouraged to become familiar with or enthusiastic about such special experiences as the sighting of an eagle or blue heron or such fascinating and simple stories as the transplantation, accidental or otherwise, of the angelica and other plants from France to the Louisbourg area where they are not native but now thrive. Similarly, many visitors to the historic site are not attune to the majestic sensations of the Atlantic ocean pounding on the shores at Lighthouse Point or at Kennington Cove, both locations accessible by road and over walking paths within several miles of the reconstruction. You cannot see a beautiful city such as Stockholm from these sites, but you can see and otherwise sense intimately the forces of nature, especially of the Atlantic ocean. If visitors were to be informed and encouraged by staff to observe carefully at these locations, they could study the alterations of the coastline and of the natural landscape generally by human occupation. Both of these locations and several others within the park boundaries provide superb natural settings for the contemplation of the significant historical events that have occurred in the Louisbourg area during both sieges, and much more could be done at Louisbourg to combine the study of human and cultural resources with natural history.

Skansen works creatively and effectively with diverse cultural and natural resources within its 75 acres. Louisbourg has almost 24 square miles of historical and natural resources, including more than 100 historic locations outside the reconstruction - most related to the fishery and the sieges - and well managed flora and fauna that rate near the top of the coastal nature reserves in eastern North America. The potential exists at Louisbourg to develop a comprehensive range and diversity of programmes, similar to those in place at Skansen. In time Louisbourg could provide a similar combination of learning,
appreciation and entertainment that 100 years of operation and cooperation with Stockholm institutions, have allowed Skansen to achieve as an educational resource and entertainment centre.

More will be written about this important educational and tourism potential in the next chapter of this dissertation, but the main purpose of this chapter is to compare Skansen and Louisbourg on the basis of their different methods of preserving and of interpreting historic properties. Once again the distinction has to be made that the Louisbourg reconstruction has been developed on its original site, whereas Skansen has assembled buildings from various districts in Sweden on a site that originally served, ironically in the context of this comparative analysis, as a sixteenth-century military redoubt. Skansen has been sometimes criticized as a threat to older buildings that still stand where they were originally erected; just as the Louisbourg reconstruction has been criticized in the Canadian museum and preservation community as a drain on funds that could have been spent on deteriorating original buildings that were in need of restoration.

The rebuttal in both cases is that the funds would not have been available for these other preservation requirements, which receive in both countries significant levels of government funding. Skansen goes further to argue, and this applies to the Louisbourg project as well, that the preservation and popularization of past architecture, methods of construction and repair and the stimulation to save crafts and skills threatened by modern technology, benefit the entire preservation movement, that they play an important role in the upkeep of those thousands of houses that are not being moved to museums but live on in their original surroundings. In this respect the two museums are more than justified for the wider appreciation they engender in the public mind for the preservation

5 Ibid. p. 175.
6 Idem.
and study of human and natural history in all its forms and varied manifestations in surviving structures, objects and specimens, whether original or contrived, so long as good research validates these efforts to preserve.

Hazelius has been acknowledged by Edward Alexander as "a museum master", and Jay Anderson in a book on Museum Time Machines repeatedly equates achievements during the research and development phase at Skansen to the innovative and formative ideas of its one founder and champion, Artur Hazelius. It is doubtful that Skansen would have developed to such proportions without the research and dedication of Hazelius. Though he worked with many colleagues in his research and fieldwork, he was a very strong individual and the central figure on whom the Skansen project depended. This is in contrast with the Louisbourg research and development process which, though initially chaotic, eventually became systematic, collaborative and anything but a one man show. For the Louisbourg project the interdisciplinary teams, cooperative working units and the support of politicians and policy makers in the Federal and Provincial Governments, working in conjunction with senior officials in the Parks Canada system, have managed to collectively sustain momentum at the project for more than three decades.

Given more time, sustained effort and sufficient resources Louisbourg could become the cultural, economic and educational stimulus to Canada that Skansen has become for Sweden. Despite the disadvantage of being at such distance from major cities and from the institutions that have coalesced around such urban centres in the early decades of the information age, the Louisbourg site has high potential for educational programming. The necessary resources,
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including computers and electronic networks are in place and the information is readily available for the knowledge based social and economic development patterns of the next century.

Colonial Williamsburg

Inevitably when Louisbourg has been discussed at museum meetings or conferences and in the many publications on its reconstruction and interpretation programmes, parallels with Colonial Williamsburg, Virginia are made. Research and development has been continuous at Williamsburg since 1926 and the first restored property was open to the public in 1932. By 1980 the amalgam of restored and reconstructed properties comprised approximately 150 structures, making it one of the largest outdoor museums in the world. Its history as a colonial capital also parallels Louisbourg, though the two sieges at Louisbourg and its busy harbour and waterfront - and the obvious differences in the two mercantile economies of England and France - give the two communities very distinct histories. The social composition of the two communities also differed, for example with the much higher proportion of slaves in Virginia and itinerant fisherman in Isle Royale. Nevertheless, there is much in terms of their history and their research and development as museum projects that the two locations share.

The context for the development of Colonial Williamsburg over six decades is in contrast to Louisbourg, and the Williamsburg source of operating funds also differs. Louisbourg has been a publicly funded project with comparatively low levels of annual funding. The initial research and development phase at Colonial Williamsburg was financed primarily by substantial endowments from the wealthy industrialist, John D. Rockefeller Jr. and from the investment income resulting from these bequests. After completion of the initial phase major additional funding was derived from admission fees and from extensive retail sales outlets, all of which were expected to defray
operating costs. This was a deliberate policy that followed the tradition of the origins and development of American museums, which were founded on individual enterprise and private capital, with government support as a secondary factor. The Williamsburg project epitomized this spirit:

The scope and diversity of the operations of Colonial Williamsburg are such that costs consistently exceed income. A portion of this deficit is offset by investment income from an endowment fund provided by Mr. Rockefeller; Colonial Williamsburg depends primarily upon the support of the public, principally through the purchase of admissions.8

Unlike Louisbourg, Williamsburg was left with extensive above ground structures that were never entirely abandoned, and its archaeological resources and research capability were at least equal to that of Louisbourg. As an eighteenth century colonial capital Williamsburg also benefited from a rich data base of documentary and iconographic evidence, and the research staff did not have to comb through England and France to locate and copy it. Historical or curatorial collections were also readily available and in many more instances were drawn from their original eighteenth century context, whereas Louisbourg had to acquire its representative collections on the European and North American collector’s market. Despite these significant differences, the two projects are remarkably similar in archaeological and architectural achievements and especially in some aspects of their interpretation to the public, principally the presentation of architecture in complete property settings validated by archaeological evidence.

Williamsburg, because of its geographical location, its stronger place in the nation's history and national consciousness, its longer and richer history of research and development and its vigorous promotion internationally, has enjoyed a much higher visitation by the public. This has produced concomitantly higher admission and sales revenue and many more academic and popular publications on its history, archaeology and museology. The project has also received more criticism than Louisbourg, especially for its early interpretation programming. There is no doubt that Colonial Williamsburg has from the outset fashioned history to celebrate American independence, patriotism and capitalism in full measure and in all of its best manifestations. There is also no question that the Williamsburg interpretation programme has until recently concentrated only on the elite of colonial society, to the deliberate and conspicuous exclusion of blacks and the poor, women in other than support and purely social roles, children and family life; the entire historical experience of the women and the common folk ignored in favor of the ruling political and economic elite. The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation's many and selective commercial presentations to the general American public could not survive the social revolution and accompanying civil rights awareness of the 1960s, particularly since so many blacks had worked in the original colony as slaves. More recent and stinging criticisms have been led by Michael Wallace, a new left Historian with an alternative perspective on American social and economic history. In an article on American History museums in 1981 he wrote about Williamsburg and its founder:

"Rockefeller was not the least bit interested in recapturing the culture of "the folk". There were precious few "folk" in evidence, and there was absolutely no reference to the fact that half of eighteenth-century Williamsburg's population had been black slaves... This town commemorated the planter elite, presented as the progenitors of timeless ideals and values, the cradle of that Americanism of which Rockefeller and the corporate elite were the
Wallace may well have leveled that criticism at the majority of established museums, which by their very nature reflect in general terms the culture and society that created and sustained them and in particular terms their institutional founders and financial sponsors. It was Williamsburg's deliberate and long-standing detachment from historical reality that provoked major changes, which also validates Wallace's radical point of view. Later in the same provocative article Wallace invoked two other commentators on social history and museums, to make a more important and convincing argument for a more balanced historical interpretation, with Williamsburg again cited as the antithesis of historical reality. He quotes Ada Louise Huxtable as saying that Colonial Williamsburg "pickled the past", that it lacked "any sense of reality, vitality or historic continuity." Wallace then refers to a more general comment by David Lowenthall: "The American past is not permitted to coexist with the present. It is always in quotation marks and fancy dress... an isolated object of reverence and pleasure... detached, remote and essentially lifeless."10

Wallace was not alone in his attacks on elitism at Colonial Williamsburg. Thomas J. Schlereth, a leading American Historian and Museologist quoted elsewhere in this dissertation and widely respected for his balanced views on historical method, summarized a new awareness of social history issues in a 1978 article in the mainstream professional journal Museum News.11 All of this led to changes at Williamsburg, including the acknowledgment and interpretation of black history in the colonial capital. Wallace quotes another leading American Museologist and senior Williamsburg


10 As cited in Wallace, op.cit., note 58, p. 95.

executive, Edward P. Alexander, as agreeing with the need for revision, that museums had been "too neat and clean, and [did] not pay enough attention to the darker side of human existence - to poverty, disease, ignorance and slavery", and that they needed interpretations that would appeal "not only to the affluent and the elite, but also to the underprivileged and the discontented."\textsuperscript{12}

Louisbourg historiography and museology, developed since 1960 with the benefit of the earlier Williamsburg experience, has not followed the same pattern of social history elitism and exclusion. As outlined in the introduction and chapter one of this study, the basic philosophy, policy and practices of the project were set in the opposite direction in an attempt to provide a reconstruction which would be: "sufficient to furnish a comprehensive representation of the material and cultural forms set up". This difference has been most evident in Louisbourg's interpretation programmes, described above in chapter three, which have focused on the lower classes of society and on the majority of the colonial population. This emphasis has been less evident in the physical reconstruction of buildings, where Louisbourg, like Williamsburg, developed a preponderance of substantial public buildings and military features within its historic boundaries. Also, though the Louisbourg project has avoided a thematic delimitation of research and development to certain social groups, it has certainly limited historical chronology and continuity with its adherence to a 1744 focal point in its reconstruction and interpretation programmes. Both projects, therefore, expend great efforts to present very narrow segments of their respective histories. Consequently, at both locations it can take visitors a lot of time to learn very little history.

