



ISBN978-4-944014-37-8

Japanese Contributions to the Studies of Mesoamerican Civilizations

Institute for the Study of Ancient Civilizations and Cultural Resources
Kanazawa University

Studies in Ancient Civilizations vol.1

Japanese Contributions to the Studies of Mesoamerican Civilizations

The 40th Anniversary of La Entrada Archaeological Project



Edited by Seiichi Nakamura, Takuro Adachi, and Masashiro Ogawa

**Institute for the Study of Ancient Civilizations and Cultural Resources
Kanazawa University**

Studies in Ancient Civilizations vol.1

Japanese Contributions
to the Studies of Mesoamerican Civilizations
: the 40th Anniversary of La Entrada Archaeological Project

Seiichi Nakamura, Takuro Adachi, and Masahiro Ogawa

2023

Institute for the Study of Ancient Civilizations and Cultural Resources

Kanazawa University

Editing Note:

The volume is published for the 40th anniversary of the *La Entrada* archaeological project. Furthermore, it commemorates Prof. Seiichi Nakamura's retirement from Kanazawa University. The two commemorated events coincided this year. However, Prof. Nakamura WILL continue to do work in archaeology in the future.

***Japanese Contributions to the Studies of Mesoamerican Civilization
: the 40th Anniversary of La Entrada Archaeological Project***

Studies in Ancient Civilizations vol.1

First published on March 15th, 2023

Editors: Seiichi Nakamura, Takuro Adachi, and Masahiro Ogawa

Layout and Design: Takuro Adachi

Publisher: Institute for the Study of Ancient Civilizations and Cultural Resources,

Kanazawa University, Japan,

Kakuma-machi Kanazawa, Ishikawa, 920-1192, Japan

TEL 076-264-5785

<https://isac.w3.kanazawa-u.ac.jp> E-mail kanazawa.isac@gmail.com

Printed by MAEDA PRINTING CO., LTD

ISBN 978-4-944014-37-8

©Institute for the Study of Ancient Civilizations and Cultural Resources, Kanazawa University 2023

Printed in Japan

Japanese Contributions to the Studies of Mesoamerican Civilizations

Contents

Importante aporte del Sr. Seiichi Nakamura para salvaguardar el patrimonio cultural de Mesoamérica <i>Yuji Seki</i>	iii-iv
Reseña del Proyecto Arqueológico La Entrada (Primera Fase 1984-1989, Segunda Fase 1990-1994) <i>Seiichi Nakamura</i>	1-7
El Puente and Copan: From the seventh to the eighth century of the Southeastern Maya Periphery <i>Etsuo Hasegawa</i>	9-21
Source Analysis of Obsidian Artifacts from the Southeastern Maya Region: Focusing Particularly on the La Entrada Region and the Outer Periphery <i>Masahiro Ogawa</i>	23-33
Cosmic Ray Imaging at the Copan Archaeological Site <i>Kunihiro Morishima</i>	35-38
A Study on Cultural Resource Management in Copán Ruinas, Honduras <i>Makiha Gokita</i>	39-46
Persiguiendo el sueño de excavar pirámides en Mesoamérica: Las andanzas de Shione <i>Shione Shibata</i>	47-52
Chalchuapa y Kaminaljuyu: Dos Grandes Ciudades de la Costa Sur de Mesoamerica en el periodo Preclásico Tardío <i>Nobuyuki Ito</i>	53-77
Sacrificed captives or venerated ancestors? A new insight into mass sacrifices from the Preclassic Southern Coast of Guatemala <i>Shintaro Suzuki, Héctor Mejía and T. Douglas Price</i>	79-90
A Study on the Development of Public Archaeology in El Salvador: for making better strategy on improving international cooperation of archaeological activities <i>Masakage Murano</i>	91-102

Dating the Moon Pyramid at Teotihuacan, Mexico – An analysis of ceramics <i>Etsuo Sato</i>	103-117
The Formative Heritage in Central Mexico:Proyecto Arqueológico Tlalancaleca, Puebla <i>Shigeru Kabata, Tatsuya Murakami, and Julieta M. López Juárez</i>	119-130
Aportaciones arqueológicas, educativas y del desarrollo local por el Proyecto Arqueológico Estero Rabón. <i>Hirokazu Kotegawa</i>	131-146
Una perspectiva sobre el problema de la invasión ilegal de los vendedores locales en la Zona Arqueológica de Chichén Itzá, Yucatán, México <i>Shigeki Shakuya</i>	147-155
Becoming Mesoamerican archaeologists and recognized worldwide: A text mining analysis of Japanese scholarship <i>Akira Ichikawa and Misaki Fukaya</i>	157-176

A Study on the Development of Public Archaeology in El Salvador: for making better strategy on improving international co-operation of archaeological activities

Masakage Murano

Introduction

One of the most important Japanese contributions to the studies of Mesoamerican civilizations is activity related to the public archaeology. Akira Matsuda and Katsuyuki Okamura define public archaeology as a subject that examines the relationship between archaeology and the public, and then seeks to improve it [Matsuda and Okamura 2011: 4]. Many practices that Prof. Seiichi Nakamura and others at Kanazawa University have conducted at the Copan and Tikal archaeological sites are probably one of the best examples of this field.

However, the relationship between archaeology and the public differs from country to country, region to region, and period to period, and a public archaeology that is appropriate to each society must continue to be found. In this sense, the recent activities being developed in the Republic of El Salvador are worthy of attention. This is because the first international symposium on public archaeology in Central America was recently held there. This is a very ambitious undertaking, and it is likely to be a catalyst for further public archaeology efforts in the future.

This paper will therefore analyze the data from the symposium and related activities, and examine the direction of public archaeology in El Salvador, or in other words, what kind of public archaeology is considered necessary there. This discussion will also shed light on areas where foreign archaeologists can make a contribution.

