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CHAPTER ONE: PAST AND PRESENT AT COLONIAL WILLIAMSBURG

‘That the Future may learn from the Past’ has served as a motto, mission statement, and advertising slogan for Colonial Williamsburg since the foundation’s beginnings. The phrase, coined by John D. Rockefeller, Jr., has been used to justify Colonial Williamsburg’s existence and to guide the interpretive/educational efforts of the reconstructed “historic area.” One of the motto’s earliest cameos appears in a special July 1949 edition of the Virginia Gazette. There (Alexander 1949), Colonial Williamsburg is described as a

“[…] project that seeks to impress upon all guests the diversified meanings of life in the eighteenth century, and to inspire them with the integrity, energy, and courage of Washington, Jefferson […]etc] All this is done, not for the sake of knowledge and entertainment, but in the belief that Americans of today will understand their present problems better by seeing them in the perspective of their tradition, will be more clearheaded and purposeful in making choices today. This is what is meant by the motto of Colonial Williamsburg.”

The political importance of Colonial Williamsburg, as defined by its developers, has always been rooted in shaping the American “past” to impact the present and provide a powerful force in shaping the future. In effect, CW serves as an idealized landscape onto which the past is rewritten daily in the present. Aiming beyond mere “knowledge and entertainment,” Colonial Williamsburg’s administrative and interpretive mission has been engaged in a quest to educate the site’s visitors and instill a deeper (or at least, distinct) understanding of America’s origins through physical engagement since the foundation’s inception in 1926. Colonial Williamsburg works to put people into past places with the
aim of highlighting the moral philosophy surrounding the American Revolution.

Colonial Williamsburg’s interpretive trajectory, however, has not been a straight path; the foundation has transitioned through a variety of methods to engage the American future with its past. This paper argues that *Revolutionary City*, a series of street theatre performances and one of the foundation’s most recent interpretive strategies, works as a nationalistic, carefully choreographed social drama at an American historic site.

During the summer of 2012, I collected targeted, qualitative interviews with visitor/viewers of *Revolutionary City*. Through applying Victor Turner’s theories of social/ritual drama to Colonial Williamsburg’s most recent interpretive effort and this interview data-set, I aim to examine the effect *Revolutionary City* registers upon its visitor/viewers and to better understand how they internalize the narrative presented. Turner is adamant that “performances perform” (Turner 1982: 91) and any Turnerian ritual analysis must examine the working aspect[s] of the ritual event. Discussions with participants in this study reveal that *Revolutionary City* serves not only as reflexive, redressive action to the 18th century issues it brings forth regarding participation in the American revolution, but also works to resolve the crisis between a post-modern America and its radically different eighteenth century past.

Understanding Colonial Williamsburg’s own past is essential to provide a context for a study of the foundation. Williamsburg’s “historic area” (the foundation’s term for the restored zone and central locus of interpretation) is over three hundred acres, includes eighty-eight restored original structures, five hundred reconstructed buildings, approximately sixty thousand American and British antiques and works of art, a major research library and a host of other collections; managing, let alone interpreting such a
massive physical plant (the country’s largest living history museum) is a major financial and managerial endeavor. Following a tradition in the establishment of American historic areas and museums (Upton 1988, in Handler and Gable 1997: 31), Colonial Williamsburg was born out of the seemingly “tireless” work of the Reverend W. A. R. Goodwin, the rector of Bruton Parish Church—founded in 1674 and located on Duke of Gloucester Street, surrounded by what is now foundation owned property. Goodwin desired to preserve and display the rapidly decaying town, and wanted to build a landmark shrine to America’s past and ‘enduring values.’ The site would be anchored by the College of William and Mary’s Wren Building/education, Bruton Parish Church/religion, and, perhaps most importantly, the reconstructed colonial capital/state (Greenspan 2002: 5-10, 40). After failed attempts at enticing a variety of benefactors to fund the project (notably, Henry Ford), the reverend successfully enlisted the financial backing, and corporate assistance, of John D. Rockefeller, Jr. in 1926. With Rockefeller’s money, Goodwin set-up a foundation and rapidly began purchasing properties in the town. Only after the restoration was underway was Rockefeller’s name revealed and the small town “convinced” that the entire project was a “good idea” (Handler and Gable: 33). The restoration/reconstruction of Williamsburg led to federal legislation promoting the establishment of a “Colonial National Monument,” displaying “Williamsburg as the continuation of Jamestown [Settlement] and Yorktown [battlefield] as the vindication of Williamsburg” (Greenspan 2002: 30-31). Both the federal and Virginia state governments took an intense interest in the creation of Colonial Williamsburg—the eyes of the entire nation were watching Goodwin and Rockefeller’s work.
Rockefeller, a noted perfectionist, desired complete “authenticity” at Williamsburg. Together with Goodwin, Rockefeller hired a team of “experts” (Handler and Gable 1997: 33-36): historians, architects, and other researchers to both inform and guide the entire creation/restoration of the historic area and provide the fledgling foundation with a sort of “credibility armor” (Handler and Gable 1997: 44) through recreating the past with fidelity in the present. The freshly mortared Colonial Williamsburg—including reconstructions, restorations, and buildings relocated away from their original foundations—was intended to transport visitors to the eighteenth century, recreating the environment in which the founding fathers lived, and enabling them to interact with a particular moment of a particularly American past. The once “backwater college town of Williamsburg” (Handler and Gable 1997: 39) was recast as a time machine-turned-shrine, with necessary modern “compromises” that would enable visitors to appreciate the ideals on display—including restaurants, hotels, shops filled with reproductions, and a variety of safety factors (Greenspan 2002: 27). These “compromises” and conveniences eventually formed the foundations’ business unit—a profiteering corporation whose income was invested in Williamsburg’s educational, interpretive, maintenance, and research endeavors. Rockefeller was anxious that Colonial Williamsburg be self-supporting (Handler and Gable 1997: 37) and the formation of a corporate, hospitality side to the foundation met the gap between operating costs and limited admissions incomes. For better or worse, the small town of Williamsburg was transformed to mimic—in the eyes’ of Colonial Williamsburg’s architects—a particular past and became an economically important hub of tourism for the Tidewater region.
During Rockefeller’s tenure at the head of the foundation, rigid, perhaps debilitating, architectural authenticity took priority over Colonial Williamsburg’s educational and interpretive work (Greenspan 2002: 25). Before World War II, Colonial Williamsburg was seen as a gathering place for the wealthy. Few children visited early on, and the local public, at least, viewed the restoration as something that only those of a high socio-economic position could truly appreciate, understand, and enjoy (Greenspan 2002: 42). The foundation’s leadership, however, had misjudged Williamsburg’s potential for broader appeal and, as the site was increasingly advertised, a progressively more diverse set of visitors came to Williamsburg (Greenspan 2002: 46) to better understand the “idea of America” (CW Mission Statement)—to learn about the motives behind the foundation of the United States and the people who developed and acted upon them. The change in visitor demographic prompted a paradigmatic shift away from self-interpretive architecture, to the formation of an organized “hostess” program of tour guides. These hostesses served as the foundation’s front-line to the visiting public, and were largely responsible for communicating the message and ideals of Colonial Williamsburg to its audience. This moment marked one of the beginnings of guided interpretation at Williamsburg.

In his book, Creating Colonial Williamsburg, Anders Greenspan argues that the interpretive message of Colonial Williamsburg has been consistently tied to, and altered in accordance with, shifting notions of Americanism. Rockefeller felt as though post-World War I America was losing touch with the ideals that its founding fathers must have held in high esteem. In its initial phase, Williamsburg was meant to expose and reconnect Americans to these ideals: “patriotism, high purpose, and unselfish devotion” as
displayed by the nation’s “forefathers for the common good” (Rockefeller quoted in Greenspan 2002: 53). The town’s connections to George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry, and George Wythe were used to trumpet the importance of the rights of the individual and the supremacy of democratic, representative forms of government; Colonial Williamsburg was a “bulwark against foreign ideas” (Greenspan 2002: 14).

During World War II, Williamsburg played host to thousands of soldiers who visited while stationed at nearby military bases. Members of Franklin D. Roosevelt’s staff contacted the foundation’s leadership, urging them to construct an education program for service members. Colonial Williamsburg, according to FDR’s administration, “offers many opportunities to dramatize the Four Freedoms—Freedom to Live, Work, Speak, Worship. These were what the Virginians lived for” (Lasswell in Greenspan 2002: 64).

FDR’s ‘four freedoms’ coupled with Rockefeller’s “sense of civic obligation” (Greenspan 2002: 65) guided interpretive efforts and structured visitor experiences at Colonial Williamsburg through the Cold War.

By the mid 1970s, however, Colonial Williamsburg’s traditional interpretation of the eighteenth century Virginia elite had “grown stale” (Greenspan 2002: 15). A new wave of social historians occupied the foundation’s offices at the Goodwin Building, notably, Cary Carson, under the leadership of Carlisle Humelsine. Carson wrote a new manifesto of interpretation, focusing the story Colonial Williamsburg on three themes: “Becoming Americans,” “Choosing Revolution,” and “The New Consumers” (Longworth 1980-81: 7). This varied approach marked a significant departure from anything previously done at Colonial Williamsburg. Rather than showcasing an idealized version of the past, Carson endeavored to present a multi-vocal series of themes based on
the broader Williamsburg community. Colonial Williamsburg was to portray the difficult economic and social transformations experienced by all (or, at least, the enslaved and white portions) of Williamsburg’s 18th century residents. For the first time, visitors would see the “experiences” of enslaved Africans in Williamsburg transposed full-scale with the foundation’s traditional Anglo-centric displays. The new Colonial Williamsburg wanted to “pay primary attention to the associations that every person in a community formed with fellow men and women in the cause of raising families, earning livings, making laws, and whatever else cannot be done alone” (Carson in Longworth 1980-81: 7). Social conditions and interactions across Williamsburg’s populations were the new focus of the foundation’s message, yet without “forsaking the patriots” (Longworth 1980-81: 7).