The recommended duration of a typical visit to Williamsburg has been three days, which is reasonable because the modern city of

\textsuperscript{12} Edward P. Alexander, \textit{Museums in Motion}, Nashville, Tennessee, American Association for State and Local History, 1979, p. 222, as quoted in Wallace, op. cit., p. 87.
Williamsburg and nearby Richmond, Virginia have long since developed ample amenities to offset museum fatigue during any such prolonged visit. Within the Williamsburg restoration area there are special entertainments and events for adults and children to enjoy as a break from the standard outdoor museum interpretation and education programmes, though these attractions do not include modern recreational programmes such as are available at Skansen. Williamsburg - much like Louisbourg - can be an overwhelming and at times exhausting experience for the ordinary visitor, especially the elderly and the disabled, and for that reason both museums have required purpose designed facilities and resources that can provide comfort and relief.

Williamsburg is a complex set of operations that can both fascinate and disorient, and as with any large museum considerable time and a strong motivation and interest to learn are the basic imperatives for a satisfying and productive visit. This type of experience at large museum complexes has implications for staff training and professional development, implications that require further discussion in this comparison of Williamsburg and Louisbourg. As usual for visitors to large institutions in any field, the initial arrival and introduction is challenging to the general public and even to those of us who happen to be practitioners in the field of museology and public history. Williamsburg has invested considerable resources in an elaborate Information Centre. The two key elements at the time of my study visit were a film that set the historical context in relation to the site, shown in a large and comfortable theatre, and a well staffed, friendly information desk programme which included full explanations and ample literature that concisely and systematically told visitors what they should expect, where they should go and what their interpretation and food options were.

Louisbourg makes the same effort in its Visitor Reception Centre, with the advantage that visitors can see, weather permitting, a panorama of the entire reconstruction; but with the disadvantages
that they want to get there directly and are reluctant to spend time in the centre preparing and orienting themselves for the visit. Consequently orientation at Louisbourg had to be extended beyond the reception centre. The review later in this chapter of the reception centre at the Blists Hill open air museum at Ironbridge, described by its Director, Dr. Neil Cossons as "a building with a loo and a ticket counter", shows clearly that there are different and equally valid and effective approaches to the challenges of visitor orientation. The elaborate centre at Williamsburg, the smaller and problematic centre at Louisbourg and the stop-over centre at Blists Hill work effectively because all three museums accept that orientation is a continuous process that must be carried through all operations by informed staff, exhibits, signage and publications, and that the process must include modern media and comforts. The elaborate and extensive Williamsburg centre is by no means out of proportion to the expanse of historic properties and other facilities available to visitors.

On the fringe of the Williamsburg historic area, where the modern town intrudes, it is difficult to develop the same sense of an eighteenth century environment, isolated both visually and psychologically in the same manner as Louisbourg and Skansen. As a visit progresses further into the historic precinct at Williamsburg, another intrusion occurs. Most buildings at Williamsburg include the sale of reproductions and other items related to the theme of the property. This pressure to generate revenue is obvious in contrast to Louisbourg where sales activity is limited to the reception centre and the period food concessions; even the Louisbourg food concessions take the trouble to conceal cash registers and the other modern requirements of retail sales. This is merely one example among many that point to the fundamental difference in the funding base of heritage institutions in the United States, which receive relatively low levels of public funding or grants, and Canada or Sweden where most large institutions and the majority of smaller museums are financed primarily by Government funds. Any comparison of commercial ventures at Williamsburg with those at Louisbourg brings this distinction to light.
More time spent at Williamsburg away from the sales counters to contemplative areas for the study of buildings in general and their contents, gradually brings to the visitor the depth and quality of the architectural and historical collections. The number of restored and reconstructed exteriors has a strong cumulative impact. Some of the shops and the many craft demonstrations provide outstanding interpretation by well informed and skilled, costumed staff who wisely let their actions and their surroundings speak for themselves, as their dialogue with visitors provokes and answers questions while they work at their craft. Louisbourg has few of these opportunities as the vast majority of commodities were imported to the colony as finished products.

Williamsburg, as with Louisbourg, is not overwhelmed by modern exhibits. One of the best exhibits in place in the early 1980s and one similar in many respects to a Louisbourg exhibit on how the reconstruction developed, concerns Archaeology and how it validated property restorations, reconstructions and curatorial programmes. Artifacts were displayed with concise labels and very few graphics. Audio narration, a separate slide show and a diorama on excavation techniques were visually complemented by an exposed excavation inside an adjoining outbuilding. This combination of media very effectively explains to the general public the intricacies as well as the fascinating discoveries involved in Archaeological work. As at Louisbourg, such exhibits are essential for visitors to understand with the aid of familiar and modern educational methods the complex of eighteenth century architecture, material culture and activity that surrounds them in abundance.

For museum workers experienced with and frustrated by the level of collections theft and destruction, Williamsburg can be a veritable training ground. Staff in modern dress and in period costume, not in great or conspicuous numbers, very effectively and unobtrusively move with and always behind groups of visitors. Rooms without staff present have barriers to prevent access, and
small objects within reach are fastened tightly. Staff members in period costume, interviewed at random, displayed a thorough grasp of security requirements and procedures and, despite many years of experience still receive training in security measures every year. Louisbourg, with a single, controlled entrance and exit to the reconstruction and a professionally trained warden staff that can respond quickly to emergency and security situations, still has to incorporate similar measures to implement adequate security within the reconstruction. Outdoor museums and historic sites such as Williamsburg and Louisbourg have had to adapt to the many special requirements of collections management in open spaces, where visitors are free to go virtually anywhere unattended. At Louisbourg, based largely on the study of experience at Williamsburg long after its completion and opening to the public, provision was made during the research and development phase for such practical, operational requirements as fire safety and security.

These practical requirements and the generation of revenue have been effectively carried out at Colonial Williamsburg, but a priority has also remained with museum education programming, supported by continuing research and the concentration of resources on interpretation. The result has been a sanitized version of Virginia’s history and a biased celebration of American patriotism, as discussed earlier in this chapter; an interpretation criticized by museologists and academic historians as a product of upper and middle class privilege and exclusion. These efforts were, however, a product of their time and despite the above criticisms the Colonial Williamsburg project has to be viewed as a major and progressive influence in the fields of museum development and public history. Edward P. Alexander, a mentor for the research and interpretation staff and arguably one of the leading American Museologists of the past three decades, wrote in Curator in 1961, ironically the first year of the Louisbourg project, a seminal article titled: "Bringing History to Life: Philadelphia and Williamsburg". It warrants extensive quotation and analysis here to place in a museological and educational context the efforts to develop new methods of interpretation for old history
at outdoor museums in North America. He concentrates on the central role of education and of interpretation in outdoor museums in the United States, but many of his comments are applicable to all museums:

What is the educational process that takes place at a historical shrine - this new kind of voluntary education often called interpretation? It has no set curriculum, no didactic textbooks, no final examinations. Tourists... are receptive to absorbing knowledge about what they are seeing. But they are not a captive audience; if they become bored, they get into their automobiles and drive off to some other, more promising place.

Museums seldom compete with each other and Alexander does not imply that they should. He merely argues that outdoor museums in particular have an exceptional opportunity to contribute to public education and awareness by stimulating all of the senses:

These historic houses and villages somewhat haltingly discovered a powerful new principle of educational motivation. They learned how to create in their visitors historical mood through sensory perception... These sensations take visitors back to their childhoods, remind them of experiences buried deep in the subconscious, and foster a nostalgic feeling of having passed this way before.

Alexander uses examples: candles mirrored in crystal chandeliers, the sounds of a folk singer's guitar as he recites a sad ballad, hefting a heavily greased musket; and writers on Louisbourg routinely refer to shutters swaying and clanging in the wind, costumed soldiers and servants shrouded in fog, the omnipresent smells of woodsmoke and
fish, gunpowder and saltwater and the many strange sounds that often seem to emanate from another era. This is not an effort to be approached casually, as there is the constant danger of perpetuating cliches and stereotypes of "days gone by", in the process generally exacerbating the romanticizing of history. The outdoor museum, Alexander wrote: "must carefully analyze the slice of history it wishes to teach... Perfection of detail in buildings, landscape, and furnishings will transmit a sense of living in another age." In his conclusion Alexander postulates three basic principles which he saw as requirements for this type of education, which can be summarized as follows: develop a detailed long-range plan, conduct abundant research, and strive to preserve properly the historical environment, to allow interpretation that "produces historical mood".13

The Louisbourg project began to experiment with these education and interpretation methods after 1970 and drew heavily from the Williamsburg experiences, good and bad, in an attempt to develop an accurate and realistic portrayal of the historical and cultural landscape revealed in the historical and archaeological record. Williamsburg staff were hired, others brought in as project consultants, and senior Louisbourg staff were routinely sent to Williamsburg to study their interpretation programmes. By this time the project needed little help with research, but the transition from social history to effective interpretation of the fortress and town to the public was a new challenge, and fifty years of research and development at Williamsburg proved to be of inestimable value in that important and extensive effort.

Another American Historian Jay Anderson later wrote: "The impact of Williamsburg's experiment with live interpretation on other American open-air museums cannot be underestimated... Some museums went further than others, but a definite "American way of history," based on the example set by Skansen, the Essex Institute,

Greenfield Village, and Colonial Williamsburg, was clearly emerging*. Louisbourg, as Canada's largest undertaking in historical reconstruction and living history can be added to that list of institutions that learned from Williamsburg and later served as a similar example and inspiration to other outdoor museums and historic sites in North America.

Blists Hill Open Air Museum

Louisbourg, Skansen and Williamsburg have attempted to preserve and to interpret many aspects of social history, but none of these projects has been concerned directly with industrial history and archaeology. Much has been written and rewritten about the Industrial Revolution that transformed the economies, societies, communities and landscapes of the western world during and after the mid-eighteenth century and up to what has been referred to as the information age of the late twentieth century. The Ironbridge Gorge Museum in the Severn River Gorge district of England, now within the modern town of Telford, Shropshire, has been a major part of British museum efforts to explain the industrial revolution to the public, and has won numerous accolades for its ambitious and innovative programmes, including European Museum of the Year Award in 1978.