Analytical perspectives for characterizing public archaeology

The field of public archaeology has developed in recent years. More specifically, the term “public archaeology” itself was first used in North America in 1972 [McGimsy1972], and in the United Kingdom, a journal under the name *Public Archaeology* was launched in 2000, and an international entity has also been established that practices public archaeology. In Japan, Matsuda and Okamura have been making efforts to popularize the field since the 2000s, and as a result several university students have already begun to major in this field.

It should be added that there have been many studies and

practices that correspond to public archaeology in these countries and Mesoamerica before the name “public archaeology” was coined, but it is significant that this field has been made more “visible” to everyone with the acquisition of a name. As Daniel Saucedo Segami points out, many archaeologists did not consider the approach to the general public as a topic of academic interest, rather they considered it as a topic of personal interest [Saucedo 2014]. Therefore, it will be academically and socially meaningful to use this name to discuss and share practical knowledge on how to create a better relationship between archaeology and the general public.

A better relationship between archaeology and the public means, in other words, ensuring public access to the resources of archaeology. Archaeology is not simply the study of the human past using material culture. Archaeology is the study of finding cultural value and historical significance in ruins and garbage, and using them as educational, tourism and cultural resources, for the benefit of society. What should we do if those resources are not reaching people adequately? For example, let us consider a case in which people in a certain society have difficulty in properly handling subsistence resources such as drinking water and education. Development theory teaches us the need to investigate the causes of the difficulties, remove them, and empower the people. Thus, in reference to development theory [Sen 1999], it would be possible to phrase public archaeology in this way. That is, public archaeology is “an effort to remove the causes of inconvenience between people and the archaeological or cultural resources produced thereby, and to increase the real freedoms of people to enjoy”. Therefore, public archaeology can be considered part of the development act.

The challenges lying between archaeology and the public are numerous. The practices and theories for their improvement are therefore also multiple. Following the work of Merriman [2004] and Holtorf [2007], who critically categorized and modeled these issues, Matsuda and Okamura [2011] have organized them into four approaches. The four approaches are: Educational, Public relations, Critical and Multivocal approaches. The Educational approach views the archaeologist as a transmitter of knowledge

Masakage Murano

The Museum of Kyoto

m-murano@bunpaku.or.jp

and aims to help the public understand the past and the discipline of archaeology from a similar perspective. The Public Relations approach aims to create a better image of archaeology in the minds of the public by developing promotional and appealing activities for archaeology, thereby gaining more social, economic, and political support for the discipline. These two approaches are practice-oriented, while the other two are theory-oriented.

The Critical approach relies on critical theory as it is referred to in the social sciences. This approach seeks to examine how the practice and interpretation of archaeology relates to and contributes to existing social and flag political regimes. This approach is a powerful tool for examining archaeology and nationalism, indigenous issues, etc. The Multivocal approach explores how the material traces left behind by humans in the past can have diverse meanings to people in the present. For example, a site may be an object of archaeological study for an archaeologist, but it will not have the same meaning for people in different positions, such as local residents, tourists, politicians, or developers. Therefore, the main focus of this approach is to first understand how different groups in society interpret archaeological sites and artifacts, and then to make the most balanced decisions about their preservation and use. In the United Kingdom, the first two approaches were the mainstream for a long time, but since the late 1980s, with the rise of Post-processual archaeology and New museology, the latter two have developed, and there has been heated debate on what position to take.

In this sense, as Matsuda and Okamura [2011] point out, it is important to understand what type of public archaeology is dominant in each country through this classification. Because it will help us understand the characteristics of each country's public archaeology and consider next steps, such as further refining and developing the leading approach, or becoming aware of other approaches and trying them out. In El Salvador, too, such discussions are likely to take place in the near future. As a first step, this paper will examine the characteristics of public archaeology in El Salvador based on these four approaches.

History of Archaeology and Cultural Heritage Management in El Salvador

19th century to late 20th century

In order to examine public archaeology in El Salvador, it is first necessary to understand the history of archaeology and cultural heritage management as a background. This section tries to summarize them, based on data obtained through conversations, interviews, and daily interactions with archaeologists and museum personnel in El Salvador, as well as through a bibliographic

survey.

There are several academic studies that summarize the history of archaeology in El Salvador. Among them, according to Geoffrey McCafferty et al. [2012], it is possible to classify them into four periods. The first period (19th to early 20th century): activity due to the interests of wealthy travelers and landowners; the second period (1920s to 1950s): the beginning of scientific surveys by archaeological experts; the third period (late 20th century): large structures and wide-area surveys; and the fourth period (2000s to present): Salvadoran-archaeologists-led surveys. Of these, the fourth period is regarded as the most exciting. The establishment of this fourth period is, for better or worse, one of the characteristics of El Salvadoran archaeology. This means that before the fourth period, there was a long period of archaeology in which the people of El Salvador were not the main actors.

The launch of official organizations related to archaeology in El Salvador is not late compared to other countries. The first of these was the establishment of the National Museum of Anthropology (Museo Nacional de Antropología) in 1883, followed in 1928 by the creation of the History Department within the Ministry of Education (Departamento de Historia, Ministerio de Instrucción Pública). The first director of this department was Antonio Sol. He was an El Salvadoran archaeologist. It is interesting to note, for example, that Sol's report on the archaeological site survey mentions the connection between the past history and the formation of the nation. In the period around the establishment of the History Department, the search for what characterizes the people of El Salvador also turned its attention to cultural aspects. Among them, there was even the idea of treating indigenous peoples as "National Soul (alma nacional)" [López Bernal 2007].

However, when the military regime came to power in 1929 due to the social crisis triggered by the Great Depression, the indigenous people were thoroughly persecuted, and in 1932, there was even a massacre called La Matanza. The indigenous population became invisible. For example, in the Census of Nationalities (CENSO), the category of ethnicity (categoría étnica) was deleted after 1930, and it was not until 2007 that it was included again. Publications on indigenous peoples have also had to be postponed.