From the injection of this ‘new social history’ came a variety of critiques. Richard Handler and Eric Gable’s work, *The New History in an Old Museum* (1997), is perhaps the most salient and biting. Through participant observation and a variety of interviews with foundation management and employees, Handler and Gable found that visitors were not receiving Colonial Williamsburg’s carefully planned messages. Rather than displaying the complexity (and often grimness) dictated by social history, Williamsburg was instead catering to the needs of its corporate half (perhaps the conventionally heroic notion of the American Revolution familiar to any reader of elementary school histories of the day). The museum continued to present itself as the ultimate authority on the American past, and often the town’s interpreters kept on repeating themes of graciousness and the southern civility of an elite, gentry class that were the hallmark of the foundation’s old rhetoric. Many interpreter/employees were disgruntled with Colonial Williamsburg’s new direction and others felt as though the divide between themselves
and the academic “history-makers” was far too great for a theme of social upheaval, political unrest, and vast economic difference to be successfully portrayed. The American past at Colonial Williamsburg lacked any sort of active engagement with its audience: in economic terms, Handler and Gable defined the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation as a calculating, cultural mass-producer (the quality of whose product will be discussed below) and its visitors as simple consumers (Handler and Gable 1997: 11). Their study contrasts with the framework outlined below, by focusing on visitors as not simple consumers, but rather complex targets—that both act and think—for the foundation’s interpretive rhetoric.

In response to these critiques like Handler and Gable’s, Colonial Williamsburg developed a new focus for its interpretive efforts: Revolutionary City, debuting in the summer of 2006 (Dobyns 2006). A street theater production performed ‘on-location’ at various buildings, stages, and greens across the historic area daily, Revolutionary City is billed as a “Colonial Williamsburg Adventure” (Rev. City Production Bulletin; see Appendix C). Revolutionary City explicitly presents scripted scenes of ‘everyday life’ for ‘everyday’ sorts of people in eighteenth century Williamsburg; it focuses specifically on lower class workers and merchants, women, and enslaved Africans. The format of the production aims to encourage audience engagement, often through participatory response and individual interaction with costumed actors planted throughout the audience. The street theater confronts its audience by juxtaposing the restoration’s grand physical landscape with the hardship and difficult choices faced by the majority of its inhabitants, as demonstrated by the following interviews (Interview 8). Revolutionary City presents multiple narratives and, at times, shows no clear path forward (though never to the extent
where the worth of the revolution is actually questioned): the performance is a complicated story.

Colonial Williamsburg’s identity has always been intimately linked to prevailing notions of nationalism. In the foundation’s early years, the press popularized the site as a “shrine” with “religious spirit” (Greenspan 2002: 41), and the foundation focused on providing a basis for a secular state religion. In the multi-cultural, technology-laden realm of twenty-first century America, Williamsburg has been forced to alter its message of the past. In Revolutionary City, the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation encapsulates a portrayal of the beginning of the American nation-state it views as necessary for interpreting the country’s present and shaping its future. Revolutionary City takes as its mission to shape the twenty-first century future by teaching the public about its eighteenth century past, in a format that requires active interpretation/participation on the part of the visitor. The new inclusive, participatory format of a visit to Colonial Williamsburg aims to arrest the attention of the visitor previously unachieved. Living history museums nationwide have struggled to maintain their status in the 21st century (Carson 2008: 10-15). With declining visitation, the new strategy Colonial Williamsburg puts forth in Revolutionary City is the foundation’s bid for survival in the future.
CHAPTER TWO: THE ANTHROPOLOGY OF SOCIAL DRAMA/ritual
performance/nationalism

As a cultural performance operating under a nationalistic mission, Revolutionary City is in a uniquely “ripe” position for anthropological study. First, this chapter examines a few previous studies of Colonial Williamsburg, then shifts to provide a brief introduction to the anthropological discourses of social drama and nationalism in the cultural sphere, utilizing Stephen Greenblatt’s museum scholarship on resonance and wonder as a connection. Focusing specifically on the work of Victor Turner, I present a framework for analyzing Revolutionary City, and work to build on the comparative mission of anthropology through analyzing the structure of performance, the kinesics of the event, and the various categories of people created by the drama.

Post-modern Critiques of Colonial Williamsburg

Previous postmodern studies of Colonial Williamsburg abound. Ada Huxtable (2002) has likened the foundation’s historic area to a “Republican Disneyland.” Huxtable contends that too much of Colonial Williamsburg’s architecture, museum collections, and interpretation is simply “of the period”—tenuously (dis)connected to any distinct past, Colonial Williamsburg has bulldozed away all reality. Over 731 “wrong buildings”—structures that did not meet the foundation’s interpretive cut-off date—were destroyed and replaced with the “right buildings” (restored and reconstructed architecture that met the foundation’s requirement for authenticity). Someone’s (generally, either an architect and/or a historian) judgment was constantly at the heart of the restoration, and this omnipotence in deciding what was right and what was wrong in a national past, lead towards a slippery slope of curatorial and interpretive decisions. A blend of “new and old,
“real and fake, original and copy” disorients the truth-seeking visitor to Colonial Williamsburg, and the “intrinsic qualities of the real place (emphasis mine)” are falsified and lost. As an aspiring “authentic reproduction” (an epitome of oxymoronism), Colonial Williamsburg attempts to invent an American reality laden with revisions, each aiming to make the foundation “more true” than the last. Colonial Williamsburg and its progeny, as the grand dame of living history, have taught the American public to value and preference “selective, sanitized versions of the past” that lack the gritty remains of success and failure, “deny the diversity and eloquence of change and continuity.”

Restored living history has paved the way for theme parks like Disneyland by glorifying the “unreal over the real,” embedding the idea that any true restoration must be completely iconic and perfect within the American psyche.

Richard Handler and Eric Gable’s notion of mimetic reality concludes with a similar understanding. The new social history of the 1970’s at Williamsburg took a decidedly constructivist approach. Colonial Williamsburg was no longer meant to be an omnipotent authority on the national past. Rather, the foundation hoped to structure itself as a learning laboratory—a space for conflicting ideals, complex narratives, and ultimately, a story that had to be pieced together by the visitor. Constructivism thus was implemented to ensure a hands-on style of learning and allow for each visitor to establish the relevance of the museum in the context of their own lived experiences, rather than passing down a set of pre-determined moral outcomes. Handler and Gable found, however, that this “do-it-yourself” approach to the historic area was being “co-opted” (Schaffer 1998) by the foundation’s front-line interpreters, who present the museum as the ultimate history sleuth. History is depicted like a puzzle, where the foundation is
constantly uncovering new facts/pieces and sharing the more correct, more complete picture with the public (Schaffer 1998; Handler and Gable 1997: 71). Interpreted historical information thus becomes objective fact at Colonial Williamsburg, and topics like slavery, where few written historical sources speaking to the condition of life for the enslaved exist, migrate/fade into the background. Museum scholars have witnessed this “fading” of powerful topics as a lost opportunity across institutions.

**Resonance and Wonder in the Museum**

According to Stephen Greenblatt (1991: 57), it is exactly this tendency of ‘fading’ that modern museums must avoid. Though intended for art museums, Greenblatt’s theory regarding the presence of “resonance and wonder” in museum exhibitions easily transfers to history museums and the ambiguous category of living history displays. Many successful museum exhibitions either center their curatorial approach on inciting **resonance** in the minds of visitors or inspiring **wonder** and awe. The ability of a museum display or performance to resonate with its audience hinges on how well the exhibition can reach out to a wider world, allowing objects and didactics to speak directly to the lives of viewer and achieve a strong cognitive connection. **Resonance** exhibits encourage reflexivity and introspection by viewing an exterior object. **Wonder** exhibits impress visitors with beauty and mystique; they “stop a visitor in their tracks” and initiate strong emotional reactions. A sense of wonder in the museum is a direct descendent from the curiosity cabinets of early modern Europe and an extension of Renaissance humanism (Greenblatt 1991: 52-56). The most powerful museum experiences, and the goal for the modern museum as a cultural institution, should affect visitors with “wonderful resonance and resonant wonder,” effectively combining and integrating the two powerful
principles of organization and display. In *Revolutionary City*, Colonial Williamsburg has attempted to achieve this delicate combination in a nationalistic setting. Utilizing Victor Turner’s theory of social drama helps to elucidate the methods with which resonance and wonder—or liminal communitas—are imparted, or not, on the visitor/viewer of *Revolutionary City*.

**Victor Turner and Social Drama**

Victor Turner conducted two and a half years of fieldwork among the Ndembu people of Zambia (Turner 1982: 60). Though trained in British structural-functionalism, an interest in poetry and literary criticism led Turner to be highly sensitive to the nuances of *lived* experiences, the power of semiotics, and the full range of the human “sensory repertoire” (Turner 1982: 10). While observing Ndembu fertility rituals, Turner developed a systematic framework to understand the rites of passage on a deeper level—this marked the beginning of his work on *social dramas*. A social drama can be roughly defined by four phases: “breach, crisis, redress, and either reintegration or recognition of schism” (Turner 1982: 69) (see figure 1). These dramas “suspend normal everyday role playing” (Turner 1982: 92)—they interrupt the normal social fabric of a group or society and cause society members to reflect and become cognizant of their own actions and values, paving the path for a potential reconciliation between the two. A social drama “is a story” (Turner 1982: 68) of experiences past present, and potential future. The drama is a narrative in itself and its processual unfolding is a lived “story.”

The “breach of a norm” (Turner 1982: 69) that initiates the social drama can be premeditated or spontaneous. It might involve the breaking of a *tapu* restriction, a military struggle, or even conflict over the representation of the past. This breach could
be premeditated and deliberate, an attempt to “challenge entrenched authority,” or might be entirely organic, the result of a boiling over of emotion (Turner 1982: 70). Inherently, opposing sides develop and factions are formed. Turner notes that, unless some third

Figure 1: Schematic of social drama theory

party enters the scenario to provide quick resolution, a breach often widens and spreads until it “coincides with some dominant cleavage in the widest set of relevant social relations” (Turner 1982: 70)—in modern America, these cleavages might occur on racial, religious, economic, or political party boundaries, among others. The uncovering of these basic oppositions existent within a society is invaluable to the anthropologist, and often has the potential to lead to a variety of structural conclusions.

Thus, the initial breach of a rule or relationship leads to a broader crisis. In order to limit the extent of the crisis/breach and prevent immediate schism, redressive action(s) take(s) place. A variety of mechanisms may be employed: legal, religious, military, and/or state-sanctioned projects and frameworks could all be utilized. All redressive activities, however share one common, important factor: the incorporation, or feature of, a performance aspect. For Turner, performances perform, that is to say, they accomplish something, manifesting a sense of completion (Turner 1982: 91). The ritualized component of a social drama, the performance, holds transformative power, or at least the
possibility for such (Cottle 2008: 109). The actors in the performance utilize and manipulate societal contentions, potentially re-organizing existing power structures. The drama encourages reflexivity in what might be termed a liminal phase for an entire society. This liminal phase is a distinctive feature of Turner’s work. Liminality characteristically marks a phase both out time and space, and signifies the inversion of social norms. In a liminal phase law, politics, economics/exchange, and religion all lose their ability to grant order to everyday life (Turner 1982: 84). Change is inherent in liminality, as the world seems to be upended, and the “biophysical human constitution” is no longer restrained by the norms of socialization.