The Ironbridge Museum has also been castigated for perpetuating myths about industrial history; glorifying capitalism.

---

14 Jay Anderson, op. cit., p.33.

15 One of the best sociological overviews of this phenomenon can be gleaned from Alvin Toffler, The Third Wave, New York, Morrow, 1980, passim. Few historians would presume to analyze the whole of western society over so many centuries in one book, but the generalizations in Toffler’s study are valid and pertinent as a categorization and vague historical chronology of the sweeping but gradual transformations from an agrarian to an industrial and then to an information based economic and social system.
and unduly sanitizing an era of greed, exploitation and pollution. As with Williamsburg, the more serious criticisms centre on the museum's historical bias toward middle class perceptions and values, specifically the celebration of capitalism and industrialization and the tendency to ignore deindustrialization and working class history.\textsuperscript{16} In an article titled "The making of the English working past: a critical view of the Ironbridge Gorge Museum", author Bob West views the Blists Hill open air museum as a 'bourgeois public space' with its constraints, preoccupations and perceptions. In a companion article British museologist Gaynor Kavanagh adds that: "The museum devises the rules, lays down one version of history and gives permission for its use".\textsuperscript{17} This approach to historical interpretation at the Ironbridge Gorge Museum, at least at Blists Hill, is consigned by Kavanagh as "a case study of 'history making' in the market-place of tourism".\textsuperscript{18} These are substantive criticisms that raise fundamental questions about historiography and museology that could and should be asked of all large museum developments. The authors succinctly and convincingly establish by inference that bourgeois history produces bourgeois museology, an issue that will be explored further in the final chapter of this study.

The Severn Gorge and Coalbrookdale district have, nevertheless, been widely acknowledged as the birthplace of the industrial revolution in Britain in the latter half of the eighteenth century, because important technological achievements and social events and processes occurred and have been documented in the seven separate Ironbridge museum sites in the Severn valley, where

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{18} Kavanagh, Ibid. p. 163.
\end{itemize}
the conjunction of iron ore, coal and river created the conditions for
the first stages of the industrial revolution. There are parallels with
Louisbourg in historical terms, at least chronologically. Blists Hill
Open Air Museum is only one of the variegated components of the
Ironbridge complex, and the only one that can be compared to
Louisbourg as an outdoor museum. In museological terms Blists Hill,
when considered in association with the other museum locations and
collections of the Ironbridge Gorge Museum, surpasses Louisbourg in
its scope of collections and in program complexity. Unlike the
Williamsburg and Skansen projects, however, Blists Hill Open Air
Museum was researched and developed contemporaneous with the
Louisbourg project.

Ironbridge, including Blists Hill, is similar to Skansen and again
unlike Louisbourg in that it is associated with two locally prominent
individuals, historian Barry Trinder and industrial archaeologist and
Museum Director, Neil Cossons. Without the benefit of a system like
Parks Canada and lacking the designation of a National Museum,
these two individuals with the help of many others in the heritage
preservation field brought together a combination of private and
public funding that could well serve as a future model for other
institutions in Europe and North America. The end result, however, in
museological terms is an eclectic mix of buildings and collections that
have been removed from their original context, transported to Blists
Hill and less than systematically organized in a contrived and often
confusing setting. In an article published in 1973 Neil Cossons
attempted to justify this unconventional approach to historical
preservation and museum development:

Blists Hill museum attempts to reflect as closely
as possible the industrial landscape of East
Shropshire which is typified by a random mixture
of housing, industry and agriculture without any
obvious plan. The creation of this randomness in
the museum, has to be very deliberately and
In a 1982 industrial archaeology conference address in Oxford, England Cossons referred to the Ironbridge approach to archaeology as "flexible conservation". In place of the usual straightforward preservation he advocated adaptation to modern use as a means to "reconcile historical landscape with present economic realities". Little wonder that some scholars subsequently referred to Ironbridge research and development as negotiated history.

The 42-acre Blists Hill site combines a number of industrial monuments in their original location, among them three nineteenth century blast furnaces, an inclined plane connected to the Shropshire Canal and a brick and tile workshop complex, with industrial buildings and machinery from other areas of the Shropshire district. On its own Blists Hill does not provide a comprehensive visual impression of the sprawling industrial complex of Shropshire in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It is relatively compact by comparison to Louisbourg, Williamsburg and Skansen, and the site does not convey within its historic properties a sense of what it was like to live in an industrial community. Some very good exhibits in the other components of the Ironbridge complex compensate, particularly the Museum of Iron, but the major advantage of Blists Hill as a monument to industrial communities is the surrounding, still functioning town of Coalbrookdale. Blists Hill, though it attempts to represent a different era and a distinctly different stage of the industrial revolution, blends with Coalbrookdale to complete the montage of a major industrial landscape, true to the paintings and watercolours in the museum's own collections. They provide a more

---


20 Author’s verbatim notes on a presentation by Dr. Neil Cossons, Director, Ironbridge Gorge Museum Trust, April 28, 1982 at the Oxford University conference on the conservation and management of historic sites.
realistic glimpse of the grit, grime, sweat and profit that came to characterize industrial communities at their peak in the late eighteenth century, as well as the decrepitude of their decline in the late nineteenth centuries.

There is an architectural and to some extent social verisimilitude about Blists Hill and the surrounding district that is strikingly reminiscent of the Industrial Revolution in Britain as portrayed in so many books and works of art. At Louisbourg, Williamsburg and Skansen there is a jarring sense of difference between the historic properties and their surroundings; not so at Blists Hill. The museum wisely recommends walking tours through Coalbrookdale and at almost any location in the Shropshire district there are vistages of the industrial age. The scattered museum components attempt to bring these together in extant remains and exhibits, with very little live interpretation and less activity generally than at the other three major outdoor museums reviewed in this chapter. But the district of Shropshire, left with many vistages of the nineteenth century, is a living testimony and monument to the social structure and technological landscape of the industrialists and their workers. All the efforts of the museum to focus on the historical significance of the first iron bridge in the western world are lost in the larger and much more important vistas of industrial life in the gorge of the Severn River. Blists Hill, the combination of many other museum components and, most convincingly, the surrounding landscape of the Coalbrookdale district, not the small bridge or Blists Hill on their own, provide the broader context for this important historical theme. Although the Blists Hill project is the most popular and commercially successful component of the Ironbridge museum complex, it has been the least well researched part of the museum.21

---

21 This conclusion is based on discussions with staff during study visits in 1882 and 1984 and has been confirmed in later consultation within the Department of Museum Studies, University of Leicester.
One of the highlights of interpretation at Blists Hill is what has been designated as the unnatural natural history tour, essentially a lesson in the transformation of the Shropshire landscape by industry. Many visitors who come to the Ironbridge Museum are familiar with this major impact on the environment of large cities like Birmingham in England, Pittsburgh and many other cities in the United States and Hamilton in Canada. At Blists Hill and the surrounding district they see a modern and surprisingly attractive landscape in anything but its pristine state. They do not see a city to explain this development and that is the special lesson in history that Blists Hill provides. The quaint shops, the sawmill, the pub and the massive machinery speak for themselves, as they must because there are so very few staff available to interpret them, but the essence of the Blists Hill story and one that can be told in very few centres of industry is that a landscape and ecology, transformed in sometimes horrific ways, can gradually recover. The Shropshire district today is a very attractive place to visit, despite two centuries of industrialization and the confluence of capitalist profit, human exploitation, environmental degradation, pollution and social blight; similar in many respects to industrial Cape Breton, conditions that eventually required exceptional efforts to revitalize the suffering economy and the moribund communities that had depended on industry and capital. The Ironbridge Museum is, like Louisbourg is to Cape Breton, part of that effort to bring new life to Telford without losing its history.

At Ironbridge the Blists Hill Open Air Museum is integrated architecturally and historically with the surrounding community, so there is little need for active interpretation of a contrast that does not exist. In the larger Shropshire district there is a distinct and known continuum of cultural history, with few modern accretions to detract from it. That is not the case in many outdoor museums and historic sites elsewhere in England and in North America, including Louisbourg.

There are two major distinctions between Louisbourg and the other three museums studied in this chapter: Louisbourg is almost
completely isolated geographically from the population that visits the site and it has almost no historical continuity with the current population of Cape Breton and the Atlantic region of Canada. As museum projects, however, the four institutions have developed in similar ways. The common thread of research and development has been their participation in change.

Neil Cossons, former Director of Ironbridge and President of the British Museums Association, wrote in 1984 about the management of change in museums: "... if museums wish to stay in business they have to seriously contemplate how they adapt to circumstances that are changing around them." All four of the museums studied in this chapter have had to establish their own objectives and standards on a continuing basis, because there were no prototypes that were their equivalent in scale and resource criteria. They remain in operation because they have responded in varying degrees to change in the fields of education and public history and in the tourism marketplace by adapting their programming. In the process they have each contributed to change in the field of outdoor museums and historic site development and they continue to serve as examples and models, good and bad, for other smaller institutions. Study visits and additional secondary research on these three large outdoor museum institutions and on many smaller attractions supplement the study of the Louisbourg project to form the basis for the next chapter on interpretation and public history.

Chapter 7

Interpretation and

Public History

American historian and museum commentator Jay Anderson, in a 1984 book on living history museums published after visits to Louisbourg, Williamsburg, Skansen and numerous other outdoor museums and historic sites in North America and Europe, wrote:

Living history is the only mode of historical interpretation, research, and celebration that involves all the senses. As such it forces us to experience the past as fully as possible. Of course, we can never be certain that the sights, sounds, tastes, textures, and smells of our re-created accounts of the past are authentic. The best we can do is to carry out our research as rigorously as possible and resist the temptation to claim too much for our time machines...

Living history lies outside the boundary of established academic and public history... Each museum, each project, and each unit makes its own covenant with historical truth and determines the way it will carry on its dialogue with the past.1

1 Jay Anderson, *Time Machines: The World of Living History*, American
In the same book Anderson had earlier praised Williamsburg and Louisbourg for having the most complete research data bases of any historic sites in North America. This study of Louisbourg research and development supports this emphasis on the inextricable and strong link between research and interpretation. In many respects the Louisbourg project has been a case study and prototype of how to balance the two museum activities in the interest of both preservation and high public history standards.