On the other hand, archaeology, which also deals with indigenous cultures, began to be investigated by the Carnegie Institution as early as the 1940s. Archaeology dealing with the "dead" indigenous peoples of the past was not as problematic for the administration at the time as anthropology dealing with the "living"

indigenous peoples of the present. The double standard [Ochiai 1996], also seen in Mexico and elsewhere, was taken. The institute conducted the Maya Research Program in Mexico and Guatemala and other areas beginning in the 1930s, which led to the development of research on the Maya region. In El Salvador, the Tazumal site, which later became a national park, and other sites were excavated and developed.

The research conducted by this team led to the formation of the concept of “Maya areas”. It also influenced subsequent research in El Salvador. During the third phase of archaeological research in El Salvador in the 1960s, the goal of North American archaeologists was to understand the “periphery” of the “Maya region”. This perception of El Salvador as a “peripheral” region (and thus as neither distinctive nor highly civilized as the Maya) has fluctuated, but still exists among researchers and the general public. The “peripherality” of the archaeological perception of the region, a characteristic of El Salvadoran archaeology, was created during this period [Paredes and Erquicia 2013].

In 1945, Stanley Boggs, an American archaeologist who was a member of Carnegie’s research team, became head of the Department of Archaeology of the Ministry of Popular Culture (Departamento de Excavaciones Arqueológicas del Ministerio de Cultura Popular). He contributed greatly to the archaeology of El Salvador, and was even later described as the father of Salvadoran archaeology [El Diario de Hoy 2005; Murano 2010]. For half a century, with few exceptions, foreigners have held the position of chief of the archaeological section in El Salvador [Valdivieso 2010]. It was not until Fabio Amador in 1995 that an El Salvadoran archaeologist replaced foreign archaeologists. North American archaeologists mainly carried out the research projects, and the training of archaeologists in El Salvador lagged behind.

This situation has been assessed as a lack of interest by the state in using archaeology or history for nation-building [Escamilla 2015]. The author may add that the low interest was due in part to the invisibility of indigenous peoples and a certain peripherality in academic regional perceptions. In other words, the perception of the government and the general public that El Salvador is a place that historically lacks notable archaeological resources compared to others because it is a peripheral region and no longer has indigenous people to tell its history, and yet archaeological surveys are conducted by foreigners, has prevented the development of archaeologists in their own country.

Since 2000

This situation changed in 2000. It was the beginning of the

fourth period. This was the first time that an El Salvadoran student majoring in archaeology graduated from a university in El Salvador (Universidad Tecnológica de El Salvador (UTEC)). A Japanese research team led by Kuniaki Ohi made a major contribution by providing practical guidance (Ohi 2000). After that, Shione Shibata, one of the team members, continued to be involved in human resource development at the archaeological department and university in El Salvador, and JICA’s Japan Overseas Cooperation Volunteers (JOCV) also cooperated. The author was one of them. At any rate, it was during this period that El Salvador was able to train and produce its own archaeologists.

The first five graduates of the program are known as the “First Generation,” and later became heads of the Archaeology section, Director of the Cultural Heritage Department, university faculty members, and museum directors. In other words, they became the driving force of archaeology in El Salvador. Today, nearly 20 archaeologists hold positions in the government’s cultural administration, while the rest teach at the university, pursue graduate studies, or work as consultants.

Around this time, a specialized agency for cultural administration was established in 1991 as the Council for Culture and the Arts (Consejo Nacional para la Cultura y el Arte). In 2009, it was reorganized as the Secretary for Culture (Secretaría de Cultura de la Presidencia). In April 2018, it was promoted to the Ministry of Culture (Ministerio de Cultura). As for the legal system, the Special Law for the Protection of Cultural Properties was enacted in 1993, followed by the Guidelines for the Special Law for the Protection of Cultural Properties in 1996, and the Guidelines for Archaeological Excavations in 2007. The number of archaeological parks and museums is also numerous, including the opening of the Casa Blanca Archaeological Museum in 2002, the opening of the Cihuatán Archaeological Park in 2007, and the complete renovation of the Eastern District Museum and the Tazumal Archaeological Park Museum, which has been described as a kind of “boom” situation [Montalvo 2002].

As a forum for the publication and dissemination of the results of academic research, a Central American Archaeological congress (Congreso Centroamericano de Arqueología) has been held in El Salvador every other year since 2005, a Student Forum of Anthropology (Foro de estudiantes de la escuela de antropología de la UTEC), and numerous other lectures and workshops have been held at the National Museum of Anthropology and other institutions. In addition, academic books have been published as tools for sensibilization and dissemination, and the Central American Archaeological Congress published its

first book (*Estudios de arqueología: México y Centroamérica*) in 2017, which includes the papers presented at the 6th Congress, and plans to continue publishing in the future. In addition, in 2014, the publication of *Anales, Revista del Museo Nacional de Antropología* Dr. David J. Guzmán, which had been out of print since 1977 and only published once in 1996, was republished. Other journals that regularly publish archaeological research include *La Universidad* (published by Universidad Nacional de El Salvador) and *Kóot* (published by Universidad Tecnológica de El Salvador). Notably, in 2006, for the first time, a map of the country's archaeological sites was produced, showing all the sites known at that time. This map visualized the presence of archaeological sites throughout the country. Thus, in line with the development of human resources, we can see that organizations, legal systems, places for publication and exchange of research results, and dissemination tools have been put in place very recently and at a considerable pace. This “youthfulness,” so to speak, is another characteristic of El Salvador's archaeology.

Among these movements, one that has become particularly prominent in the 2010s is the search for an “El Salvadoran Archaeology (*Arqueología Salvadoreña*)” [Escamilla 2015]. Although it has not yet taken concrete form [Escamilla 2015], it is a movement to form its own archaeology in El Salvador, one that is distinctive from the other countries. This is an appropriate move at a time when the archaeology of El Salvador is reaching a certain “maturity”.