The redressive action and its liminality lead to two possible solutions—different culminations of the social drama. After completing the process, a society might end its liminal phase and come to a “consensual recognition of irremediable breach” (Turner 1982: 92); a permanent schism in the fabric of a society. Often this includes the physical separation of the groups originally cleaved by the breach. Alternatively, the social drama ends in reconciliation and reintegration—a highly emotional outcome that results in a resounding sense of communitas. Turner defines communitas as essentially “an unmediated relationship between historical, idiosyncratic, concrete individuals” (Turner 1982: 45). While experiencing communitas, community groups are unified, boundaries are broken, yet individuality is maintained. Structure does not disappear, but is subverted while togetherness is trumpeted and society finds itself uniquely synchronized (Turner 1982: 47).

Social dramas require a society or, as Turner describes, they “occur within groups bounded by shared values and interests of persons having a real or alleged common
In every society, one is obliged to belong to distinct, or perhaps remarkably murky groups. People are more likely to experience the full range of a social drama’s processual steps when the drama centers on a group or community that they identify with most closely (Turner terms these “star groups” (1982: 69)). In the modern western world, an affiliation or identity directly associated with a nation-state almost certainly ranks among many individual’s star groups, particularly those in the western world. Life in these star groups is “characteristically pregnant with social dramas” (Turner 1982: 11), and one social drama easily leads to another, or might in fact contain multiple dramas. Scale, while not irrelevant, is not a primary factor in the initiation or completion of a social drama: social dramas that occur as ritual performances rather transcend all factors of scale—Turner cites both Ndembu fertility rites and the Watergate scandal as examples (Turner 1982: 69) of massive cultural phenomena that contain and promulgate multiple smaller dramas.

Later in his career, Turner made a strong connection between social drama and contemporary western cultural performances— theatre. Turner utilized Clifford Geertz’s symbolic anthropology to inform his connections. In Geertz’s terms, theatre in western societies is an important type of metacommentary (Geertz in Turner 1982: 104). Theatrical performances are carefully orchestrated, interpreted self-portraits of a society. Their subject matter reanimates past events and investigates realms of future possibility. “Social problems, issues and crises” (Turner 1982: 105) are exposed and reflected upon, and often, brought to some sort of resolve. Yet the resolve they initiate need not only be relegated to the stage. Rather, the theatrical experience requires active interpretation and participation (mental and, in many cases, including street theatre, physical) on the part of
audience members who internalize, digest, reflect and pass judgment on the performance’s quality, narrative, and themes. Often, and most definitely in the case of *Revolutionary City*, these themes are intended to connect and resonate deeply with audience members, encouraging reflection on contemporary, *lived* experiences in the audience’s life. A dramatic, theatrical performance includes “bit[s] of reality” (Schechner in Turner 1982: 93), encountered both by the actors and audience. Thus, contemporary, western theatrical performances often depict social dramas. The process of watching or acting in a play is a distinct type of social drama in its own context (Turner 1982: 99), and in exceptional performances, an audience and cast are joined together by a sense of communitas in their own right.

Yet acting and performance do not only occur on the formal setting of the stage. Erving Goffman contends that all social individuals effectively “act” to portray certain roles in social settings; we all play different parts in various settings and assess the performances of roles played by others (Goffman 1959: 2-19). Daily life is composed of a variety of act[ion]. Actors attempt to guide and control situations by altering their dialogue, changing their appearance, or manipulating the backdrop/setting. Modern dramatic theory holds that a theatrical performance centers on its character’s objectives and intentions (Bauer 2013). The basis for a dramatic narrative must then focus on the conflict caused by obstacles that prevent the achievement of said objectives. The same holds true for acting in social interactions outside the realm of formal theatrical settings. Both formal and social actors maintain agendas and goals in attempting to guide the perception of their audience.
Thus the audience of *Revolutionary City*, understood as a theatrical performance that depicts everyday encounters in 18th century life, must grapple with both formal and social acting. Audience members question the narrative on two levels. On a social scale, in the context of the performance’s narrative, are the actors expressing their true thoughts and feelings? In the context of a theatrical production that operates under the promise of historical accuracy, audience members must also question the ‘truths’ put forth in the performance. Richard Schechner (1985: 9) notes that “the distance between the character and the performer allows a commentary to be inserted.” Interviews with visitor/viewers of *Revolutionary City* demonstrate the process by which audience members recognize, internalize, and/or question this commentary.
CHAPTER THREE: SETTING THE SCENE—A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF REVOLUTIONARY CITY

Billed as a “Colonial Williamsburg Adventure” (CW Rev. City Bulletin, Appendix C), the Revolutionary City program consists of three different, yet thematically linked, performances, each focusing on a particular time period. The performances alternated by day of the week. On Mondays, visitors saw “Building a Nation;” Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Saturdays were reserved for “The King’s Government Collapses, 1765-1776;” and on Wednesdays, Fridays, and Sundays (in abbreviated form) “The Challenge of Independence, 1776-1781” was performed during the weeks of my observation. Though the events and scenes varied from one performance to the next, the narrative and general physical mapping of Revolutionary City remained similar. For the sake of brevity, I will provide a physical description and short synopsis of the “The King’s Government Collapses,” and will discuss the primary differences between it and the other performances as necessary.

At the beginning of the summer season each Tuesday/Thursday/Saturday performance began at 3:30 pm and concluded around 5:00 pm. Revolutionary City was the last interpretive activity most of its viewers saw in Colonial Williamsburg (all of the foundation’s interpretive buildings close by 5 pm) and the capstone to a visit to the historic area. An admission pass was required to enter the last block of Duke of Gloucester Street, near the capitol, during the performance, and the remaining area of the historic zone (normally open for all) was roped off on all sides to prevent those without a ticket from entering. Upon presenting a pass, visitors were handed a program bulletin, which provided the time, location, and a short introduction and temporal setting for each
scene, and, on the reverse a supplementary time line, to aid visitors in positioning a scene’s actions into a broader historical setting (see Appendix C).

“The King’s Government Collapses” opens at a stage in front of the Raleigh Tavern. Viewers sit and stand on benches to the left and right of the stage, and on the raised sidewalk across the street; interpreters prevent viewers from standing in the street. Revolutionary City is extensively advertised—most viewers arrive before the start of the performance, and costumed, in-character actors move in and out of the crowd engaging audience members and each other in (apparently) impromptu conversation and pose for photographs. Topics of conversation ranged from contemporary (1770’s) events in Williamsburg to cuisine and rifle specifics. Many people show obvious discomfort during this pre-show performance and physically distance themselves from the actor/s. Other visitor/viewers however, clearly enjoy the direct engagement with the actors (Interview 13).

The first scene (The Gale from the North! April 29, 1775) begins with a rider on horseback, galloping down Duke of Gloucester street, exclaiming that he has “news from the North—blood has been shed in Massachusetts.” The rider finds Peyton Randolph exiting the tavern and preparing to depart for the Continental Congress in Philadelphia. Williamsburg, as Randolph and his assistants explain to the audience, has experienced a crisis of its own: Lord Dunmore, the Royal Governor of Virginia, has removed all the gunpowder from the Public Magazine (a reconstructed building which stands further down the street). The actors express a variety of opinions on why this has occurred, and the audience is told that a local militia is gathering for action—in short, fear and mob mentality are rampant “around town.” Randolph begs the audience, who, in this segment,
are treated by those on stage as colonists, to see reason and maintain a defensive rather than offensive stance, in terms of maintaining their liberties. The horseback rider is not appeased, and demands that Randolph accept the protection of several militiamen on his journey north. Randolph agrees, and the scene ends.

Two important observations to note here: the audience is directly addressed as though they have been transported back in time and costumed actors are interspersed throughout the audience. Throughout all of Revolutionary City’s scenes, the audience is intended to actively participate in the action. The presence of costumed actors in the audience is meant to heighten the level of engagement and foster a sense of time travel. Actors in the crowd speak, yell ‘huzzah!’ and, generally, respond directly to what is transpiring ‘on stage,’ openly addressing visitor/viewers, and inciting them to respond as well. There is no ‘fourth wall’ in Revolutionary City; characters, both on- and offstage, speak directly to the audience.

The next scene (Swordplay, a Lesson from Fencing Master, September 1775) continues on the Raleigh Tavern stage. A young man, which the program describes as an officer from the “new Virginia Regiment” has gone to see a master swordsman who previously served for British forces. The scene’s dialog all occurs while the two men fence—the young officer hopelessly out-skilled. The officer has come to the fencing master not only to seek sword training, but also to elicit his help and convince him to join the new Virginia regiment. The fencing master, after besting his opponent, agrees to enlist, but only after he is certain the young man is aware of the magnitude of the situation and the horrors that war will bring.
The following scene (A Court of Tar and Feathers September 3, 1775) starts on the Raleigh Tavern Stage and quickly progresses across the street in front of the wig-maker’s shop (a large portion of the audience is seated around the entrance). There stands a ‘Liberty Pole’ complete with a bag of feathers and a bucket of tar. Several men, including Captain Innes of the Virginia Regiment of the Continental Army, forcibly pull Joshua Hardcastle, out of the Raleigh Tavern. Innes proclaims that Hardcastle, a resident of Williamsburg, is guilty of treason. Hardcastle has made derogatory remarks about the regiment’s military capabilities while intoxicated in the tavern on several occasions.

Innes calls three male audience members onto the stage—forming a makeshift jury—and demands them to vote on Hardcastle’s guilt. Without fail, all three “jurymen” follow Innes’ lead and vote for Hardcastle’s guilt. As the defendant’s hands are bound, he is marched across the street to the ‘liberty pole;’ Hardcastle’s shirt is un-tucked and Innes’ men prepare to apply tar to his back. At this point, the actors in the audience reach a new level of hysteria, screaming that “Hardcastle has a family” or that “traitors must be taught,” etc. At the last moment, Hardcastle screams out an apology, begging the militiamen to stop. Innes and his men exit the stage, warning those who might “sport” with the great and glorious cause of America.