Though such fundamental lessons can be learned from the development of large and well funded museum projects such as Louisbourg, Skansen, Williamsburg and Ironbridge, it is also necessary for the purposes of this study to support conclusions in the fields of outdoor museums and historic sites development by studying different and particularly smaller institutions. This chapter will attempt to draw some general conclusions and additional object lessons concerning interpretation and public history, based on some of the practices prevalent at large and small museums and historic sites that have been visited and observed by the author. The overall purposes of the chapter are to reiterate and compare the Louisbourg project's approach to interpretation, to establish its place in the field of public history, and to affirm its relationship to tourism.

In the previous chapter the Blists Hill approach of letting most of that particular museum's extensive industrial collections speak for themselves was highlighted in contrast to Skansen and many large outdoor museums in North America, where staff members more actively interpret themes and related collections. This relatively passive approach at Blists Hill partially fits the tradition of the many

Association for State and Local History, Nashville, 1984, p. 191.

Ibid., p. 61.
historic sites and heritage buildings in England that were previously administered by the Ancient Sites and Monuments Board of the Department of Environment (DOE) and the National Trust. Ironbridge Director Neil Cossons was sharply critical of the DOE approach to heritage preservation in 1974, even though his own museum was just beginning to study and adapt some of the more active methods of interpretation which had become common in North American museums by the 1960s:

In protecting formally these monuments little thought was given to the user, and this remains, generally speaking, a characteristic of DOE sites today. Thus admirable technical standards of conservation are applied but there is as yet virtually no site interpretation.\(^3\)

In a curious way that situation can perhaps be explained, at least to North Americans, by reference to the many centuries of history that survive in extant remains throughout England and Europe in general. The active interpretation of history and its many contrasts with the modern age have been largely taken for granted, or left to books and film, in favor of preservation, and this has been the approach emulated by Parks Canada in much of its historic site development. Louisbourg has been an exception. Until recently there has not been a concerted effort by Parks Canada and what has become the English Heritage agency to present history to the public in a proactive manner in museums and historic sites. The norm had been to display what constitute some of the best collections in the world with no more than supporting texts and publications, with exhibits that sometimes incorporated audio visual techniques. In North America in general, particularly in the United States, there has

been an exceptional effort at places such as Williamsburg to present history to the public in a fuller context as an amalgam of European, aboriginal and African traditions, with guides and costumed staff providing an active interpretation of both the natural and cultural environment. Parks Canada's Halifax Citadel project and a variety of provincial historic sites have followed this example in their own interpretation programmes. These efforts have been emulated and extended in various ways in national capitals, in most urban communities and in many rural areas where significant historical resources are located. As discussed in previous chapters, Louisbourg has often been the point of comparison for these new projects.

The reconstruction's greatest legacy is, perhaps, the research, development and interpretive systems that were introduced and tested at Louisbourg, for these systems have subsequently been adopted as standard practice not only by the Parks Canada system, but by historic restorations in many parts of the world.4

The overwhelmingly positive public response to such projects and the economic benefits to the tourism economy are often the principal justifications used as the basis for significant resource allocations, particularly by governments. The cumulative effect in the United States and to a lesser extent in England and Canada has been a more vigorous pursuit of public history. The more traditional and less active pursuit of history that still prevails at some British and Canadian museums and historic sites is yet another example of how different cultures present their history in different ways. This pattern of research and development produces different project

objectives and standards of operation, in essence different agendas. Any comparison of these various approaches or attempts to draw museological lessons from them must first consider these different purposes, which in some cases involve fundamentally different philosophical and operational principles. The examples and case studies that follow are intended to amplify this assertion.

The reconstructed fortifications of Louisbourg bear some physical resemblance to the original, seventeenth century coastal defenses and fortifications that have been preserved at Berwick-Upon-Tweed, on the Northumberland coast of England near the Scottish border. Both extensive systems of fortification were based on the bastion trace and the use of smooth bore artillery, and both were designed to withstand a naval assault. In museological terms, the resemblance ends there. There had been at the time of visits in the mid 1980s far less active interpretation at Berwick and very little promotion of it as a historic site. It is obvious that the priority has been placed on preservation, not interpretation.

There is, however, an important lesson to be learned from this particular case study. Institutions with limited funds to spend and historically significant resources to maintain sometimes need to confirm in their programming that one of the first and most important words in the generally accepted definitions of museums is preservation; the proverbial maxims of collection, preservation, study and presentation that guide good museum theory and practice were not meant to carry equal emphasis. Louisbourg’s national significance historically and museologically - and the anticipated benefits to the tourism economy - may justify the many millions of dollars spent over the past three decades on both preservation and interpretation, but that large-scale approach to outdoor museum and historic site development has to be selective if the benefits of public history are to reach a larger spectrum of the regional, national and international public.
There are many small military sites in Canada, some within the Parks Canada system, that have been preserved and left in a relatively undeveloped state even when funds have been available and convincing economic arguments have been presented for comprehensive, tourism related programming. They remain largely mute in their witness to history, but like Berwick they nevertheless occupy an important place in the preservation movement and in the public history landscape.

The funds have not been available to apply the Louisbourg methods of interpretation to all of the historic sites and parks in the Parks Canada system and elsewhere. There are, however, other examples of outdoor museums and historic sites in Canada and in England where not enough money and time has been made available to develop interpretation programmes to an appropriate scale and with the effectiveness of Louisbourg, Williamsburg, Skansen and Ironbridge, usually because these smaller institutions work with different mandates and fewer resources.

Two British sites that have been visited for this study are Beamish North of England Open Air Museum and the Weald and Downland museum on the Sussex coast. It is clear that both institutions carry out an important preservation mandate, but they could not at the time of study visits in the mid-1980's educate and stimulate to their full potential, just as Louisbourg could not in the early stages of its development in the 1960's. One of the main constraints at Beamish and Weald and Downland is that site selection is more difficult to reconcile with the collections of buildings and objects, which are not situated in their original location. Theme selection and storyline development becomes an amalgam of historical evidence and creativity, sometimes leaving the visiting public to guess at development patterns and planning in an admixture of largely unrelated properties. Historically important
buildings and related collections that would otherwise have been destroyed, however, have been relocated and preserved in both locations. The point that requires emphasis here is that research and development at outdoor museums and heritage institutions in general must be measured first as preservation and secondarily as interpretation, with research emphasized throughout the process.

The best museums and historic sites seek to ensure a balance between preservation and interpretation and to present the results in a manner that is clear and comprehensible to the general public. There is always a measure of conjecture and creation, including at Louisbourg, which is part of the historical interpretation process to which visitors will add their own subjective impressions in any case. The end result in terms of public history experiences varies from group to group and from individual to individual in a process of informed intellectual and sensory inquiry. Interpretation becomes shared between the institution and the visitor, where the aim of the museum or historic site is not necessarily to instruct, but to provoke inquiry.

Outdoor museums have a special opportunity to interpret and educate in open, less congested environments. With proper planning and adequate staff support the collections and the visitors can be dispersed, allowing the contemplation of the specimens of nature and the works of human cultures in an unfettered and non-coercive educational setting. This ideal balance between collections and the setting in which they can be displayed and appreciated, and in the process explained in a broader historical context, is the essence of good outdoor museum interpretation.

Traditional gallery museums often have the same opportunity to interpret collections. The Musee de La Marine in Paris has a direct thematic connection to Louisbourg as one of the leading institutions in Europe that had provided source material for the research and
development phase at the project, because it is one of the main repositories for the collections of the French Ministry of the Marine, the department which administered the colonies, including Isle Royale. The musee can also be compared in museological terms to other maritime museums such as Greenwich, England. As at Greenwich, much is on display from world class art collections at the Musee de La Marine. The natural, architectural and material culture surroundings in along the river Seine in Paris, however, can have an additional and thematically relevant impact before the visitor enters the museum. The main collections of marine art and artifacts in the museum are relatively dispersed and can be studied on their own by theme, category and chronology; especially the Vernet port scenes of coastal cities in France in the eighteenth century, which have been invaluable in comparative studies of the Louisbourg harbour and waterfront. Consequently there is a clearly articulated and broader context for the meanings conveyed by the marine collections on display, whereas the Greenwich museum, relatively isolated from the port city of London, has a more limited set of interpretation options.

The contrast of interpretation at the two major maritime museums in England and France raises the issue of how museums choose interpretation methods. A much smaller Maritime Museum of the Atlantic in Halifax, Canada, with collections and themes that derive largely from England and France as well as Nova Scotia, utilizes in addition to its conventional exhibits an interpretation method of simply displaying reserve collections to visitors, without labels, scripts or any other attempt to have the objects do other than speak for themselves. This is a valid and to visitors a stimulating insight into what the museum is trying to accomplish in collections research and education programmes. At the Halifax museum, however, informed staff are available to explain the collections and to answer questions, and all staff - including the Director and Curators - work a weekly shift on guided tours for the public.
The methods of preserving our natural and cultural heritage vary from nation to nation and within nations, and the challenge to compete with such modern technologies and thematic derivatives as Disneyland and its fantasy clones in North America, have their place alongside the original remains of our past, so evident in Europe and in so many other parts of the world. The essence of good museology, nevertheless, is to preserve the old and to develop interpretation programmes that utilize the new methods available. Preservation of extant remains and equal efforts to preserve their story - their documentation and their interpretation - can teach the lessons of history in many ways, and to many people who would otherwise be excluded from this public history process of inquiry.

Oral tradition, for example, is exceedingly important in the research of societies and communities throughout the world, and studies of linguistics and folklore have found their place in Wales at St. Fagans, and in England at Beamish, Ironbridge and at Weald and Downland, where the story of ordinary people is documented and presented. These oral history interviews have been essential in their research, and audio selections from these interviews could be used effectively as part of the interpretation programme. Louisbourg does not have this interpretation option, but the statements of ordinary folk are recorded in the text of court proceedings, and these are extensively quoted in exhibits and animation scenarios. This is just one example of how the combination of research and curatorial methods can determine the range of interpretation options open to the museum or historic site.

The effort at Louisbourg to document and present a colonial capital which developed originally without newspapers, photography or tape recorders and to represent a material culture on the basis of relatively scant original remains, except for archaeological artifacts, has posed special curatorial demands. Meeting those demands has required the utilization of a combination of documentary source
material, period art and cartography and archaeological artifacts, with qualified interdisciplinary researchers working together to resolve the many contradictions inherent in the overall curatorial effort, and in the process to provide sufficient information to guide interpretation. The balance struck between Louisbourg research and interpretation programmes, described in earlier chapters, has been made possible by an enormous investment of financial and human resources and by continuous efforts to keep all disciplines and work groups involved in a collaborative process.