The characteristics of the current archaeology of El Salvador become clearer when considered in conjunction with the following events. First, in 1994, the Council for Culture and the Arts declared that “the most urgent need is the search for our El Salvadoran identity”. Second, the Tazumal and San Andrés archaeological sites, which are representative of the country, have been used on the country's banknotes since 1993 (the issue ended with the dollarization of the currency in 2000), and the image of the Tazumal site has been available on the identification card (DUI. Documento Único de Identidad) since 2010. This has promoted the visualization and symbolization of the archaeological sites. In addition, the Census of Nationalities (CENSO) has been reinstated in 2007 with a section on indigenous peoples as an item to be examined in the Census of Nationalities, in response to suggestions of improvement from outside sources, such as the United Nations. Based on the idea that census, museums, and maps function as institutions that form “imagined communities” [Anderson 1983], the actual impact and other factors should be carefully considered, but El Salvador is currently actively trying to link its archaeological heritage to its national identity. This is

a major difference from the third period, especially before the civil war.

In this respect, the search for identity overlaps with the movement to form an “El Salvadoran archaeology”. In other words, it appears to be a movement to seek some kind of recognition for their archaeology by the public. Moreover, the approval for archaeology by non-archaeologists is also needed to resolve important issues that have arisen as archaeology has developed. In El Salvador, for example, it is not yet common for students who have studied archaeology to go on to graduate school. Even though some are interested in going abroad for more advanced education, the number of students who can go abroad is still few. One of the reasons for this is the financial burden on students, and approval for archaeology by people and governments is needed before grants and other programs can be developed in the future.

Other issues are also beginning to emerge. Although the number of archaeologists is increasing, the staff of the archaeology division of the Ministry of Culture in the capital city must carry out work throughout the country. As a result, there is inevitably a bias in the areas where preliminary surveys and inspections can be conducted [Valdivieso 2014]. Therefore, proposals for reform from a centralized to a decentralized system have been seen in recent years [Valdivieso 2014]. Even though there is employment at the moment, if the number of graduates continues to increase, more will not be able to find work. However, the establishment of cultural property protection or archaeological departments in local governments could solve these problems. For this reason, the approval of archaeology to people and governments is essential.

Thus, in the fourth phase, archaeology and cultural policy have entered a new phase, with goals and challenges of a different quality than in the past. So, in this current position of archaeology in El Salvador, what kind of relationship are archaeologists trying to establish with the general public? What exactly are they trying to do by using the name of public archaeology? In the next section, we will examine this question using the data obtained at the workshop and symposium held in El Salvador.

Analysis of Trends in Public Archaeology in El Salvador

Public Archaeology Workshop

The workshop was held on December 7 and 8, 2017, at the National Museum of Anthropology, hosted by the Archaeology Division of the National Direction for Cultural and Natural Heritage of El Salvador and the Kyoto University of Foreign Studies. The title was “Public Archaeology, a tool for strengthening iden-

A Study on the Development of Public Archaeology in El Salvador:
for making better strategy on improving international cooperation of archaeological activities

**La Dirección Nacional de Patrimonio Cultural y Natural
a través del Departamento de Arqueología
y la Universidad de Estudios Extranjeros de Kyoto le invitan al Taller:**

Impartido por:
MIRIAM MÉNDEZ Y MARGARITA MORÁN
Departamento de Arqueología
SOFÍA ALBAYERO
Arqueóloga Independiente
HIROSHI MINAMI
Profesor
Universidad de Estudios Extranjeros de Kyoto
MASAKAGE MURANO
Curador del Museo de Kyoto
Investigador invitado
Universidad de Estudios Extranjeros de Kyoto

**Dirigido a profesionales, estudiantes y público general
(mayores de 18 años)**

Confirmación de asistencia:
Miriam Méndez, mmendez@cultura.gob.sv
y Margarita Morán, cmoran@cultura.gob.sv

**7 de diciembre y 8 de diciembre
de 8:30 a.m. a 4:00 p.m.**

**Sala Lúdica
Museo Nacional de Antropología "Dr. David J. Guzmán"
Entrada gratuita**

**"Arqueología
Pública, una
herramienta para
el fortalecimiento
de la identidad"**



Fig. 1 Poster of the Public Archaeology Workshop

tity (Arqueología Pública, una herramienta para el fortalecimiento de la identidad)". The main objectives were the following: 1. To share the Japanese experience in the field of public archaeology with students and professionals in Salvadoran archaeology. 2. To share with Salvadoran students and professionals in archaeology, the experiences of public archaeology that have been developed in El Salvador both by nationals and Japanese volunteers. 3. To stimulate in the participants of the workshop, the desire to integrate the society in the archaeological work, like protective agents and diffusers of the archaeological patrimony. In keeping this objective, five presenters from El Salvador and two from Japan reported on each other's projects related to public archaeology. Participants included archaeologists, anthropologists, and other researchers, students, lawyers, and government officials.

Of these presentations, the El Salvadoran side had a common feature. First, let us look at the Sofía Albayero's presentation. She listed the following six goals for public archaeology [Albayero 2019]: 1. To strengthen and revalue the archaeological sector as a dignified and necessary employment for society. 2. To disseminate the work of the discipline. 3. To involve society in the field of archaeological monuments, only up to the extent of its

intervention without infringing the legal regulations for the protection of cultural property. 4. To bring the general public closer to the research and to explain the archaeological reality with suitable methodologies. 5. To make society aware of the value of the archaeological heritage. 6. To educate in values of conservation and respect for the archaeological heritage. As can be seen at first glance, her presentation shows that she is trying to make the general public aware of the value of the field of archaeology and the significance of archaeological heritage preservation.