The scene changes and A House Divided (no date) begins with Arianna Randolph (sister-in-law to Peyton) exiting the Golden Ball Jewelry store. Arianna calls out to her daughter Susannah in the street, who is standing in front of the stage. Susannah complains to her mother: she has been mistreated by a local shopkeeper (the wigmaker) on the basis of her father’s loyalist political tendencies. Susannah is distraught, and asks how her mother can possibly maintain such a calm demeanor. Susannah’s father’s
political viewpoints are not just affecting her public life—there is also conflict in the Randolph’s domestic sphere. Susannah’s brother, Edmund, is a revolution supporter, and at constant odds with his father and the rest of the family. As Arianna paces up and down Duke of Gloucester street, she finally explains to her daughter that the family, unable to cope any longer with the discrimination they face in Williamsburg, will be moving to England. Initially speechless, Susannah closes the scene by exclaiming that Virginia is the only home she has ever known.

To Be or Not (July 1775) begins with an enslaved African woman stepping out of the audience and onto the stage, exclaiming that she’s been given a letter to deliver to Elizabeth Nicholas—presumably a love note. The woman invites the crowd to follow her “quietly” to the coffeehouse backyard, where she knows Elizabeth Nicholas is waiting. A stage and bench seating are set-up for the audience behind the coffeehouse, and, as the audience sits, Elizabeth comes to the stage, and reads the contents of the note aloud. The note is from Edmund Nicholas, who quickly arrives on scene. Elizabeth’s family, or father at least, are firm “patriots” and pro-revolution, while Edmund Randolph’s father is extremely loyal to the king. The two discuss the bad blood between their families. Edmund breaks the news to Elizabeth that the rest of his family will be returning back to England; he, however, will be staying to join the Virginia regiment. Elizabeth is scared, but apparently overjoyed. The revolution will apparently allow them to overcome their previous political separation. The scene ends in a kiss and embrace, as Edmund is called to duty by his commanding officer.

Liberty to Slaves! (November 17, 1775) continues in the coffeehouse backyard. Two enslaved Africans enter the stage, Eve and Kate. Soon, another slave, William, joins
them. All three are hovering over a document. They explain to the audience that
Governor Dunmore, now exiled from Williamsburg, has declared martial law in the
colony. The paper the Kate holds is a proclamation from Dunmore, granting freedom to
slaves, Eve says. All they have to do is make it to Norfolk. Yet, this will be a risky trip,
and if caught, the enslaved could be killed. The three discuss whether or not freedom is
worth the potential dangers of the trip. Kate remarks on her uncertainty regarding
whether or not she’s prepared for freedom, as slavery is all she’s ever known. While the
others discuss, William, who has been reading the document, lets out a loud yell.
Dunmore’s proclamation stipulates that only those slaves and indentured servants owned
by rebels (those fighting against the British) would be eligible for freedom. William’s
master is a loyalist. William walks off the stage, while Kate runs after him, carrying a
Bible. There is a strong religious undercurrent throughout the entire scene.

*Revolutionary City* concludes as the audience walks from the coffeehouse to Duke
of Gloucester street, directly in front of the capitol building. The scene, *A Declaration of
Independence!* (July 25, 1776), is a loose interpretation of the declaration’s first reading in
Williamsburg. Peyton Randolph stands on the capitol’s balcony and begins the reading.
The entire cast, many elevated by standing on tree stumps place in front of the palace,
soon joins in, each actor reciting a part, and everyone speaking (in a chorus-like fashion)
certain key phrases. Several of the actors portraying enslaved Africans recite the lines “all
men are created equal”—the irony here is palpable. The actors are accompanied by a fife
and drum corps, and after the declaration has been read, *Revolutionary City* ends with an
impressive round of gunshots and cannon fires.
In publications, Colonial Williamsburg is explicit about its goals for the performance. The foundation aims to cast Revolutionary City’s visitor/viewers in the story, bringing new levels of audience engagement. Colonial Williamsburg wants “guests to suspend disbelief,” allowing people to “get caught up in […] events as they unfold” (Crews 2012: 27-29). The foundation is re-tooling tours, activities, and interpretive discussions to match several of the techniques utilized in Revolutionary City. Perhaps most significantly is the widespread use of “in the moment” interpretation, where frontline employees speak to visitors in the present tense, “as if they are in the 1700s” (Crews 2012: 26) without assuming a particular character. Within Revolutionary City, Colonial Williamsburg wants to explore contradictions (“like those between the patriot’s call for freedom and the continued existence of slavery” (Bill Weldon in Crews 2012: 27)) with many gray zones, making visitor experiences more “thoughtful,” “provocative,” and “emotional.” As visitor/viewers to Revolutionary City watch the performance, they are meant to come into contact with “citizens from all classes (Crews 2012: 29)” who talk about “loyalty, community, sacrifice, citizenship, freedom, war, suffering, and loss” in what often seems like a thinly-veiled effort to ensure reflection on modern American events. The program’s developers bill their technique as “participatory history”—in short, a constructivist approach to living history.

Actual observed audience participation/physical engagement in this “history” varied wildly. Either before the start of a performance, or, while a scene was being performed on-stage/in the street, costumed actors, spread throughout the audience, often attempted to engage with audience members situated nearby. Although one participant visitor in the dataset below (Interview 12) enjoyed and “learned” from this type of
interaction, many audience members I observed shied away from this style of
eengagement, physically removing themselves from the encounter by relocating to a
different seating or sidewalk area. Few visitors left during the performance of a scene.
Many, would, however, skip certain scenes, remaining in one location, waiting for the
performance to come back to them, as it made its cycle around the historic area; other
audience members would leave mid-performance during the transition between scenes
(this most commonly occurred around half an hour into Revolutionary City). Vocal
participation was largely confined to prompted “huzzahs!” and the occasional “shout-out”
of name recognition when Martha or George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, or Benedict
Arnold would appear. Facial expressions often were rather blank (though this could be
due to June temperatures in Williamsburg more than anything else) until the final two
scenes—especially the reading of the Declaration of Independence, where nearly
everyone brightened up considerably, and left the performance jovial and perhaps a bit
awe-struck.
CHAPTER FOUR: THE INTERVIEWS

Previous anthropological studies of Colonial Williamsburg have made data sets from interpreter interviews and discussions with the foundation’s leadership (Handler and Gable, 1997). Richard Handler and Eric Gable seem far more interested in understanding the production of social history at Colonial Williamsburg, rather than the effect this history elicits on the visiting public. While valuable insights have been gained from their work, it is critically important to also understand how visitors to Colonial Williamsburg digest and internalize the foundation’s narrative. People who come to Williamsburg are more than simple “cultural consumers” (Handler and Gable 1997, 11). Rather, they are complex participants and observers, who must work to understand Colonial Williamsburg’s reenacted 18th century rhetoric in the context of their own experiences. Any attempt to gauge the foundation’s success or, rather, effectiveness must center on the historic area’s visitor.

Collection Methods

In order to facilitate this study, I conducted interviews with forty-five visitors to Colonial Williamsburg, over the course of twenty-three sessions during the summer of 2012. Understanding Revolutionary City as a direct response to critiques of Colonial Williamsburg’s injection of ‘social history,’ I interviewed visitor/viewers directly after they had seen the performance. I obtained approval from the Protection of Human Subjects Committee of William and Mary’s Institutional Review Board and carried out my study through the month of June 2012. Initially, I was particularly interested in understanding how Colonial Williamsburg’s audience noted (or failed to note) changes in the foundation’s narrative and interpretive practices over time. Thus, when finding
participants, I targeted visitors who appeared as though they might have made multiple trips to Colonial Williamsburg over a relatively large period of time—namely, the 55+ set, who I hoped would be interested in talking to me and also might have a longitudinal perspective on the project. I also spoke, however, with several younger groups near the end of my interviewing period. Geographically, participants came primarily from the eastern half of the United States, with many from Virginia, Ohio, and South Carolina. Nearly everyone I spoke with had been to Colonial Williamsburg more than once. During the trip in which they were interviewed, only 7 interviewees (30%) visited another exhibit or interpretive event that discussed slavery. The Governor’s Palace, Capitol building, and the Raleigh Tavern were the most commonly visited buildings/tours that participants had seen.

After the conclusion of a day’s Revolutionary City performance, I would approach an audience member or group, briefly explain the project, and obtain informed consent. I proceeded to hand them a short survey sheet to complete, explaining their anonymity and obtaining a few pieces of demographic information (see Appendix B). The interviews were qualitative in nature and consisted of verbal questions that I recorded and later transcribed (complete transcriptions are attached in Appendix A). I utilized a list of twenty prepared questions (see figure 2 on following page), alternating the questions asked based on the tone and responses of individual interviewees. My questions focused on portrayals of race, gender, and class in Revolutionary City, overall impressions about early America as garnered from Colonial Williamsburg’s interpretation, and the connections (or lack thereof) between the story told in the historic area and modern America. On average, interviews lasted around ten minutes.
In which years have you visited CW?

How have you seen interpretation/the story told at CW change over these visits?

What is your primary reason for coming to Colonial Williamsburg?

Have you seen or interacted with any costumed interpreters portraying the ‘Founding Fathers’?

What sort of opinions about the revolution have enslaved Africans expressed to you during ‘Revolutionary City’?

Thinking about what you saw in ‘Revolutionary City’ what do you think the role of enslaved Africans was in the Revolutionary movement?

As presented at CW, do you think most members of the community of Williamsburg right before [or] during the revolution were at relatively similar or different social/economic levels?

If different, how do you see this displayed in the historic area? What differentiates high-income people from others?

Over time/multiple visits, how have you seen portrayals of daily life for everyday people change?

What is your overall impression of early America from this visit—how was life for people?

What sort of attitudes do female re-enactors express about the revolution?

Thinking about what you’ve seen today (or during this trip) at Williamsburg, what adjectives would you use to describe the quality of life at Williamsburg before the revolution? After?

Based on your own background, which re-enactors or interpreters do you relate to most directly?

How do you think the story of Colonial Williamsburg relates to America today, if at all?
Discussion of findings: Portrayal of Slavery

For most of the study’s participants, Revolutionary City was the only place during their visit where they heard an explicit discussion on slavery and the lives of enslaved Africans. Visitor’s thoughts regarding the portrayal of African-Americans varied widely. The performance only displayed the lives of the enslaved in the context of the revolution. I framed my question to participants similarly: “What sort of opinions did you hear enslaved Africans express about the revolution?”

There was no one, clear answer that interviewees gave in response. All of the participants, save one (Interview 8), acknowledged that they did see enslaved people in the performance. A few responses (Interview 1, 5, 11, 18) were candid reiterations of historical “facts” recited in the performance. A participant in Interview 11 responded that “they [enslaved Africans] were hoping for freedom out of it, they thought King George was going to give them freedom;” similarly, a respondent in Interview 18 suggested “I think the main thing that I got from that was that they [enslaved people] were excited about freedom because of owners that were separatists.”