Striking this balance is not an easy task for small museums, historic sites and nature reserves that usually lack the funds necessary to preserve and to fully interpret their collections, because many cannot generate sufficient revenue from admissions and retail sales to offset operating costs. After Louisbourg and other large parks and sites in the Canadian system became a major drain on the financial resources of Parks Canada, new capital development projects proposed in the department’s financial and personnel forecasts began to be assessed in terms of their "operations and maintenance appetite". If funding could not be reliably estimated and justified for the long term operation and maintenance of the resource to an empirically established and acceptable standard, the capital project was unlikely to be approved. This policy particularly applied during periods of fiscal restraint. In this resource allocation and budgetary process, as systems planning and policy formulation advanced in sophistication and impact, Parks Canada’s primary preservation requirements were to prevail over all associated interpretation and education programming, and this inherent assignment of priorities was formalized in a national policy document approved by the Parliament of Canada in 1980. There is another important lesson to be learned by other small and large museums,
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5 Parks Canada Policy, published under the authority of the Minister of the Environment, Ottawa, 1980.
Too little attention to the quality standards of interpretation can also constitute a problem, one that can undermine preservation efforts. An example of this pattern of development is provided at Bosworth field near Leicester, England, where the site of the Battle of Bosworth in August, 1485 is commemorated in a network of signage, footpaths and exhibits. Ground interpretation is supplemented by an excellent account of the battle and its historical significance, locally published by Leicester University Press.\(^6\) During a visit to the site in 1982 it was difficult to conjure up a vision of events on the broad scale depicted in the historical account, studied closely prior to the visit. The exhibits were not self explanatory and the publication was not available at the visitor centre, a facility which was somewhat haphazardly accommodated in converted farm buildings. Ground level signage on the footpaths effectively interpreted battle tactics but ignored the wider historical context, and an audio-visual model of the battlefield, located in one room of the visitor centre and isolated from the main battlefield, was in need of repair and maintenance. As with many private and local authority museums in Britain, live interpretation by informed staff or volunteers was not provided, doubtless due to a lack of funding. The Bosworth site, with its surrounding farms dominating the landscape, does not speak for itself in historical terms, unlike many of the well preserved DOE ancient monument sites with a similarly passive level of visitor services and interpretation. In public history terms the Bosworth field effort is another missed opportunity in heritage interpretation.

An example of interpretation taking precedence over

---

preservation has been provided at the Alexander Graham Bell Museum Complex in Baddeck, Nova Scotia, 75 miles from Louisbourg and also developed and administered by Parks Canada. At times in Parks Canada's development, particularly in the expansionist days of the late 1970s when nationalist rhetoric matched public funds, a disproportionate amount of resources were allocated to nationally popular interpretation projects at the expense of preservation and collections management. The exhibits at Baddeck, which were approved and designed in Ottawa largely in isolation from local museum management and staff, provide a prime example. Hundreds of reproduction photographs and voluminous reams of interpretive scripts and graphics in the first two of three large galleries provide far too much information for the average visitor or for children to absorb. In total they confuse the history of Bell, his family and associates and their many achievements in science and technology and in humanitarian endeavors. Many important artifacts and documents are either not on display or are obscured by modern interpretation methods. Within several years of their completion, serious deficiencies in the conservation of the Alexander Graham Bell family collections had to be recognized and their conservation adequately funded at the Baddeck museum. As a large, national organization with a serious commitment to conservation and with the professional and the technical resources to rectify this imbalance, Parks Canada was able to adjust its programmes at the Baddeck museum during the early 1980s. More attention was devoted to collections management, including the development of a systematic plan to rationalize and improve their presentation to the public in a research and interpretation renewal effort that continues to this day.

Many smaller institutions, however, have been left to live with similar mistakes made in the allocation of scarce resources to trendy and ephemeral interpretation projects, often at the expense of proper preservation and conservation. Public history and tourism are better served by concentration on both preservation and interpretation in
research and development programmes, and in operations that are rooted in acceptable standards of museological theory and practice.

Some of the other major historic sites and museums visited and studied for the purposes of this thesis and included as the basis for this chapter are: Plimoth Plantation and Sturbridge Village Historical Farm, two large outdoor museums in Massachusetts, U.S.; King's Landing, New Brunswick and Upper Canada Village, Ontario, two of Canada's largest provincially administered historical farm villages; the British Museum of Natural History, The Tower of London and the Victoria and Albert Museum, London, England; the Louvre and the Musée des Invalides, Paris, France. They have not been referred to specifically as case studies in this comparative analysis, but they and the remainder of the institutions listed in the study visits section of the thesis bibliography have helped collectively to form the basis for this brief, critical review of interpretation and for the conclusions that follow.

Louisbourg and these other large, mature and adequately funded institutions have made a significant and lasting contribution to the development of museological standards for outdoor museums and historic sites in Europe and North America. Collectively they have made the pursuit of history a public phenomena and they have recognized and advanced the associated tourism benefits as an internationally important social and economic force. From the latter decades of the nineteenth century to the turn of the twentieth century, continually expanding efforts have been made in the western world to involve the public in relevant historical process and understanding, and to imbue the attempts with high social and economic value.
Public History

Whether it is a natural instinct or a mere illusion, I can't say, but one's emotions are more strongly aroused by seeing the places that ... have been the favorite resort of men of note in former days, than by hearing about their deeds or reading their writings.  

When the Roman, Cicero, uttered these words more than two thousand years ago he was surrounded by inspiring monuments to civilization, many of which have survived as ruins and restorations to this modern era. Neither the Louisbourg reconstruction with its surrounding ruins nor the other historic sites and outdoor museums reviewed in this thesis are likely to rival ancient Rome or its extant remains as international historical monuments, and certainly not as major tourist attractions. But Louisbourg and these other institutions do stand as important testimony to the historical preservation movement and to the labors of research; serving both as a cultural legacy and as tourist attractions with high standards and, in at least Louisbourg's case, equally high potential. As Cicero entreated with respect to Rome and countless historians and museum commentators have preached and practiced since, Louisbourg and other outdoor museums and historic sites must be visited to be fully appreciated; and as Edward Alexander has so often and eloquently pleaded in his writings, history is better experienced on location and in all of its dimensions.  

History is also better served and experienced when all classes

---

8 Ibid., pp. 263-289.
of society are studied and when the monuments of ordinary folk are visited with the same enthusiasm as those of the rich and famous. Outdoor museums in general, especially folk museums in Europe and historical farms in North America, are products of this century and in their presentations they have provided a balance to the elitist institutions and bourgeois historiography derived from the nineteenth century and earlier societies. Bourgeois historiography and archaeology produces bourgeois museology, and the museum legacies of this tradition blanket the urban landscapes of older cities in both Europe and North America.

In its historical research programme and in its development as a historic site and outdoor museum, Louisbourg has taken special efforts not to perpetuate this tradition. This philosophy and policy evolved because the project developed during a period when most Canadian museums and cultural agencies enjoyed and actively sought general public support and involvement. A former Director of the Nova Scotia Museum and later President of the Canadian Museums Association and one of the earliest Canadian museologists to be named a fellow of the American Association of Museums, Donald K. Crowdis, wrote in 1976 in an article on the past and future development of Canadian museums:

The biggest change in the last twenty-five or thirty years has been acceptance by the public. Several causes have been given - leisure, travel, the media, school involvement, a different attitude in museums. Whatever the cause, this public acceptance has changed our world. 9

Why did Cicero develop such an avid interest in the monuments of ancient Rome and why does the modern Canadian public continue to visit and support museum collections in increasing numbers? The answers to these questions can provide a foundation for a better understanding of the public history phenomena, its central importance in society and how it can be pursued successfully. Many of the answers are rooted in the basic reasons why people collect. In a recent article titled *Collecting Reconsidered*, Archaeologist Susan Pearce identified three categories of collecting: souvenir collecting, fetish or obsessive collecting and the more systematic collecting associated with museums. Her commentaries on both souvenir and systematic collecting pertain to this attempt to understand the public history phenomena in the modern age.

Pearce wrote that souvenirs make public events private, and that they move history into the personal sphere, giving each person a purchase on what would otherwise be impersonal and bewildering experiences. She elaborates by adding that: "Souvenirs, then, are lost youth, lost friends, lost past happiness; they are the tears of things... part of our attempt to make sense of our personal histories."\(^{10}\) Concerning systematic collecting she writes later in the same article:

> Systematics draw a viewer into their frame, they presuppose a two-way relationship between the collection which has something public (not private) [author's parentheses], to say, and the audience who may have something to learn, or something to disagree with. Such collections are favoured by curators.

---

because "...you can engage your public."\textsuperscript{11}

This process of stimulating thought by the visitor is characteristic of systematic collecting, good curation and active interpretation. Ideas form the essence of systematic collections, and the external world, however perceived, gives rise to these ideas. Though collections in history museums are both relics and reflections of the past, they are explained in the present to a public that uses collections, their interpretations and their own intellect and personal experiences in an attempt to understand both past and present.

No one starts to form or to display a collection without inheriting past process, and each collection or display in place contributes its mite to the dynamics of change.

The whole continuous reconstruction is part of the concrete appreciation of the world, with all its awkwardness and dislocation, and each actor in the story can be involved in the struggle.\textsuperscript{12}

Pearce has articulated the compelling link between history and the public, founded on the fundamental need within people to situate themselves in an often confusing world. This need to seek a personal and public history through souvenirs and museum collections has been intensified in the post-industrial age, with its dislocations and seemingly discontinuous change. We seem to need history more than ever.

Museums, particularly outdoor museums directly associated

\textsuperscript{11} Ibid., p. 149.

\textsuperscript{12} Ibid., p. 150.
with historic people, places and events, communicate in a much more
comprehensive and meaningful language than that of academic or
conventional historiography with its limited text and illustration,
which helps to explain the more popular appeal of museums and
their collections. The museum exposes and employs the meanings
inherent in objects and collections, meanings which are always
subject to a variety of personal interpretations in a free learning
environment. Museum collections and historic sites speak on their
own by revealing physical characteristics and at least suggesting
form and function - their internal evidence. In series, in associations
with people, places and events and in the overall context of their
time they also begin to reveal external evidence. Through further
interpretation and comparison, important patterns emerge that add
substantially to academic history.