Another presenter, Margarita Morán, was more data-driven, pointing out the importance of educational actions. She noted that interviews conducted through workshops at the Cihuatán and Tazumal archaeological sites revealed that participants had significantly low knowledge and information about archaeological sites, as well as about the legal system and organization of cultural heritage protection. She then stated that we must bear in mind that this type of work must be carried out permanently and with the involvement of other departments of this institution, as well as other governmental entities, to strengthen this initiative, because to the extent that people recognize the value of heritage, they will become protective agents of it, achieving that

the destruction due to ignorance is reduced while they can take advantage of this resource for the improvement of their living conditions. Thus, she also stressed the importance of action to make people aware of the value of their archaeological heritage. Miriam Méndez' practice is a very progressive effort to link tourism and community development with archaeology, and she emphasized that public archaeology plays an important role in this process [Méndez 2017; 2019]. Her project had the following goals: To establish the bases of a public archaeology oriented to the strengthening of historical memory, identity and roots with the territory and to the valorization of the archaeological heritage seen not only as an element of identity, but also as a lever for development. She also listed the following three more specific objectives: 1. To turn the population into active agents for the protection, conservation and dissemination of their archaeological heritage, through a process of awareness-raising. 2. To turn their heritage into a reference of identity, an anchor of roots for the community and a valuable resource for its development. 3. To make the population aware of the importance and impact that the archaeologist's work contributes to societies. In this way, she was attempting to raise the awareness of the community involved with the site in order to ensure that the archaeological heritage fulfills its potential and does not lose its value.

A common feature of these presentations of public archaeology practices, as classified by Matsuda and Okamura [2011], is the emphasis on educational approaches. The importance of this approach can be seen in the desire on the part of archaeologists to make the general public more aware of the information and value of archaeology and archaeological heritage. Interestingly enough the participants in this workshop also shared common awareness of the issues. The answers to the question "What are the biggest challenges in the protection and utilization of archaeological heritage?" in the survey of workshop participants are instructive.

1. Lack of interest in archaeological heritage among landowners and the general public.
2. Society does not recognize archaeological heritage, so archaeological sites are not considered important and are not respected.
3. Land affiliation. Because many archaeological sites are not owned by the state, there are difficulties in protecting resources. There is no general outline to summarize the infrastructure, valorization of artifacts, importance that archaeological sites have, and a good safety system.
4. Smuggling of artifacts. Lack of public interest in archaeological artifacts.

5. Despite the existence of the Law for the Protection of Cultural Heritage, there is no clear direction for its effective implementation. Furthermore, there is little economic investment needed for the protection and development of archaeological resources. In addition, the general public has little education or information about archaeological resources. Therefore, they do not value archaeological resources.
6. Ignorance of the general public. Lack of budget. Lack of direction in archaeological research. Knowledge often remains at the academic level. Lack of promotion.
7. Lack of public awareness of the importance of cultural heritage. In addition, lack of interest from government agencies.
8. Need stricter laws on cultural heritage protection. Likewise, awareness needs to be created through education about cultural heritage in schools.
9. There is no culture in this country that values cultural heritage and gives importance to archaeological materials. People steal, sell, and destroy earthenware. There is no awareness of this.

With the exception of the point made in response 3 regarding challenges in government cultural policy, there are clear commonalities among the above responses. To put it simply, the general public is ignorant of the value of archaeological resources, which is why there is a need for awareness and education. A similar view can also be seen in the mass media. For example, under the title "Museums, a forgotten cultural resource," there is a reference to the fact that "the general public rarely values their own cultural identity on display and has no understanding of their artistic heritage" [Chicas y Canales 2010]. Of course, the circumstances surrounding each of these statements are very complex and should be treated with caution, but it can be said that the strong educational and enlightening orientation of all of them is a common characteristic. A similar orientation was evident at the next public archaeology symposium held after this workshop.

Public Archaeology Symposium

The First Symposium of Public Archaeology in El Salvador (I Simposio de Arqueología Pública en El Salvador, ISAP) was held from October 24 to 26, 2018, at the National Museum of Anthropology, hosted by the Ministry of Culture of El Salvador and the Kyoto University of Foreign Studies. The title was "Beyond Archaeology: Public Archaeology (Más allá de la arqueología: Arqueología Pública)". This was the first symposium



Fig. 2 Poster of the Public Archaeology Symposium

in Central America to focus on public archaeology and attracted many presenters from countries other than El Salvador, including Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico and Japan. A collection of papers from this symposium was published in 2019 [Méndez et al. 2019].

The symposium's call for papers stated the purpose of this event. It is summarized as follows. Increasing interest in and commitment to cultural heritage is one of the priorities of social scientists, and if we take into account the official reason for archaeology as a social science, namely professional ethics, then activities related to heritage education are necessary and even urgent. This is because, on the one hand, it avoids confining archaeological research to academia and excluding non-specialists, and, on the other hand, it leads to the empowerment of those involved in cultural heritage.

This statement continues as follows: Cultivating identity about the places where we live, through education and sensitization, leads to knowing and valuing cultural heritage. Not only do people enjoy and learn about their cultural heritage, but also in terms of their social connection to and rootedness in a place, this heritage-rich place will not be of any use unless it is properly



Fig. 3 Result of mining analysis (Voyanto-tools) selected 45 frequently used words from the ISAP abstracts (except “arqueología” “arqueológico” “arqueológica”)

protected, promoted, and preserved.

In this way, as the purpose of this symposium, it was emphasized the importance of archaeologists not only excavating and studying, but also disseminating this information and the findings to the general public, as this will lead to empowerment of people and social connection, and the strengthening of their identity. In line with this objective, five themes were established: 1. Importance of Heritage Education for the protection of archaeological heritage. 2. Public archaeology as a tool for strengthening identity. 3. Experiences in public archaeology. 4. Public archaeology and local and social development. 5. Dialogue with the public.