Considerably more frequent, however, were responses that indicated Revolutionary City had questioned either their previously held beliefs on slavery and the revolution or that the performance had, in fact, produced a narrative that presented a variety of viewpoints expressed by enslaved Africans. In Interview 14, a visitor recalls: “[...] the one guy [enslaved African] kept saying 'God Save the King'--so that would make me assume that he was against the revolution. The other one, they were talking about how their masters were for the revolution. It seems like their
opinions were fairly evenly split, and often what they thought depended on their masters.”

Rather than feeling as though the enslaved population possessed one, collective viewpoint, the participant left the performance with the sense that early African-Americans were capable of, and did, express a variety of perspectives. Another interviewee found her preconceptions called into question. One scene in particular obfuscates the simplicity of assuming the positive nature of ‘freedom.’ Interviewee 16 said:

“But it was also back by the coffeehouse, when they talked like: 'you all revolutionaries] aren't really freeing everybody' and then idea of well, 'free is better? but maybe it isn't.’”

A similar opinion is expressed in Interview 15:

“[One enslaved person said] let's just get free and figure the rest of it out later, and the other wasn't too thrilled with that idea--figuring it all out after the fact. She kind of wanted to know what she was getting into. Anyways, I thought that did a pretty good job of displaying it. Slaves weren't necessarily all in favor of being in the revolution...”

Again, an audience member is recognizing the complex nature of slavery, and the ability of the enslaved to be rational decision makers.

Not everyone was convinced by the performance’s portrayal of slavery; several interviewees pointed towards significant problems. Considering the paucity of slave narratives from Williamsburg during the revolutionary period, it seems likely the foundation has taken considerable historical license in constructing the supposed opinions
of the enslaved. Several interviewees questioned the accuracy of this representation (Interviews 7, 19, 23): “The entire play had one scene with African Americans in it,” an audience member points out in Interview 19. “One scene at the very end? Not cutting it,” especially considering the number of slaves known to be present in 18th century Williamsburg. Others (Interview 3 and 17) point out the strong focus on religion they observed anytime African-Americans were ‘on-stage,’ later criticizing this characterization of all enslaved decisions being based on religious faith.

In terms of overall effectiveness, Revolutionary City successfully brings the lives of the town’s enslaved population to the forefront, showing their situation as different from Williamsburg’s other inhabitants. This is a significant departure from the foundation’s previous efforts, and one that many of the historic area’s repeat visitors are cognizant of (Interview 7 and 10). Awareness is important, but the performance does little incorporate the deeper and darker themes of the slave experience. Few of the visitors interviewed remarked on the hardships experienced by African-Americans, instead, focusing on the political aspect and decision-making capabilities of their lives.\footnote{One notable exception to this occurred during a Tuesday performance (6/18/2012, Interview 21), when a pre-slave auction scene was incorporated into the day’s performance. The vignette featured harsh physical brutality and emotional distress—both of which were commented on by visitors during an interview that day. I saw the scene only performed once during the month of conducting interviews.} This scenario renders the portrayal hollow when compared to the lengthy discussion of the difficult challenges faced by Williamsburg’s white population.

**Discussion of findings: Class differentiation**

Varying based on the performance, Revolutionary City introduces audience members to characters from an array of socio-economic classes: poor soldiers, middle-class shop-keepers, and the extremely wealthy (e.g. Randolph family, military officers,
cameos by Martha Washington, etc.) Yet, most interviewees remembered only two classes: the poor and wealthy, gentry-elites. An excerpt from Interview 5 sums up the majority opinion: “Yeah, I think you [Revolutionary City] had two classes: all the gentry and then the service people.” Of the fifteen interviews that addressed representations of social class, eleven (73%) only saw two classes portrayed. Although Revolutionary City broadens the narrative told at Colonial Williamsburg, it largely fails to impart a lasting impression on visitors regarding any sort of middle, merchant class—a group very present in the 18th century town.

When questioned on how they differentiated between class groups, surprisingly, several people remarked on the importance of clothing. In Interview 14, a viewer responds:

“I would say there was a range [of social classes]. There were definitely the well-off women, who were the Nicholas family and the Randolph’s. And then, some of the people who walked through the crowd seemed very genteel, while others were wearing work, dark clothes and aprons, and then the enslaved people as well.”

Gentility, or lack thereof, for this visitor was defined most clearly by apparel. A respondent in Interview 12 expressed a similar opinion: “Well, it was a range. You could tell by their dress. Some were upper-echelon, and some were servants...”A participant in Interview 21 also notes that “90% of them [actors/interpreters] are white and aristocrats, well dressed. There are also, the others as well though. You see some poorer ones and the African Americans.” Race is clearly an important factor in audience perceptions of wealth. The fact that appearance is so important in interpreting class is noteworthy.

Visitor/viewers are unable to identify class boundaries based upon on opinions spoken by
different actors. There seems to be no collective class opinions on the revolution, or, in fact, on any matter of common discussion in *Revolutionary City*—this multi-vocality is an interpretive strength of the performance.

Speech patterns and vocal tones were also important indicators of class/wealth for viewers. A male participant in Interview 23 remembered that he “really enjoyed listening to how the upper class expressed themselves. They took lots of care in word-choice and appeared very educated/refined.” The judgment of particular aspects of the performance’s cultural references seems inherent in participant perceptions. Where this viewer finds the vocabulary choices of the wealthy admirable, others found some of the actor’s exclamations admonishable. “They shouldn’t have been doing that,” a female respondent in Interview 14 said in reference to an actress portraying a wealthy woman who yelled in the street. Although in this case, it was unclear whether or not the interviewee was basing her criticism on what she saw as a lack of historical accuracy or a break from conventional modern etiquette, I increasingly noted interviewees making qualitative judgments on the themes they perceived through the performance series.

**Moralizing the Narrative**

As interviewees continued to make these sorts of qualitative statements, it became increasingly apparent that Colonial Williamsburg’s narrative was laden with moral judgments. Colonial Williamsburg has veiled a political message under a constructivist approach. The foundation asserts that, through programs like *Revolutionary City*, they present a variety of viewpoints—to an extent, *RC* succeeds on this front. Visitors hear about the dire cause for independence, but also the horrors of war; enslaved people discuss their lack of autonomy and the desperation of their situation, but also the
problems they predict and fear they feel about being ‘freed;’ lower-class workers discuss the plight of their financial situations but also the skills they possess to be relatively self-sufficient; etc. Yet, all these contradictions are linked together to glorify the cause of democracy and promote the nation-state. Actors on the stage struggle to make choices, just as the audience must make choices as to which characters to believe, whose viewpoint to trust, and which characterization to identify with. Through all of these problems, however, the privilege of choice is trumpeted. Republican forms of government (necessarily, the American style of government) are promoted in *Revolutionary City* through this narrative of choice: though the characters on-stage might hold different opinions, they all desire the ability to express and act upon them (this is especially true for scenes involving enslaved Africans)—everyone wants to hold the ability to actively decide their own path. By closing a performance with a ‘Declaration of Independence,’ Colonial Williamsburg asserts the ability of the United States to allow exactly this sort of decision-making. Although *Revolutionary City* might question the methods and motives with which the American Revolution was fought, Colonial Williamsburg never truly questions the idea[ls] upon which the United States was/were founded. Audience interviews corroborate this finding, through a discussion on links drawn by visitors between the past, as shown at Colonial Williamsburg, and the modern American present.

**Past-Present Linkages**

Every interview conducted ended with a question asking respondents how they believed, if at all, Colonial Williamsburg relates to America today. Out of all twenty-three interviews, only two interviewees responded negatively (i.e. they drew no
connection between Colonial Williamsburg’s narrative and the US today or that the relationship between the two is based on dissimilarity) (Interview 16 and 18)—only 4% of the total forty-five participants in the study. There were largely two different (albeit related) camps of thought held by the respondents: those who believed that the import of Colonial Williamsburg lies in its occupation as a [hi]story-teller—they trumpet the notion that “history not remembered is doomed to repeat itself” (Interview 8). The narrative of Colonial Williamsburg is valuable, to these people, by preventing the regression of American society to a pre-revolution state.

The other faction finds value in a visit to Colonial Williamsburg through education, recognizing that the conflicts and problems presented in the historic area are directly relatable, if not the same, as those they experience as Americans today. Thus by understanding how these problems (e.g. financial hardship during economic down-turn, racial inequality and the struggles of a multi-cultural society, political upheaval, and moral confusion) were resolved, and the varying outcomes these resolutions achieved, the modern American might be able to make a more informed decision on the contemporary iterations of these issues. An excerpt from Interview 10 sums up the viewpoint: “We've been talking every night at dinner about things that happened during the day and how you could so relate to the times even though there are hundreds of years in between. How many things we still face today.” After a visit to Colonial Williamsburg and watching Revolutionary City, nearly everyone left expressing a sense of continuity between 18th century and modern America. Examples of this sentiment are rampant in the interview transcriptions: “Politics is always in turmoil; then and now” (Interview 11), “the defiance is what has lived on [through the past]--all Americans are defiant” (Interview 12),
“standing up and speaking and thinking about what you believe in. It's [the quintessential American trait,] the ability to express yourself” (Interview 14), Interview 15 characterizing America as a work in progress that began in Williamsburg—one long, justified process, “We just seem like we're in a really high stakes game in America today. Things are so determinative […] Colonial Williamsburg is showing us the same things happened in the 18th century” (Interview 20), etc.

These responses are naturally complex and considerable weight in interpreting them must also be put on the individual experiences of the respondent. Younger viewers in the dataset were considerably more critical in their responses regarding past-present links. A participant in Interview 17 (20-25 year old) turned the connection: “I believe the message that they're trying to give off is that, while America is not always perfect it is getting better. And that, as people say, history has an arc towards justice. The message is that America has an arc towards justice itself too.” The respondent later goes on to describe this arc towards justice as a misconception, thus incriminating Colonial Williamsburg for imbuing a false sense of positivity into the historical record. Another younger participant was quick to search for perversity in the foundation’s goals. In Interview 19 a female respondent found that Revolutionary City:

“fits the patriotic/nationalistic fervor that is very prevalent. You can't really go around America, saying that you hate it, as that's considered un-patriotic and you don't appreciate what your country has done for you. So, CW definitely fosters that type of sentiment, that long-time tradition, of binding people to the country, their native homeland. This could serve as the foundation for a modern sense of nationalism in the US.”
Colonial Williamsburg certainly does not wish for visitors to depart from the historic area “hating” America. This visitor envisions the foundation as providing a sort of historical glue, binding people, as citizens, to their nation-state “homeland.” She perceives Colonial Williamsburg’s role as important and powerful, sponsoring and inciting a “prevalent” nationalistic fervor.