The two pursuits of history work better in combination than in
isolation, especially when they are intended for public consumption.
The special communication and language richness of museums such
as Louisbourg should be further acknowledged by educators and put
to use by all who seek to further an understanding of the past,
including academics, if the public is to benefit fully. The process of
investigating meanings does not end with curators, museologists and
historians, not even with museum educators and public historians,
for the museum visitors - the public consumers of history - invest
their own personal history, as they see fit, to derive impressions and
understanding. It could be argued that every visit to a museum or
historic site or, for that matter, every reading of a history text or
viewing of a display or interpretation activity could produce a
different set of experiences, perspectives and conclusions. This
invested meaning can be altered by the museum or historic site
experience, of course, but it is always a factor in the learning process,
just as reading a book for the second time can produce different
insights because we bring a different knowledge base to our
comprehension of the original.
The use of several of the senses in this public history and living history learning process has been discussed above in chapters five and six, and applies here in this discussion of the nature of the outdoor museum and historic site educational experience. In a book of essays on *The New Museology* Ludmilla Jordanova, an historian at the University of Essex, offers an important commentary on the Jorvick Viking Centre in York that could be applied to the Louisbourg project and many other outdoor museums:

... the claim is not simply that the museum generates knowledge, but rather that a simulacrum of the past is available that renders the conventional notion of a museum obsolete. The search for the authentic is taken to its limits, by stimulating *three* (author's italics) senses, and by stressing the ability not to convey information but to mimic experience...

... many aspects of life cannot be conveyed through looking, smelling and listening - work, hunger, disease, war, death are obvious examples. We understand the past, not by spuriously re-experiencing it, but by turning over many different kinds of evidence relating to it and by generating from this an understanding which inevitably has a strong intellectual, that is, abstract component.\(^{13}\)

The outdoor museum educational process, of course, involves ideas and collections; learning through sensory observation,

reflection and thought. This is basically what some of the early planners of the Louisbourg project conceived, particularly the leading consultant to the project, Ronald Way. Just before joining the Louisbourg project at its outset in 1961, Way directed the development of Upper Canada Village in Ontario, where he expressed to an academic audience the following educational philosophy in a description of the newly created historic village as:

... an animated diorama of history, conceived, executed and operated for the purposes of mass education... the only difference between myself and the university professor of history is that he is selling history in a specialty shop while I am in the super-market business. The living museum might be likened to a sugar-coated pill, the serious educational message made palatable by a coating of divertissement.\(^\text{14}\)

Even if we allow for the hyperbole in Way's remarks and the attempt to provoke, perhaps amuse and certainly to convince the professoriate of the educational legitimacy of his own work, we have to extract a timely museological lesson from such musings, his additional writings and his later contributions at Louisbourg. This non-academic, nevertheless serious pursuit of history was intended to be both a physical and mental involvement by the visiting public. In a more recent book about the social and intellectual meanings of sightseeing in Europe, Australian political scientist and historian Donald Horne wrote in 1984:

As sightseers tick off sights on their itineraries, whether they know it or not, they may be looking for escape from the dislocations of the industrial society - even if only on holiday. In nature, views, sights, ruins, or the strange customs of other lands, they are looking for new meanings - even if they go home confirmed in their old meanings.15

All of this, of course, is also about memory and perception and its place in our daily lives, a vast subject beyond the pale of this study. The psychology of our attachment to certain places and objects - of the space they occupy in our minds and the comfort they provide in difficult or stressful moments - has to be considered, however, in any explanation of the dynamics of personal memory and the importance of public history. In a special article contained in a 1990 American Journal of Psychiatry, the common phenomena of the *deja vu* experience, defined as any subjectively inappropriate impression of familiarity of a present experience with an undefined past, was analyzed by two psychiatrists who began by quoting Sigmund Freud's *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life*:

> We must include in the category of the miraculous and the uncanny the peculiar feeling we have, in certain moments and situations, of having had exactly the same experience once before or of having once before been in the same place, though our efforts never succeed in clearly remembering the previous occasion that announces itself

in this way.

Not content with the writings of psychologists, the authors went on to refer to many novelists and poets who have been fascinated by this feeling, including such familiar names as: Charles Dickens in *David Copperfield* (1849), Leo Tolstoy in *Childhood, Boyhood and Youth* (1852), Marcel Proust in *Remembrance of Things Past* (1919), and Sir Walter Scott in *Guy Mannering* (1815). The experience was also depicted by Tolstoy in *War and Peace* (1859), a classic work of historical fiction and a model for how history can and should be presented to the public. The importance of this instinct for remembering the past, albeit subjectively and selectively, in our personal and public history experiences was further emphasized in a separate article by an eminent American Psychiatrist, John Romano, who wrote about its applications in his own medical practice and in his research and teaching:

> Psychoanalytic psychology helped me understand the significance of the life history narration and, in particular, the natural history of disease when attention was focused on the sequence of forgotten as well as remembered events. The predominant concept in the life history narration is that the organism carries past experience as long as life endures.

---


Even health professionals, therefore, argue that the pursuit of personal and public history has become more important in the modern age, as a relief for the mind and emotions and, of course, as a leisure activity. This trend along with the democratization and popularization of many museums, their collections and their stories, encourages more active involvement on the part of the museum staff and, more importantly, the visiting public.

Louisbourg, Skansen, Williamsburg and Ironbridge and some of the other institutions reviewed for this study have attempted to present in an active way a comprehensive cross-section of a past culture to the general public, employing an equally comprehensive range of education and interpretation methods. The validity of these museums is rooted in popular culture; they inform a larger public and collectively they combat the social isolation of the more elitist and exclusive forms of cultural heritage, such as Williamsburg presented in its early decades. Their validity is also rooted in both academic and popular history and in consistently high standards for research and development, characteristics that have endured at the Louisbourg project since 1961 and that have brought Louisbourg's history beyond academic scholarship and bourgeois museology to a fuller appreciation by the general public. That public dimension of the Louisbourg project is central to this study of Louisbourg's contributions to the heritage community.

**Louisbourg and Public History**

From the rich sources that survive to record the half-century of this small, lively community on the Atlantic shore of Canada, we can discover how some ordinary people lived and died in eighteenth-century Canada, how they dressed and ate and built their homes, how they earned a living and raised their
children, how they fell in love and went to war... since history usually denies us the chance to go past kings and heroes to the lives of the ordinary and the undistinguished, those rare occasions when we can make some ordinary people briefly famous are worth seizing.18

When former Louisbourg staff historian Christopher Moore wrote those words in 1982 the Louisbourg reconstruction project was nearing completion and receiving national acclaim from authors such as Moore, who had developed his approach to popular history as a staff historian at Louisbourg, and from increasing numbers of the general public who had developed a new sense of history from visits to the site, from reading about it and from thinking about its special relevance in their own lives. For more than two decades Louisbourg had developed as a mirror of Canadian heritage, reflecting French, English, Native and American traditions. It has also served as a testimony to the growth and maturity of the heritage preservation movement in Canada and to the vicissitudes of the Cape Breton economy. This dual impetus to commemorate a national monument and to stimulate the local economy had justified a level of human effort and financial expenditure that is not likely to be duplicated in Canada with such intensity over such a relatively short period of research and development.

The Louisbourg reconstruction, therefore, must be understood not only as a product of history and of this generation, but as an internationally important heritage centre and tourism product for future generations; an enduring commodity for public consumption in the cultural tourism marketplace. Ephemeral in the historical

sense, Louisbourg now faces the challenge of relative permanency, subject not to the ebb and flow of historical events and trends but to the uncertainties of current socio-economic and political forces and to the constraints of geography and culture.

The socio-economic plight of Cape Breton is not likely to improve substantially in the foreseeable future, so the basic economic justification for expenditures at Louisbourg will remain. One of the few opportunities for the area's economic improvement, the expansion of tourism, further supports Louisbourg's role as a major heritage centre, but a serious effort has to be made to convince politicians that heritage preservation and quality interpretation standards are not only compatible with tourism, but integral to its growth and renewal. These elements of 'sustainable development', to adopt one of the catch all phrases of the 1990s, have to be presented convincingly to professional and business groups, to the public and to the politicians who determine resource allocation:

In the next 25 years the challenge may centre on the preservation of the integrity of the island's culture by entering more definitely into the political arena.... This will entail a greater degree of involvement on the part of museologists, historians, and archivists working with the so-called grass roots.19

At Louisbourg there is precedent for this involvement. J.S. McLennan, the leading proponent of Louisbourg's designation as a

---

National Historic Site, worked regularly with prominent politicians and in later life became a member of the Canadian Senate. John Lunn, the first Park Superintendent at the Louisbourg project and the prime mover for its research and development phase, regularly informed and courted politicians throughout his controversial tenure at Louisbourg. This activity must continue if Louisbourg is to play a leading role as a heritage centre and an economic impetus to tourism in Cape Breton and Atlantic Canada.

The geographical and cultural constraints to expansion of Louisbourg's role as a heritage centre can be overcome. The site's geographical isolation on the southeast coast of Cape Breton is not a major obstacle in today's world of modern transportation and electronic information exchange. The city of Sydney is 25 miles away and all of the usual institutions and information networks, including computers, are in place. But the lack of a close socio-cultural identity between Louisbourg and the rest of Cape Breton Island remains: "The gap between the far-off days of the 18th century French occupation of the island and 20th century, largely English-speaking Cape Breton was too wide to allow a personal identification with the project."20 The obvious and distinct architectural manifestations of the French presence at Louisbourg add a diversity to the cultural landscape that is observed, studied and widely appreciated by Cape Bretoners and tourists alike, but there is a lack of direct historical and cultural identification with the historic site and its reconstruction. The proprietary interests of the industrial area residents and their political representatives need to be further developed over the next decade of consolidation and growth in cultural tourism and economy.

This lack of personal identification with the Louisbourg site does not preclude a wider public appreciation of its place in history.