As a result, the presentations showed a different trend from the usual archaeological conferences. Figure 3 shows an image obtained through text mining analysis. Text mining seeks to extract useful and important information from document formats. By means of this technique 45 words were selected, depending on the frequency of their use in the abstracts of each presenter of the I SAP. If the same analysis is done with papers in general archaeology conferences, the words Maya civilization, potteries, tombs, etc. will be frequent. However, during this symposium it could be observed that many presenters talked about heritage, community, public, development and education.

A questionnaire survey was administered to presenters and audience at the symposium. The purpose of the survey was to determine the expectations and challenges of the symposium, and to help in setting the theme and improving the organization of the next symposium and the following ones. The question-

naire also asked questions relevant to this paper. The question was, “For you, what is “Public Archaeology”? This was a very interesting question. The responses provided an indication of the characteristics of public archaeology in this country and the expectations for public archaeology.

1. Action of different actors in support of archaeology.
2. It is the rescue of cultural public goods with a community purpose for their rescue, dissemination and maintenance in the local, national and regional territory.
3. Study of the relationship between archaeology and present society in all its fields in order to help communities by teaching them projects so that they can put them into practice.
4. It is a discipline that seeks to build two-way bridges with other areas and disciplines of knowledge, as well as with the different actors involved in order to create or strengthen identity.
5. Archaeology for and with the community, because knowledge must be transferred in a participatory manner and in active uses.
6. It is the branch of archaeology whose function is to link communities.
7. It is an Archaeology that serves to develop the relationship between Archaeology professionals and the general population.
8. A relationship between Archaeology and the community in a way that influences aspects such as political and social aspects within it in which they have access.
9. Branch of Archaeology or tool that allows to educate the population.
10. It is the means of transmitting information from archaeological specialists to the student community or to any interested society.
11. Promote students’ knowledge of cultural heritage through educational programs, and ideally, field trips.
12. It is to communicate and share scientific research with the community and the general public.
13. It is the one that is made known to the public, thus serving to relate archaeology professionals to the population.
14. It facilitates the transmission of the knowledge obtained by practical archaeology to sectors of the population that do not belong to the archaeology guild in order to bring this knowledge to the entire population and not become an elitist study.
15. It is the way to return to the public. The advances and discoveries and projects of archaeology, a way to raise awareness and “vulgarize”.

16. The socialization of archaeology that leads to the appropriation of archaeology by the population, which leads to an awareness, enjoyment and curiosity about the past.

The responses listed here show that public archaeology is viewed in a variety of ways. A certain orientation, however, can also be discerned. Although Responses 1 and 2 have different objectives (archaeology support and cultural heritage rescue, respectively), they share the idea of involving non-archaeologists. Responses 3 through 8 focus on precisely that relationship between archaeology and the public. These responses are similar to the definition of public archaeology as described above. In contrast to these, more clearly oriented can be seen on the responses 9 through 15. They focus on education and knowledge transfer, suggesting that they view public archaeology as an educational approach. It should be noted that Response 15 points out that it is to make people aware of archaeological discoveries and to vulgarize archaeology. “Vulgarize” means to popularize, to make more ordinary, or to make less formal. The idea of communicating archaeology in a more popular way, rather than through formal education such as school classes or lectures by archaeologists, can be seen as similar to a public relations approach. Moreover, the socialization of archaeology in the response 16 appears to be envisioned as a further step in the vulgarization of archaeology. In order to make the appropriation of archaeology by the public, archaeology must concede certain privileges so that non-archaeologists can deal with archaeology. Non-archaeologists’ opinions will be treated on an equal footing with archaeologists. Such a position would, in a sense, resemble a multivocal approach.

Significant feature of public archaeology in El Salvador: Educational approach

The question of this paper was what kind of public archaeology was considered necessary in El Salvador. According to the data analyzed in this paper, it can be answered as an educational approach, as classified by Matsuda and Okamura [2011]. In addition, we found ideas similar to the public relations approach and the multivocal approach. The target of these approaches is the general public that still has little awareness of the value of archaeology and archaeological heritage. Public archaeology for such people not only revitalizes archaeology and preserves archaeological heritage, but also enhances cultural identity and attachment to the place where they live, and can even lead to community development. In a survey at the first Public Archaeology Symposium, a number of people asked for more detailed



Fig. 4 Outreach activities to the elementary school

practical examples of educational approaches and theories to be presented in the future symposium.

Based on these results, the next question arises: How can foreign archaeologists contribute to public archaeology in El Salvador with such a clear consciousness and orientation? First of all, we should consider how we could contribute not only in terms of producing archaeological results, but also in terms of educational approaches. With this question in mind, the author has conducted a survey of the public's perception of the archaeological sites since 2007 [Murano and Valdivieso 2007]. And, continuing with this survey, the author has conducted surveys of school teachers' awareness of and experiences with archaeological heritage, developed worksheets for children to learn about archaeological heritage, and given lectures on archaeological heritage at schools [Murano2008; 2011]. These could be put into practice in the author's case by working with schoolteachers and archaeologists, and were subsequently developed by Mizuho Ikeda and other JICA volunteers and Salvadoran archaeologists [Ikeda y Morán 2010]. Currently, archaeologists in El Salvador

are actively developing their practices in various locations [Consuegra and Albayero 2013; Liuba Morán 2017; Margarita Morán 2019; Albayero 2019; Mendéz 2017; 2019]. Thus, experience is now steadily accumulating, and one contribution for foreign archaeologists will be to continue to collaborate in the same direction with archaeologists in El Salvador.

Second, it may be possible for foreign archaeologists to adopt other approaches that are currently not widely practiced. The need for a public relations approach and a multivocal approach, as mentioned above, has already been pointed out. The public relations approach has made extensive use of media such as movies, TV programs, and newspapers, and now, with the spread of digital technology, there are even more tools available. The fact that the approach can be used outside of El Salvador is important for foreign archaeologists, and should increase its availability and effectiveness of implementation in the future.