Others too, found Colonial Williamsburg’s role in modern America important. Several people interviewed suggested that a trip to Williamsburg should be part of a mandatory curriculum for students nation-wide (“I would love to have every junior high or high school history class come to Williamsburg for at least two days and participate in some of the reenactments, some of the vignettes that go on,” Interview 5). Colonial Williamsburg was frequently characterized as displaying the “foundation” (Interview 5 and 23) upon which the modern US stands.
CHAPTER FIVE: A SOCIAL DRAMA ANALYSIS

This chapter investigates the mode with which *Revolutionary City* imparts its narrative. Following the theoretical framework introduced in Chapter Two, I argue that *Revolutionary City* functions as social drama on two levels. The performance of *Revolutionary City* consists of a depiction of one social drama in full through the narrative of its subject matter—the social struggle for American independence. *Revolutionary City* also serves as the redressive action for a larger social drama—working to resolve the crisis between an American past and present.

*An eighteenth-century social drama*

The narrative on any given performance day begins by portraying a breach in the social fabric of 18th century Williamsburg. On Thursdays (the performance described in the synopsis above), this occurs with the delivery of news from Boston regarding physical combat between British troops and colonists. This news is indicative of a dramatic change—the ‘mother country’ has taken to injuring her own colonists/children. As news spreads and is retold throughout the performance, characters began to factionalize, taking sides on the issue of revolution. A crisis has developed in the social fabric of 18th century Williamsburg as shown on stage—should the colonists fight for independence or not? This cleavage intersects racial, class, and familial boundary lines, the dominant breaking point being along political/ideological beliefs.

A redressive action is conducted—war is waged against Britain, though without the support of all of the colonies’ inhabitants. Turner directly addresses military conflict as one method of social redress. The Revolutionary War in this context takes on characteristics of liminality—social norms are inverted. Slaves contemplate freedom,
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military court is established, physical harm and death become justifiable and even, perhaps, honorable. The historical drama concludes with reconciliation in the colonies, and a permanent breach between the states and Britain. Together, the newly independent colonies and their inhabitants come together, unified, as shown in *Revolutionary City*, through documents like the Declaration of Independence. A sense of communitas abounds with the construction of a new, American identity. The narrative of the performance depicts the cycle of a social drama in full.

**A modern social drama**

A common expression in modern America encourages individuals to turn to the past to better understand the present and plan for the future. It is a widespread sentiment that we should look to our country’s beginnings to better understand ourselves—this was expressed clearly in this study’s interview transcriptions. Yet, interviewees also frequently noticed major differences between 18th century life and today: the totality of slavery, self-sufficiency among Williamsburg’s inhabitants, the authority of religion, a lack of urbanity, individual autonomy, and others. How then, do contemporary Americans reconcile these two opposing notions? I argue that this is the modern crisis which *Revolutionary City*, as the performative aspect of a social drama being acted out between past and present, attempts re/address.

The world of living history is an inherently a liminal space. Visitors are encouraged to suspend disbelief, imagine they are ‘time-traveling,’ ignore incongruities, and render themselves receptive to the nuances of life in the past. Quotidian activities are on-display as exceptional relics from which valuable lessons can be learned. Visitors are meant to stare and gawk and openly analyze the portrayals of costumed interpreters in a
fashion that would be socially offending in most modern contexts. The experience of living history can be disorienting, especially at Colonial Williamsburg. Visitors in the historic area rarely achieve a holistic experience. During one performance of *Revolutionary City* (Monday, ‘Building a Nation’), viewers are ricocheted through fifteen years of the 17th century over the course of a short hour-and-a-half in real time. The grand physical reconstructed landscape of Williamsburg often stands at odds with the difficult situations being expressed during interpretive activities.² In short, the liminality of living history is the ideal stage for redressive action.

As a performance, *Revolutionary City* makes themes of the major points of contention between 18th and 21st century America. Slavery, class conflict, and political strife are all focal points in the performance, and were handled, arguably, very differently in the period of the Revolutionary War than they are today. Yet, after viewing *RC*, interviewees were quick to point-out these themes as major similarities between the past and present. The multi-vocality of opinions expressed on all these points during the performance allows visitors to connect or identify with at least one, reducing their level of separation from the lives of the characters on the stage and in the street—effectively drawing the audience into the play.

After introducing and investigating these “raw spots” of society, the performance presents a way forward: the Declaration of Independence and the foundation of the American nation-state. As the entire cast reads the document, all are united under one cause. The 21st century audience is brought together with the 18th century past; communitas is achieved. The lack of a fourth wall and the intended level of audience

---

²A participant in Interview 16 reported: “it's all pretty and nice around here, but listen to what they're saying and you can hear that they are miserable.”
engagement also encourage this sense of togetherness throughout the performance. After the conclusion of the performance, audience members were all readily able to connect with the portrayal of the past they had witnessed—[a particular version of] the past and present had been reconciled under a banner of the supremacy of the American form of government.
CONCLUSIONS

Colonial Williamsburg’s re-telling of the movement for American independence is ritualistic drama in the deepest sense. Like the majority of Colonial Williamsburg’s interpretive efforts, the performance of Revolutionary City is repeated, scripted, and remarkably controlled. Yet, the narrative of the founding of the American nation-state told on Duke of Gloucester street (with recent injections of post-modern critique) is intended by the foundation to be presented as a singular story of political upheaval, social unrest, inequality and eventual ‘glorious’ resolution; the first success story on the American continent that has paved the ‘golden’ way to our modern nation-state. Revolutionary City works to mitigate CW’s stodgy, and often stiff interpretive reality (and past) with its goal of telling an engaging story of initial injustice, eventual social mobility and national[istic] success. Revolutionary City serves as a beacon of what Colonial Williamsburg hopes to become; a cohesive experience where the

A return to Greenblatt

The historic area of Colonial Williamsburg is impressive by nearly any standard. The magnitude of the restoration is awe-inspiring and its landscapes and architectural form, beautiful. In short, the physical landscape provides a sense of wonder to visitors. Colonial Williamsburg, however, is attempting to move beyond physical impressiveness and elicit emotional responses (Crews 2012) from visitors by utilizing (whether the foundation is aware or not) the framework of a social drama. The foundation is wants to achieve engagement through performance, liminality, and communitas. Colonial Williamsburg wants its message to resonate in the minds of visitors, inspiring them to promulgate the cause of nationalism. Utilizing Stephen Greenblatt’s theory, it becomes
clear that, as an interpretive tool, *Revolutionary City* is the foundation’s attempt to build a museum experience that combines both physical awe and emotional/cognitive inspiration.

*A continuum of liminal communitas*

Turner’s early work conceives of liminal zones as entirely anti-structural spaces (Cusack and Diganace 2003: 230). In the strictest sense, living history street theatre does not qualify as a liminal zone—the performance fails to rip its audience out of reality or remove all psychological or physical boundaries. Turner later refines his definition of the liminal concept, understanding liminality, and communitas as associated with it, existing on a continuum—especially in contemporary western society (Turner 1982: 35-42). I continue to argue for understanding *Revolutionary City* and its living history context as a liminal zone. The term liminal is derived from a Latin noun-*limen*, a threshold or doorway. Colonial Williamsburg attempts to position itself as a doorway to the past, a threshold to developing a better understanding of how ‘America’ came to be. Though definite social norms are maintained in the performance (e.g. actor-audience boundaries, maintaining atmosphere of respect, etc.), other aspects of the performance are closely linked to liminality. The performance disorients linear notions between past-present-future. Each scene deals directly with the formation of identity, and the resounding sense of structured communitas at the end of a day’s performances reinforces the utility of a Turnerian framework for understanding *Revolutionary City*.

*Liminal street theatre and notions of nationalism*

The modern nation-state is largely an imagined community (Anderson in Ericksen 2010: 120)—the inhabitants of a nation will never hear or meet the vast majority of their fellow-members. Yet the sentiment, the connection—the nationalism—that identification
with a nation-state encourages, often has very tangible effects: participation in war, personal sacrifice, willingness to commit resources, etc. Nations are ideological constructions seeking to link one or more cultural groups to a political state, and are often created based on a distinctive understanding of a unified past (Ericksen 2010: 120)—this holds true across the modern world. Yet, the diversity of cultural groups existent in the US requires nationalism in this country to be particularly strong.

*Revolutionary City* encourages the strengthening of this national sentiment, through the creation of a glorified national past. The communitas aroused by the performance reaffirmed participants’ identification with the United States—this sentiment was universal across all interviews. No participants in this study left the performance expressing frustration or disenchantment with the US. Rather, they left Colonial Williamsburg with a particular understanding of an often-difficult past and a particular understanding of how the challenges in that past were resolved. By proclaiming the eminence of individual choice in a liminal space, the Colonial Williamsburg foundation communicated an American nationalist message with remarkable success.

National history is carefully made, assembled, and communicated at Colonial Williamsburg, and at historic sites around the world. Citizens make pilgrimages to monuments, reconstructions, archaeological excavations, and other locations in order to justify their allegiance to a nation-state. These histories, especially those presented in a dramatic format, are constructed with less ‘objective’ fact and more with national pride and fervor. Colonial Williamsburg operates so “That the Future may learn from the Past,” yet it is through the creation of an American history in the present that the foundation’s programs work to bind Americans to their nation.
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APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPTIONS

Consent forms, rough notes and demographic information for each coordinating interview are attached in Appendix B. In order to preserve participant anonymity, interviewees are referred to by sex (W, M), and were assigned arbitrary numerical markers to differentiate between speakers when necessary; these pseudonyms are not consistent across different interviews (i.e. W2 in Interview 13 is not the same respondent in Interview 15). The date and day of the week also accompany each transcription and can be matched to individual program guides attached Appendix C.

Interview 1 (5/31/12, Thursday performance)

E: So, what sort opinions about the revolution did you all hear enslaved Africans express, during the 'Revolutionary City' performance? No right or wrong answer of course. If you heard any at all?

W: Are you talking about the interpreters?

E: Yeah, the actors.

W: They were very authentic, very appropriate for the era they were representing.

E: Okay. So, then, thinking again about what you just saw in Revolutionary City, the performance, what do you think the role of enslaved Africans was in the Revolutionary Movement?

W: I think their role at the time was probably underestimated. But I think that they were very, very important in the revolution.

E: Yep, I think Revolutionary City, is really interesting, because CW has not always been so 'gun-ho' on talking about slavery, and at one point, down there by the coffeehouse at least, they really bring it towards the forefront.

W: Mhmm.

E: Looking at CW as a whole then, where have you seen daily life for the "everyday people" of Williamsburg presented? Trade shops, down along DoG street, or here even, at the performance?