20 Ibid., p. 5.
There is, of course, a strong connection between public history and public education, especially at the Louisbourg project where the actual visitation numbers are comparatively low. The real potential for Louisbourg as an educational resource extends beyond the park and beyond Cape Breton. The success of Skansen was based largely on the educational genius and organizational talent of its founder, Hazelius, who was determined to understand the history of the ordinary folk of Sweden and to explain this to the public at Skansen and beyond: in the school system, the museum community, the university, the performing arts and in popular culture. His original concept of education and extension, his dedication and that of his adherents at Skansen and elsewhere, have won both national and international acclaim since 1873. Its national appeal as well as its international significance has developed because it was created at a moment of extraordinary political and social change and because the project met the spirit of the times. Skansen has since evolved as a national institution that reflects and bolsters the best of Sweden’s ideals. As an outdoor museum and educational resource Skansen is a product of and a resource for all of Sweden, not just Stockholm, just as Louisbourg is a cultural tourism product and educational resource for all of Canada, not just Cape Breton.

Louisbourg challenges its visitors and those who study it through other media to view Cape Breton and Canada, today and in history, in a different way. Its combination of natural and historical resources, its blend of French, native Indian, British and New England traditions, impart a special educational opportunity; one of clear, provocative and instructive contrast with its surroundings, much like Skansen and Williamsburg have induced in many millions of visitors. All that remains is to place the Louisbourg project, through high quality and sustainable educational and extension programming, on the map of international heritage preservation and tourism; a status achieved by Skansen and Williamsburg only in the course of time and always in cooperation with other heritage-related institutions.
and economic development agencies.

**Louisbourg and Tourism**

In an article written in 1986 for the Canadian Museums Association journal, Muse, Peter Koppel, a professor on the faculty of administration at the University of Ottawa, wrote: "... the museum must adapt its marketing activities to the conditions created by social, cultural, political, legal, economic and competitive forces." Those conditions have been known at the Louisbourg project since its inception in 1961, but promoting the reconstruction in the widest possible tourism market and in cooperation with other agencies has only received serious attention since major research and physical reconstruction neared completion in the early 1980's.

Efforts within Parks Canada are still limited by the more important mandate to preserve historical resources for future generations and to interpret Louisbourg to those who take the trouble to visit the park during the four month visitor season; a policy that avoids the "... danger that selling the 'history' or the 'heritage' as a marketable product will deflect resources from the museums' fundamental responsibilities for the collection, research and conservation of material".

This does not mean that Louisbourg should not be marketed more vigorously, however, particularly if Parks Canada continues to manage the resource properly and thereby make it an even more marketable product. The solution to this seeming dilemma is for Parks Canada to concentrate on its preservation and interpretation.

---


mandate and to cooperate with other agencies concerned with marketing by providing free and open access to its historical resources, information and expertise; in effect, leaving the principal marketing responsibility to the tourism sector.

Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation (ECBC), a separate federal government agency established to further stimulate the Cape Breton economy, has assisted in marketing the various tourist attractions on Cape Breton Island, including Louisbourg, since the late 1980s. Their influence and efforts and the approval for construction of a new coastal highway that will link Louisbourg directly to the main tourist entry points for the first time, promise to substantially increase visitation to the reconstruction by the mid-1990s. ECBC, not Parks Canada, are leading special efforts to commemorate in 1995 the 250th anniversary of the first siege of Louisbourg and the 100th anniversary of the first attempts in 1895 to memorialize the historic site (see above, Introduction and Chapter one). Implicit is a timely recognition by government planners that the tourism and economic aspects of the Louisbourg reconstruction project are beyond the preservation mandate of Parks Canada and the newly created Canadian Department of Heritage, just as the tourism benefits and economic impact of Louisbourg are beyond the pale of this study and thesis. It is clear, however, from this study and others that a major marketing and promotion campaign is required to fully realize Louisbourg’s potential as an international tourism destination point and economic generator.23

Throughout the research and development phase of the Louisbourg project and in its first decade of operation as a partial reconstruction, outdoor museum and historic site, Parks Canada has

---

continued to place emphasis on preservation, interpretation and on the refinement of Louisbourg as a public history and educational product. As a large national agency with a primary preservation mandate and secondary educational role, now within a Heritage Department which also administers all of the national museums, Parks Canada is certain to continue its focus on the cultural and heritage values of the reconstruction, in the process consolidating its role in public history and education. The marketing that is required for maximum tourism and economic benefit is a separate challenge.

Marketing has been defined as the matching of a product to the potential customer for that product. Market research "... is as important for museums... as it is for any other organization that provides a service to the public." This type of research on existing and potential visitors to Louisbourg and other heritage resources in Cape Breton, particularly if carried out to the same high standards as historical and archaeological research since 1961, could help to guide a major marketing and promotion campaign designed to place Louisbourg on the map of international tourism, which would realize the hopes of those who set objectives for the project and those who worked to achieve them over the past three decades.


25 Ibid., p.46.
Conclusion:

The Louisbourg Model

The report of the Rand Royal Commission in 1960 had marked a major turning point in the difficult evolution of the Cape Breton economy, and its observations and conclusions concerning Louisbourg provided a needed and welcome catalyst for the outdoor museum and historic site preservation movement and for public history in Canada. Its recommendation to partially reconstruct the eighteenth century ruins of Louisbourg resulted in the most ambitious heritage reconstruction project in Canada, and eventually led to the creation of what became an international model for historic site preservation, interpretation and public history. In its role as an outdoor museum and tourist attraction, Louisbourg has further advanced the profile of public history in Canada and affirmed its impact on the tourism economy.

The immediate context for research and development at the Louisbourg project was socio-economic and political, though there had been efforts to commemorate, preserve and develop the ruins before and since its designation as a national historic site in 1928. The initial two years of the research and development phase were politically driven from Ottawa and to a lesser extent Halifax, and the project was professionally directed and controlled by a relatively inexperienced group of engineers and bureaucrats in the National Parks Branch. What started chaotically and disjointedly as an archaeological survey that was to precede major engineering and construction efforts, was salvaged under the new direction of the
Ottawa research staff of Parks Canada and the general consultant to the project, Ronald Way. He struggled with a fractious team of senior professionals to bring the various disciplinary and occupational groups together for a set of common objectives.

Out of this intense and disparate process a common respect for the project emerged, respect for both its national importance and its international historical significance. Eventually a shared sense of purpose prevailed. The human and financial resources allocated to the project were generous and the rich historical and archaeological record was very quickly recognized and exploited. It is doubtful that such progress could have been made without the availability of extensive international archival and museum collections and expertise, particularly from France, England and the United States, where source material was gathered and research staff and more experienced staff and consultants were recruited. Though Canadian in purpose and design, the Louisbourg project had to be launched and sustained as an international effort.

The success of source gathering and synthesis efforts by historians and the survey, excavation and reconstruction design efforts by archaeologists eventually gained the respect of the engineers and planners, who recognized that the project could not proceed without comprehensive research and collaboration. Research and reconstruction methods became innovative and interdisciplinary, and control over standards and scheduling at the project passed from engineers and managers to design teams and committees. The level of participation by historians and archaeologists in every facet of the project from technical analysis to major decision making, planning and development was extremely high and came to characterize the research and development phase at Louisbourg.

The success of this interdisciplinary, methodological process coincided with growing public interest in the Louisbourg project and Canadian heritage preservation in general. In the years preceding and following Canadian centennial celebrations in 1967, the public
history profile of the Louisbourg reconstruction as well as the popular appeal of its concurrent operation as a national historic site increased steadily. Within Parks Canada the project became both a model for historic site development and a significant drain on scarce resources. The socio-economic justifications for the project remained, however, and the additional tourism benefits and potential were increasingly recognized and expounded as a politically expedient rationale for continuing the research and development as well as operational programmes at a very high level of resource allocation throughout the 1970s.

High standards, generous resources, political support and public acceptance sustained momentum at the project through the difficult early years and through two decades of extensive research and development. With progress in its interpretation and visitor service programming, the Louisbourg project has found its place as one of the leading outdoor museums and historic sites in North America, comparable to some of the long established museum and cultural institutions of western Europe. The difficulties and limitations of the project, as well as its progress and achievements, essentially the lessons of the project as a model for historical preservation, interpretation and public history, have been grouped in this conclusion under headings that follow the sequence of chapters in this study. They are summarized as follows.

Early Research and Source Gathering

The extent of the historical and archaeological record concerning Louisbourg determined the parameters and the primary objectives of the project brief. Though initially daunting to research and development staff, that data base, a clear legacy of the prominent French, British and American roles in the eighteenth century colonies of Isle Royale and Cape Breton, became an enduring and inspirational beacon for the project. The high research standards to which Parks Canada was committed allowed a very high degree of
accuracy in reconstruction, a precedent and standard which became an imperative throughout research and development and which prevented the project from becoming just another historical recreation and tourist attraction. The extent and richness of data also confirmed the historical significance of Louisbourg in North American and European terms, and was a constant inspiration to project staff and ultimately to the Canadian public. The historical and the equally extensive archaeological records gathered in the first several years began to guide and to validate the reconstruction and its interpretation to visitors.

Planning and the Role of Research

There was no formalized and systematic planning process for the Louisbourg project until its second decade of research and development, a deficiency that exacerbated serious research and reconstruction coordination and scheduling problems in the early years. Five-year capital forecasts prepared each year were an inadequate substitute. Philosophy and policy statements were available from Parks Canada to provide general direction, but the early years of resource allocation and practical project planning were fraught with conflict and scheduling difficulties. Many of these problems could have been avoided if the project had been preceded by a proper and sophisticated planning process, with sufficient research lead-time to stay well ahead of construction activity. This experience provided a valuable lesson for Parks Canada and helped to rationalize an extensive systems planning exercise with formal planning stages for major projects initiated after 1970.

Many of the mistakes made in resource allocation and scheduling were eventually overcome because of the high level of funding and expertise available to the project and because a solid teamwork ethic emerged at the Louisbourg site. After the first targets for reconstruction of the Kings Bastion were met in the late 1960s, a separate Parks Canada task force planning process for
Louisbourg produced a set of 1973 planning documents to guide further research and development, including interpretation and public history programming. The 1973 task force planning documents also set the basic parameters for Louisbourg's operation as an outdoor museum and historic site.

**Programming and Interdisciplinary Work**

The teamwork ethic and practices developed at the Louisbourg project in the early 1960s were later formalized in a network of interdisciplinary teams and committees and integrated with the regular park organization to provide a complex but workable approach to programme development. That system became the most distinguishing feature of the Louisbourg research and development process, was emulated within Parks Canada and elsewhere in the Canadian historic site development field, and was further and formally entrenched at Louisbourg as a method of renewing and updating operational programmes.