The multivocal approach is difficult to adopt as long as one believes that the general public has no value awareness of archaeology or archaeological heritage. In fact, the author's data show that even elementary school teachers visiting archaeological heritage sites do not have a grasp of basic information [Murano2011]. There are, however, non-archaeologists who are interested in archaeology and archaeological heritage. For example, artists should not be overlooked. Since 2007, the author has been working with artists on an experimental archaeological project [Murano2008; 2017; Murano and Sermeño 2019]. The project was to reveal ancient pottery pattern-making techniques. During the course of this experiment, when a pattern different from the ancient pattern appeared, it was easy to judge it as a failure from an archaeologist's point of view. However, to the artists, the patterns were beautiful and interesting. In other words, even though the archaeological value was low, the artistic



Fig. 5 Experimental archaeological project

Left: Observation of the results of a firing experiment, Right: New art work inspired by past technologies, "Identidad Fragmentada" (Foto: Henry Sermeño)

value was there. Such value cannot be realized if we only pursue archaeological answers, and even if we do, it will be dismissed as merely secondary. However, there are times when something other than the correct archaeological answers can add to the appeal of archaeology and archaeological materials. Such value should be cherished. The more archaeologists collaborate with other people, the more diverse the values will be founded. This is because the more diverse the perspectives on archaeological heritage, the more new logic to explain new value will be added. This will ultimately increase the value of archaeology and archaeological heritage.

Thus, to the extent that foreign archaeologists have a somewhat bird's-eye view of the local situation, they should be able to identify approaches that have not been adopted locally and work toward their effectiveness.

Conclusion

Due to the COVID-19, the 2nd Public Archaeology Conference, which Kanazawa University was one of the organizers, had to be postponed. This was a great disappointment, even though the call for applications had already begun. It is said that cultural activities in El Salvador are greatly affected by each change of government (as is the case in Japan as well). However, it is the function of public archaeology to consider and improve the relationship between archaeology and contemporary society, taking into account such political and social trends. In this sense, the development of public archaeology in the country is important for the future of archaeology in El Salvador.

Moreover, the movement to promote public archaeology in El Salvador has received good reviews from other countries. During the first symposium, participants from other countries expressed their hope that this was a very good initiative and that it would be continued. In other words, El Salvador is expected to lead other countries in public archaeology. When this expectation is actually fulfilled, there may come a time when other countries will even say that public archaeology is one of the "El Salvadoran archaeologies" that continue to be explored in this country.

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my sincere thanks to the Direction of Archaeology, the Ministry of Culture of El Salvador, especially Miriam Mendez, Margarita Morán and Shione Shibata, for their cooperation in the activities described in this article. I also thank Hiroshi Minami for his generous support of the workshop and symposium. I would also wish to express my deep appreciation

to the Professor Seiichi Nakamura for his guidance from the time I was a JICA volunteer to the present.

Bibliography

- Albayero, Sofia
 2019 Arqueología pública en El Salvador, ¿para que? *Estudios de arqueología: México y Centroamérica*, edited by José Heriberto Erquicia and Shione Shibata, pp. 13-24. DPI, San Salvador.
- Anderson, Benedict
 1983 *Imagined Communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. Verso, London.
- Chicas, Karla and Silva Canales
 2010 Museos, la riqueza olvidada de la cultura, *Comunicación* (San Salvador), 24 Feb. 2010.
- Consuegra Premper, Karen and María Sofía Albayero
 2013 Arqueología, patrimonio y educación: Una propuesta didáctica para la integración del recurso museístico en la educación formal en El Salvador. *Revista Digital de Estudios en Patrimonio Cultural*. Nueva Época. Volumen I, Número 3.
- El Diario de Hoy
 2005 Padre de la arqueología salvadoreña. *El Diario de Hoy en El Salvador*, 29 Mar. 2005.
- Erquicia, José Heriberto
 2012 A quince años de la formación de arqueólogos en El Salvador, 1995-2010. Perspectivas y desafíos. *Memorias del XXV Simposio de Investigaciones Arqueológicas de Guatemala 2011*.
- Escamilla, Marlon
 2015 ¿Arqueología salvadoreña? Una utopía en construcción. *Entorno* 58: 61-67.
- Escamilla, Marlon and William Fowler Jr.
 2012 Práctica y conducta de la arqueología salvadoreña durante los últimos 25 años: el inicio de una arqueología nacional. *XXV Simposio de Investigaciones Arqueológicas de Guatemala 2011*: 427-438.
- Holtorf, Cornelius
 2007 *Archaeology is a Brand! The Meaning of Archaeology in Contemporary Popular Culture*. Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek.
- Ikeda, Mizuho y Liuba Morán
 2010 *Informe final el proyecto de colaboración entre el museo del sitio arqueológico Casa Blanca y Chalchuapanecos: taller de arqueología para niños*. Entregado al Departamento de Arqueología de la SEC, El Salvador.
- López Bernal, Carlos Gregorio