W: I think it's been everywhere. The people that walk the streets stay in character and the shops were very authentic; the taverns. Everywhere we've been, everyone's been very much what we expected for that time.

E: Let's see then--couple more, sorry! What's your overall expression of early America from this visit? How do you think life was for people?
W: Hard, challenging, and exciting

E: Based on your all's own background which re-enactors or interpreters, in the performance, do you relate to most directly, do you think?

W: I believe, I don't know the lady's name [Mrs. Hoy], but after they were going to tar and feather that guy. But even before they tarred and feathered him. She was going through the crowd saying: 'Hey, they're bullies! We should be allowed to say what we think! Are you all just going to stand around and let them do this?' I probably relate to her.

E: I think that's a pretty powerful moment in the performance, too. Last one: How do you all think the story of CW relates to America today?

W: We're seeing some of the same things today. We need strong people to stand-up and be leaders, and save the country.

[END]

Interview 2 (6/2/2012, Saturday performance)

E: Alright. So you all said you've been here twelve times. Do you all remember where your first visit was? What year maybe?


W: Maybe 1999

E: So at least for the last ten years, then?

W: Correct.

E: I'm curious, have you all seen lot of big changes in the story that Colonial Williamsburg, as a whole, has told over those ten years?

M: Um, not a change in the story, but definitely a change in how they present it. Like I don't remember when we first came here that the Revolutionary City...

E: Right, I think this is its 7th season.

M: Yeah, so that was new, and I think it's phenomenal--a great way to do it. And of course when we first started coming things like the Coffeehouse, it wasn't here. And neither was that, um, outdoor area that they do presentations in behind it. So, it's definitely grown more since we started. And that's just in what, 10 or 12 years?
E: Ok, yeah, I'd bet it has. Alright, so even though you all indicated that you hadn't been to any exhibits that discussed slavery, but thinking about what you just saw, especially behind the coffeehouse in the Revolutionary City thing, what sort of opinions did you all hear enslaved Africans express about the revolution as a whole? Just, what comes to mind?

M: Right, what we've heard over the years is that the declaration says equal right for all—all men were created equal. Yet, slaves were not free, and so many of the founders were slaveholders, and, obviously that was a conflict for them personally, but it was interesting, that we heard today from George Wythe. Now that was a new presentation, we had not heard before...

E: Over at the Wythe house?

M: Actually at the St. George Tucker House.

E: That's the membership place—you all are members then?

W: Right, we're members, yeah.

M: But he's [Wythe] a new character that they've, in fact he said he just started in March of this year. He was talking about how when you free the slaves, the discrimination was so heavy, that most of them who were free didn't really want to be

W: Even if they had skills to work, and even if they were literate, if they had had that opportunity to learn that, um, it still didn't make a difference to them.

M: It became, I think, and, now this isn't what they said, but I think when you look at it, it needed to be a process, by which it happens. And they felt, the founders, I believe, having done some pretty extensive reading on it and having been here quite a few times, that the process that they felt was going to happen might have even been in their lifetime. I don't think any of them [founding fathers] felt as though slavery would continue and actually increase by the numbers it did, causing the Civil War.

E: Hmmm. That's really interesting. I don't get to go into the Tucker House, being a student, but I'll have to try to figure out some way to weasel myself in there.

M: Yeah, talk to George Wythe, he has an interesting perspective on that. He even said that several of them [freed slaves] had committed suicide after they were free, because they just hated being outside. And so many of them wanted to come back. Now, even after the Civil War, there's a lot of stories about that where the slaves, even though they were free, they didn't leave, they stayed with their quote-on-quote slave masters or whatever, because either they didn't have the skills or they weren't (unintelligible). Now another that would be interesting to talk to would be Patrick Henry, because Henry was very big on educating his slaves, which in some colonies was frowned on.
W: Yeah, I recall that he one time said that he made sure all of his slaves could read and write.

E: Interesting.

M: I've done some extensive reading on this part. The US wouldn't exist as it does today if slavery had been abolished. The southern states wouldn't have agreed. They wouldn't have been part of the declaration or the constitution. They would've become a separate country right away. We don't even know how the US would've existed. How the War of 1812 have played out.

E: What's your overall impression of early America from this visit in particular? How do you think life was for people? Just a few adjectives.

M: Uh, that's a good question.

W: I would say it would be difficult, but I'm not sure that they would say it would've been difficult. I mean, they had an abundance of resources. They were able to plant, and so had food. They were able to trade of their skills to each other. I'm not sure that we can say how they would've thought life was, but only how we look back on it.

E: Right. I think that's something though, that RC tries to get across.

M: Relative to our way of life, it was difficult. But it was very much free, you were on your own. You were expected to provide for your family--there was no government fall-back position. Because of that you had a lot of opportunities. This area would have been lightly populated compared to what we see now and just a vastness of the wilderness and the country that people hadn't gotten to explore yet.

E: Based on your all's own backgrounds, which of the actors or interpreters that you saw in Revolutionary City do you think you relate to most directly?

M: Of those we saw today?

E: Right, RC

W: As a woman and mother, I would say the Randolph family. I mean that family was being torn apart. Her son was going to stay here and not go back to England with the rest of the family. It must have been difficult for any mother who had sons or family members that were going to war. It certainly had an impact on them, when their men were gone.

M: And I would've related to, not one of the upper-crust, but certainly one of the regular type of army people that would've been right there volunteering to go win our independence. I'm not sure which character that might've been, or if they were even named.
E: I think RC is a place at CW to see exactly those sorts of everyday type of people. That's what I'm trying to get at in my study. Alright, and one more question: How do you all think the story of CW relates to America today?

W: It needs to have a bigger impact, I think. I think that the further west and further down the generations you go, the significance of what happened here holds less and less value. And if the schools don't teach it, no one is going to know.

M: And my thought process is that more people need to come here to SEE the past to understand. Because it's just like anything else: if you don't understand where you came from and you don't really know how or where you should be going. And especially in this day and age, with the way the government has evolved, the way these people envisioned the government is totally different. People need to realize this. One of the things that I think the tea party organization have successfully brought to light is let's talk about the founding fathers; let's talk about the founding of this country; let's talk about what the premise was and what we were originally intended to be. Talking about the whole ordeal as a grand experience.

W: And the sacrifices that so many people have made over the years for us to have what we've got.

M: When you listen to those words at the end of the declaration, about how we 'pledge our lives, sacred honor and fortune.' My goodness--those were true words, and those folks really did use those things. Many lost lives and family members, going up against the greatest nation of the era that was very much imperialistic. Britain had territory all over the world and you're just one of their colonies. Difficult to imagine.

M: One thing that you do realize here when you view and hear the re-enactments, is that there was a lot more godliness and faith and religious beliefs, much stronger than we have now. Especially the Jeffersons and others, who may not have liked organized religion, but were very spiritual. Those are things that the country's gotten away from too.

E: You've brought up a very good point there. CW must appeal to all sorts of political and religious affiliations. People are coming here to figure out what was it, exactly, that the founding fathers wanted. As a big foundation, it wields a considerable amount of influence. It's good when they can do good.

M: I think they are very, very much wanting to replicate the whole experience to every detail. They show conflict and compromise. You have to have compromise. Their were meaning different opinions and beliefs, but to reach the end goal they all had to compromise. This is an incredible place. It's important to be able understand where you and your founders came from and trace the evolution to where we are now and to be able to come back and say, let's get back to our roots maybe and get back to the premise of what this country was founded on. Those who forget the lessons of the past are condemned to repeat them. Let's remember when we were at our greatest, the peak, and
when were we on the wrong course. We're always making mistakes. But we need to learn from them and not repeat them.

[END]

Interview 3 (6/3/2012, Sunday performance)
E: Okay, so you've said you've been here twenty times, then. Do you all remember when your first visit to CW was?

W: The first time we were here was 1972.

E: Ok, wow! That's a new record for my interviews! I'm really curious, though, how you all have seen, I guess, the interpretation or the story that's told at CW change, if you think it has changed over that time.

M: Well, it certainly has changed over the years. You know, of course the Revolutionary War story, that is absolutely a great addition. We always liked to go through the various, different homes, houses, and stores, because there's a lot of just different people. Every year, it's different answers to different questions. The "Rev City" gives you a definite feel for the time period.

E: Okay, very good. So thinking about what you just saw here in the 'Revolutionary City' performance, what sort of opinions about the revolution do you all remember enslaved Africans talking about, or saying?

W: Most definitely religion.

M: Yeah, religion.

E: It does get stressed pretty heavily. Just considering this visit, that you're on right now, what's your overall impression of early life in America, just how was life for people do you think? A couple of adjectives, maybe...

W: For the elite, I guess it was great, for the majority it'd have to have been pretty tough. I don't really know how anybody survived.

E: So, do you feel like you get a sense of both pictures of the elite and everyday people here?

W: [nods head, yes]

E: So where have you seen some of the everyday people, would you say? If you had to pinpoint a couple of locations.

W: I think, I recall, the apothecary. I mean, they're not definitely what I would call, the elite. But how they would be treating your injuries and illnesses.
M: We saw some of the, uh, people with the carts, the workers...

E: All right, and based on your all's own backgrounds, which actors, here in 'Revolutionary City' would you all say that you related to most directly?

M: Which one could I relate to the most, huh? Ha Ha!

W: Um, Mrs. Hoy: not wanting her husband to leave and go to war. I mean that's, that's look, how many young people are being sent-away today, leaving houses and children behind with no guarantee that they're going to come home.

E: Yeah, something really relevant then. Great. And last one: how do you all think the story of CW relates to America today? I think you touched on this a bit with your last answer.

M: How's it relate to today? Well, yeah: exactly that. We still struggle with the same kind of issues, the same politics: someone wanting to take control over somebody else. Only the technology has changed. People are very much the same I would say.

[END]

Interview 4 (6/3/2012, viewed Friday performance)

E: So, in which years have you visited CW?

W: 2012 and 2009

E: Ok. Thinking about what you just in the Rev. City performance bit, what sort of opinions about the revolution, um, have enslaved Africans--slaves--expressed to you about the Revolution?

W: Hopes of being emancipated.

E: What social class level would you put the people, the actors, that you just saw in Rev. City? Would you say they are at different levels or all pretty similar?

W: I think different levels.

E: Ok, so what level would you most of them are in?

W: Well, some of them appeared to be farmer types, and then, storekeepers (who obviously had more wealth than that one couple who hadn't had enough money to pay for that cow that they bought, or the horse, maybe). Then, let's see...