The system of design teams and committees was essential in bringing the various disciplines together to resolve the sometimes conflicting research evidence and to work out other reconstruction problems. Interdisciplinarity was also a key element in developing a comprehensive range of interpretation themes and objectives as a basis for interpretation and public history programmes.

**Historical Reports and Early Publications**

In addition to the exchange of information within the team and committee system, a number of memoranda, reports and publications were prepared as part of the research and development process. From an early emphasis on structural, technical and military topics these manuscripts evolved to cover a range of social history subjects. The collection reflects the vast extent of historical evidence available,
the changing pattern of reconstruction and interpretation over two decades, and the increasing sophistication and appeal of public history methods and products. The results have also altered the historiography of Isle Royale and New France in general and added significantly to Canadian academic and popular history.

Collectively the reports and publications provide an excellent foundation and starting point for additional interpretive and educational presentations in text, illustration, film and multimedia. Retention of the project archives and library as well as the vast archaeological research collections at Louisbourg after the completion of research and development has allowed Parks Canada to refine programmes at Louisbourg and its other historic sites; and to serve as a major resource centre for eighteenth century studies and historic site development.

Museum Programmes

Museum programmes, of course, have similarly reflected the research and development process, but they also reflect new and formative experience at the operational level. The requirement to simultaneously interpret the Louisbourg site and to provide visitor services while the reconstruction progressed, combined with the inclusion of operations staff in the interdisciplinary system of teams and committees, have allowed a balance of traditional and innovative methods of exhibition and presentation. Interpretation methods such as costumed animation scenarios, candlelight tours, and the theme lounges that combine period appearance with modern comforts and communication technology, have been successfully developed. In interpretation terms these are secondary to the reconstruction of original features and the presentation of reconstructed properties in combination with costumed animation, but these newer programmes have added to the balance of old and new interpretation methods.

The reconstruction and interpretation programmes have been too focused chronologically on the mid 1740s, a decision that was not
sufficiently debated at the outset, and which has since imposed an unnecessary constraint on education, public history and living history presentations. The related emphasis on town properties and fortifications has shifted research and resulting public history efforts away from the harbour and the sea, which has produced a further thematic imbalance in the presentation of Louisbourg history to the public.

**Louisbourg and Other Outdoor Museums and Historic Sites**

Comparison of Louisbourg to other major outdoor museums and historic sites reveal patterns of research and development that have changed over the past century on the basis of national culture, institutional mandate and museological method. These comparisons suggest new directions for the Louisbourg project, principally in the entertainment and modern service components of interpretive, visitor service and educational programming. The lack of a range of alternatives to serious public history, activities that are fun for weary tourists, and that provide modern distractions such as exist in particular at Skansen and Williamsburg, partly results from Louisbourg’s isolation from any major urban area. This disadvantage could be addressed in the modern town of Louisbourg or in the nearby city of Sydney as part of a strategy to increase the educational and tourism appeal of the Louisbourg site.

Comparisons have also underlined the paramount importance of preserving and developing Louisbourg as the original site of the eighteenth century fortress, town and harbour. The nature and impact of its interpretation and public history presentations is based on this quality, which distinguishes the Louisbourg site from many other historic sites and outdoor museums.

The relatively low level of visitation at Louisbourg results in less economic and tourism benefits than the three other large,
geographically advantageous institutions have provided in Skansen, Williamsburg, and Ironbridge, which suggests that a renewed emphasis should be placed on community extension and educational programming. Given Parks Canada's and Louisbourg's primary mandate for historic preservation, these new educational and marketing activities would be best pursued in cooperation with other institutions such as national and provincial heritage and economic development agencies as well as the school and university system. Success in these areas would add to the diversity of Louisbourg programming, increase the public profile and possibly the visitation levels at the site and could further justify the substantial national resources that have been invested in the Louisbourg project over the past thirty years and that continue in the 1990s.

Interpretation and Public History

The Louisbourg project has developed beyond limited historic preservation to present a major case study in history making for the public and to a lesser extent students and scholars. In addition to being a major outdoor museum and historic site the Louisbourg reconstruction functions as a set for historical fact and fiction, a public history prototype for the popularization of museums and living history. Its original historic resources, high standards of research and development and its status as a national monument transcend popular theme parks in terms of historical depth and validity, but the site can actually rival such derivatives as a setting for books and films. Louisbourg's isolation from major and modern urban developments has provided historical and psychological contrast with the modern age, which has allowed the project to experiment more intensely with history making or living history programmes. Once again, the main potential in this area lies in Parks Canada's careful cooperation with outside agencies who can take full advantage of a properly managed collection of historical resources; without threatening their preservation.
There have been good books of scholarship and fiction written about Louisbourg, and films set within the reconstruction have progressed from early documentaries to a major Disney production during the spring and summer of 1993. Potential in these areas of history making will be further realized as awareness of the Louisbourg project spreads and experience is gained in balancing these activities with existing preservation and interpretation programming. This potential is based on the sometimes profound intellectual and psychological impact of historical places and collections in general, accentuated at Louisbourg by the nature of its military and social history and its modern isolation. It is also based on the increasing mass appeal of public history.

The tourism appeal of Louisbourg will continue to be limited by geographical and cultural constraints, but these are likely to be alleviated by the construction of a new and major highway access and by more vigorous promotion and marketing. This growth must be based on partnerships with external agencies, particularly with the associated federal government economic development agency known as Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation and with the University College of Cape Breton, which has recently been formally linked to both the Canadian Department of Heritage (Parks Canada) and the Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation under the terms of two separate memoranda of understanding. The Louisbourg project and the other heritage and cultural resources of Cape Breton Island constitute some of the most important opportunities in community economic renewal. With the consolidation of preservation and interpretation resources and related programming within Parks Canada over the past three decades, the project is now poised to find a more prominent place in public history and international tourism.

Louisbourg represents the heritage efforts of one generation of Canadians, with considerable help from France, England and the United States. It has played a small but significant role in history making and nation building and in the process it has set high and enduring research and development standards for future generations.
of public history adherents. As a Canadian model of heritage preservation, interpretation and public history the Louisbourg project is likely to contribute even more substantially to the future development of world heritage sites and to our own individual and collective sense of time and place in the history of civilization in the modern world.
Appendix 1

Excerpts from the Report of the Royal Commission on Coal
by the Honorable I.C. Rand, Ottawa, Queen's Printer, 1960.

Report - page 33

One aspect of community disruption should be elaborated. Nothing has been found to be more difficult than to attempt a large-scale uprooting of long-settled home life. Younger men may heed the call of distant scenes, and are adaptable to new surroundings; and in communities where family roots are not deep, movement and change are normal. The experience in Britain and in Europe generally, however, has led, if it has not been compelled, to the policy of bringing new work to the community or within its practicable working range.

Report - page 46-48

So far this report has dealt with direct and positive means of sustaining operations of the industry; but a complementary and even more important aspect remains to be examined. A single extractive industry, by its nature, is not a desirable economic base for a community and in coal there are incidental accompaniments that render it more undesirable than others. For the Sydney-Glace Bay-Louisbourg district, alternative and supporting economic and cultural activities must be considered, a scheme adequate to introduce new wealth into Cape Breton and bring fresh and heightened scenes and an elevation of mind and spirit to its people. In this we should turn first to its natural and historic endowment as the source of new interests and incidental material benefits, and undoubtedly there are resources of this nature fit for full exploitation.

The Island, without excessive cost, can be so exhibited and revealed as to bring to its people that new outlook and spirit, as well as economic betterment. Contemplation of its natural beauty of coast line, lake and mountain, enhanced by the intrusions of ruggedness, brings not only immediate enjoyment but as well those intimations of "old, unhappy, far-off things" for which the plaintiff numbers of the highland girl flowed; the scenes which entranced that great man, Graham Bell, with their cool refreshing simplicities; from which come the subtle strands unheard that found expression in the eloquence of one of Nova Scotia's most deeply native sons, the late Angus L. MacDonald. These are the ineffaceables of that land, the permanent imprints of nature, awaiting only experience of them by men and women.
Equally impressive with the munificence of nature are the historical relics of man's works. Mouldering on the southeastern coast of the island is a mute reminder of the wastage of time. Here is the scene of one of the striking events in the historical course of things that have led to the Canada of today. In the early part of the 18th century began the work of building the strongest fortification then existing on the Atlantic Coast of North America and of establishing a community bringing to the New World the architecture, traditions and culture of the French people at the direction of the most polished court of continental Europe. As a revelation of European life of that century and a reminder of the vicissitudes of North America's development, what could be more stimulating to the imagination or instructive to the mind, not only for the people of Cape Breton and Nova Scotia, but of Canada and the eastern portion of the United States, than to look upon a symbolic reconstruction of the Fortress of Louisbourg. Not that each item in the total scene should appear but sufficient to furnish a comprehensive representation of the material and cultural forms set up in a strange land inviting settlement. That site marks a salient occasion in the transplantation of a civilization significant to the history of Canada; and to allow it to sink into ruin and obliteration would be a grave loss to the civilizing interests of this country. To give the reconstruction the fullest exposure, a highway from Louisbourg to Point Tupper should be built enabling the entire Island to meet the desires of tourists; and to accommodate those to whom time is more important, additional modern airfields should be made available...

Here are resources of profundity as well as of enjoyment; the scenes are a national property to be brought to an attainment of their potentialities. What is proposed will be not only of economic benefit to the Island; it will introduce elements to regenerate its life and outlook, dissolve the climate of drabness and let into human hearts and intelligence the light of new interests, hopes and ambitions. Mechanical industry remains uncertain, but there are pursuits of deeper purpose lying within the will and action of people and governments.

Recommendations - page 53

13. That beginning not later than in the year 1961 work on a scheme of reconstructing the ruins of the Fortress of Louisbourg as an historic site be commenced and that it be carried through to an appropriate completion; that assistance be given to the Government of Nova Scotia in completing a modern highway between Louisbourg and Point Tupper as incidental to the reconstruction of the site; that at the same time measures be taken to exploit fully the attraction possibilities of the Cape Breton Highlands National Park; that both projects be planned insubstantial dimensions to extend over a period of from 15 to 20 years, during each of which not less than approximately an expenditure of $1,500,000 will be contemplated.
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Preamble:

This bibliography lists a selection of sources consulted over the past ten years on the subjects of historic sites, outdoor museums and heritage preservation in general. An attempt has been made to select those that have been of some value to this study. A number of published bibliographies are available in this field, several of which have been listed below.
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