- 2007 Lecturas desde la derecha y la izquierda sobre el levantamiento de 1932: implicaciones político-culturales. In *Las masas, el martinato en El Salvador: ensayos sobre 1932*, edited by Erik Ching, Carlos Gregorio López Bernal y Virginia Tilley, UCA Editores, San Salvador.
- Matsuda, Akira and Katsuyuki Okamura
2011 Introduction: New Perspectives in Global Public Archaeology. In *New Perspectives in Global Public Archaeology*, edited by Okamura, K. and Matsuda, A., pp. 1-18, Springer, New York.
- McCafferty, Geoffrey, Fabio Esteban Amador, Silvia Salgado, and Carrie Dennett
2012 Mesoamerica's Southern Frontier. In *Oxford Handbook of Mesoamerican Archaeology*, edited by Deborah L. Nichols and Christopher A. Pool, pp.83-105, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- McGimsey III, Charles Robert
1972 *Public Archaeology*. Seminar Press, New York and London.
- Méndez, Miriam
2017 Puesta en valor del sitio arqueológico El Panteoncito, Cooperativa San Isidro, municipio de Tamanique, El Salvador. Un esfuerzo desde la arqueología pública. *Estudios de arqueología: México y Centroamérica*, edited by José Heriberto Erquicia and Shione Shibata, pp. 183-199. DPI, San Salvador.
2019 Arqueología pública en El Salvador. In *I Simposio de Arqueología Pública en El Salvador, 2018: Más allá de la arqueología: Arqueología Pública*, edited by Méndez, Miriam, Margarita Morán, Hiroshi Minami y Masakage Murano, pp.113-124, San Salvador.
- Méndez, Miriam, Margarita Morán, Hiroshi Minami y Masakage Murano (eds.)
2019 *I Simposio de Arqueología Pública en El Salvador, 2018: Más allá de la arqueología: Arqueología Pública*. San Salvador.
- Merriman, Nick
2004 Introduction: Diversity and dissonance in public archaeology. In *Public Archaeology*, edited by Merriman, N., pp.1-17. Routledge, London.
- Montalvo, Adda
2002 El boom de museos en El Salvador. *Revista Dominical, La Prensa Gráfica (San Salvador)*, 7, oct. 2002
- Morán, Margarita
2019 Arqueología pública: los gobiernos locales como protectores del patrimonio arqueológico. In *I Simposio de Arqueología Pública en El Salvador, 2018: Más allá de la arqueología: Arqueología Pública*, edited by Méndez, Miriam, Margarita Morán, Hiroshi Minami y Masakage Murano, pp.76-84, San Salvador.
- Murano, Masakage
2008a Una mejor utilización de los museos en el ámbito de educación: Estudio del caso en el Museo del Parque Arqueológico Tazumal. *Papeles de Arqueología*. Consejo Nacional para la Cultura y el Arte (CONCULTURA). pp.542-566.
2008b *Informe preliminar: Resurgimiento de técnica antigua para elaborar cerámica y desarrollo de una nueva artesanía y material educativo*. Entregado al Departamento de Arqueología del CONCULTURA y JICA, El Salvador.
2010 Stanley Boggs and Archaeology in the Republic of El Salvador : For establishing a logic of conservation and utilization in cultural heritages. *The SHIEN or the Journal of History* 147: 59-98 (in Japanese)
2011 *Una situación actual de la enseñanza de arqueología en los centros educativos en Chalchuapa*. Entregado al Departamento de Arqueología de la SEC, El Salvador.
2017 Una Síntesis del Estudio Sobre la Técnica para la Elaboración de Una Cerámica de Estilo Usulután. *Kanazawa Cultural Resource Studies*, 16:111-135. Center for Cultural Resource Studies, Institute of Human and Social Sciences, Kanazawa University, Japan.
- Murano, Masakage and Fabricio Valdivieso
2007 Para hacer "Arqueología Pública": Investigación sobre la utilización de los recursos arqueológicos en El Salvador y su perspectiva. Ponencia para II Congreso Centroamericano de Arqueología en El Salvador.
- Murano, Masakage and Henry Sermeño
2019 Para empezar la siguiente etapa del proyecto de resurgimiento de técnica Antigua para elaborar cerámica de estilo Usulután: experiencias y desafíos. In *I Simposio de Arqueología Pública en El Salvador, 2018: Más allá de la arqueología: Arqueología Pública*, edited by Méndez, Miriam, Margarita Morán, Hiroshi Minami y Masakage Murano, pp.85-95, San Salvador.
- Ochiai, Kazuyasu
1996 Gender Designated Between Cultures, Indigenous Civilization, and Distinction : production and consumption of cultural self-portraits in modern Mexico. *The Japanese Journal of Ethnology* 61(1): 52-80.
- Ohi, Kuniaki (ed.)
2000 *Chalchuapa. Memoria Final de las Investigaciones Interdisciplinarias de El Salvador*. Universidad de Estudios Extranjeros de Kyoto, Kyoto.

Paredes Umaña, Federico and José Heriberto Erquicia

2013 Los conceptos de pasado histórico, Estado y patrimonio como elementos indispensables para la elaboración de una biografía crítica de la arqueología salvadoreña. *Identidades* 6: 9-31.

Sausedo Segami, Daniel Dante

2014 *My Huaca: The Use of Archaeological Heritage in Modern Peru from a Public-Archaeology Perspective*. Doctor Thesis. The Graduate University for Advanced Studies, Osaka.

Sen, Amartya

1999 *Development as Freedom*. Alfred A. Knopf, New York.

Valdivieso, Fabricio

2010 Remembranzas de un departamento de Arqueología con los primeros arqueólogos formados en El Salvador. *Revista de Museología Kóot* 2: 77-100

2014 *The Use of Archaeological Resources for the Benefit of Rural Communities in El Salvador*. Master Thesis.

Japanese Contributions to the Studies of Mesoamerican Civilizations
: the 40th Anniversary of La Entrada Archaeological Project

Studies in Ancient Civilizations vol.1

First published on March 15th, 2023

Editors: Seiichi Nakamura, Takuro Adachi, and Masahiro Ogawa

Publisher: Institute for the Study of Ancient Civilizations and Cultural Resources, Kanazawa University, Japan

Kakuma-machi Kanazawa, Ishikawa, 920-1192, Japan

TEL 076-264-5785

<https://isac.w3.kanazawa-u.ac.jp>

E-mail kanazawa.isac@gmail.com

Printed by MAEDA PRINTING CO., LTD

ISBN 978-4-944014-37-8.

©Seiichi Nakamura, Takuro Adachi, and Masahiro Ogawa 2023 Printed in Japan