E: Right.
W: And then the people who were in the army, the leaders--they were upper as officers tend to be, due to education or prosperity.

E: What is your overall impression of early America from this visit--how do you think life was for people?

W: I think they had to work hard--want me to be more descriptive?

E: Oh yeah--I just want to hear what you think!

W: It also must've been pretty rustic. Like, I think of that one skit where that woman and her husband weren't able to take care of--you know, he was willing to join the army just so he could pay off some of his debts. That struck home--we're struggling.

E: Alright, just a couple more.

W: Ok.

E: Thinking again just about the performance of Rev City, and I think you just kind of touched on this too, but what sort of attitudes did female re-enactors express about the revolution to you?

W: Well, I think they thought it held a lot of promise that they would be worthy opponents for the English, that they could do it all successfully. Very hopeful.

E: All right. So based on your own background then, which of the actors/interpreters of Rev. City do you relate to most directly?

W: Well, not the slaves. That's a hard question.

E: Yeah, I know. Well, you were just kind of talking about the one woman--the shopkeeper's wife.

W: Right, I can relate to her, she felt sorry for the hardships that the one couple were facing, yet she also had to look-out for her own family. SO when it came right down to it, she took that horse, cause she had her own family to look after. And, there towards the end, when the Hoys, when the camp-follower/wife had been attacked and roughed-up, the woman [who W relates too] was more than happy to take her in and give her a few nights rest. Yes, I would like to think that I would be able to do that as well.

E: So you feel more like you relate to the mother (Mrs. Hoy) in.

W: Right, yeah.

E: Great. One last question: how do you think the story of CW relates to America today?
W: Well, we're always hoping our government/our officials will represent us for our needs instead of looking out for their own. And our elected officials will continue--well even that we have elected officials. And to make sure people are informed of the issues at hand.

E: What does CW tell you about people being informed, then?

W: Um, well that it can be a struggle, to stay informed, especially for those soldiers. A bit of an uphill battle. I think at the beginning, when they were still trying to recruit people--able -bodied people, they needed to know what they were fighting for.

E: So you think that's similar to today?

W: Right, like today's tea party--speaking for the people, getting back towards the grass-roots issues.

E: All right thank you so much.

[END]

Interview 5 (6/4/2012, Monday performance)

E: Ok. You all said you've been here more than 10 times. Do you remember when your first visit was, what year?

M: had to be early '90's, 1991 or 1992.

E: Ok, so for the last twenty years then, just about?

W: Right, right.

E: How have you seen the story the CW tells change over these past 20 years? If you think it's changed at all.

M: The biggest change that I've seen is that they don't talk as much about slavery.

W: Yeah, we've come before when slavery was the big theme.

M: Down at Carter's Grove we once attended a vignette, an evening presentation, where the black overseer was beating one of the slaves. It got pretty graphic.

W: Because we've come sporadically during the past ten years, the themes have changed; we may not have hit all the ones in transition.

E: Right. It's really interesting that you all noticed that. So much of your perception of that change depends on when you come as well.
W: I also think it has a lot do with where you grew-up. I grew-up in the East, you know?

E: Yeah. Lots of different factors at play. Thinking about what you just saw in the performance of RC, what sort of opinions about the Revolution did you hear enslaved Africans express, if any?

W: They realized that the Revolutionary War did not effect them. The freedom of the white man was not necessarily linked to their own. It wasn't going to change their lifestyle.

E: Alright. As presented during RC, do you think most members of the CW community were at relatively similar or different social or economic class levels.

M: Oh, I think they were mostly the gentry.

W: Yeah, I think you had two classes: all the gentry and then the service people.

M: Mostly gentry.

W: You may have had an emerging middle class running stores, but, that's hard to tell.

E: So, what's your overall impression of early America from this visit? How do you think life was for people here in Williamsburg?

M: I think they lived well in Williamsburg. I think those living in rural areas, the western parts of the colony, was pretty much frontier and very different.

W: Really, that was only 30 miles away from here, they weren't living as well. This was the Beverly Hills of early America.

E: What sort of attitudes did you all hear female re-enactors express, just in the RC part?

W: Well, we had two females: Martha Washington, who expressed appreciation for the soldiers,

M: Also, too, I think we've been shown that they were dedicated, maybe subservient to their husbands. They supported their husbands and we lost it [laughter].

E: Well then...

W: Then you had the black lady who came up to challenge the preacher behind the coffeehouse, and brought-up the fact that the Revolution wasn't going to change anything about their status.
E: Ok. Based on your all's own backgrounds which re-enactors or interpreters do you think you relate to most directly?

W: I think I relate to George Washington. I saw his presentation about his plan for the future. He really hit today's political situation right on the head.

M: We have political parties that rise and fall, we have people that become enamored with certain parts of it. The balance between the three legs of the government doesn't always stay balanced. And he was talking all those deals and potential dangers.

W: And it all makes sense today.

M: A little bit more control today, marginal. But things were much more fragile in those days.

E: And actually that leads right into my next question: How do you think the story of CW relates to America today.

M: It's a basic foundation. I would love to have every junior high or high school history class come to Williamsburg for at least two days and participate in some of the reenactments, some of the vignettes that go on, to just get a greater taste and feel for "wow, these people put a lot on the line."

W: I think kids are just so far removed in their textbooks

M: Their texting and they really don't care about much else.

[END]

Interview 6 (6/4/2012, Monday performance)

E: Alright, you all said that you've been to CW five times. Do you remember what year your first visit was in?

M: Um, about ten years ago.

E: Right. Then, since that first visit, how do you all think you've seen the story or message of CW change? If you think it's changed at all.

M: They've added things. Almost every time we come, we notice or see something that hasn't been here before.

E: Thinking just about what you saw here in RC, the street theatre performance, what sort of opinions about the revolution did you hear enslaved Africans express?
W: Well, he really didn't say anything about the revolution. He was talking about being freed.

M: But the lady that was there she was very suspicious, I think, not totally accepting or believing what she was being told.

W: But that was more about their association with their master's more so than the government.

E: Ok. What economic or social class level did you see people portraying in the performance?

W: Well, there was the top class, which was lady Washington, and the lower-middle class, the black preacher.

M: There was the fella who was wounded in the war, he was a working a man. So he was probably lower income.

W: Yeah, we really saw lots of different types of people.

E: What is your overall impression of early America from this visit. How do you think life was for people?

M: Hard work and long hours. I think people were happy though.

W: Well, we're looking back at this idyllic setting. But the ones that we hear seem to be very educated, and influential.

E: So you think it's difficult to hear the voices of some of the lower class?

W: Well, I think they try to portray that in some of the tours that they do...

M: Yeah, and in some of those shops, you certainly get an idea what they were like. And well, you know that apprentices and stuff.

E: Ok. Based on your all's own backgrounds, which re-enactors or interpreters in RC would you say that you related to most directly?

M: I would probably be a worker guy

W: I would be lady Washington

M: I wouldn't be Washington--too aristocratic.

W: Maybe the carriage driver?
M: No, I'd be the guy sitting back and trying to decide which side I wanted to be on.

E: Great. Last question: how do you think the story of CW relates to America today?

W: Well, in the way George Washington was talking, it really sounded like what he was talking about could've been a speech written for us today. A lot of the same political things.

M: Just like that.

[END]

Interview 7 (6/4/2012, Monday performance)

E: Alright, so you all said you've been here 8 times, or there about? So, do you remember what year your first visit was in?

M: I came here as a child, so probably around the mid- to late-60's.

E: Ok, so you've seen it over a broad swath of time then?

W: I remember my first visit in '54 or '55.

E: Ok. I'm curious, how have you all seen the story that CW tells change over that time period?

M: Oh, drastically. None of this (Rev. City). It was all just shops, streets, buildings. You'd go into the jewelry shop and that sort of thing, but that was about all it was. There might have been a few interpretive speeches...

W: But not in the streets or anything like that.

M: It was just whatever you learned going into the capitol building or palace. Nothing like this huge program.

E: Right, it's a big production. So do you think the message they're trying to get across has changed since you've been coming? Or has it really remained constant?

W: Oh, I think it's changed drastically, because it was just a restored city for ages, and now they're adding a human interest into all of it.

M: Introducing essentially real people, and what was going on in their lives. It was pretty much sterile before.
W: It was aristocratic people that lived here. But the thing that I still don't think they're getting across is that it was a sleepy town, and the only time people truly were here was....

M: When the capitol was in session. I mean people lived here, but I think it would've been mostly a central commercial location for the surrounding plantations.

W: I'm not sure that more than 50% of the people visiting pick-up on that.

M: And up until the last five years, there was very little to no mention of slavery or the black community, which would have comprised 40 or 50% of the population, and they built the place.

E: They used to have a tour called the 'Other Half,' where someone interpreting a slave would have taken you around town.

What sort of opinions about the revolution did you hear enslaved Africans express, just in the performance aspect of RC?

M: Well, they were very uncertain about their future. All these fine words were about equality and opportunity, and it didn't apply to them. And they of course didn't know who was going to win. And the British advertised freedom for those who would fight with them. Some did and some didn't. They showed that it was a very, very difficult time for them.

W: I think the blacks were probably apprehensive about how their masters would feel about insurrection.

M: We heard M. Washington talk about one of her favorite woman slaves that she was going to give to her cousin, or something like that, but the slave hated the cousin and actually escaped and got on a boat and got up to Portsmouth, NH. Martha sent somebody after her.

E: So did they tell the whole outcome of that at CW?

M: Yes, but eventually they told that Martha lost interest and never perused that. But still, that's not something you here about all the time. She ended up in not the greatest circumstances, but at least she was free.

E: What economic or social class level do you see people portraying here in RC?

W: In today's performance? [Yes] Yesterday's was featured on the blacks.

M: Yeah, we've seen three of these. [RC's performances rotate, there are three total] Well, that was an interjection on the black's position. Beyond that, I never sensed there was a lot of diversity--it was mostly the landed gentry. Who of course were in charge. The free
farmers out there [owners of the 'hundreds'], I don't feel like we heard much from those
guys. There was very little of their point of view. 'Course they were the soldiers, though.

E: So what's your overall impression of early America from this visit? How do you think
life was for most people in Williamsburg?

M: It was not as tough as was out in the hinterlands. Out at the plantation that CW owns,
you get a much better feel for the quarter-segment folks. There was a lot of big money in
the plantations, and that's what drove politics, commerce.

It was really probably no different that it was today. In a sense, there are the haves, and
the have-nots and a lot of folks in between.

E: So would you say that you saw all of that portrayed in RC?

M: No, you didn't hear much about...the only have-nots you heard about were the slaves.
Nothing about the free land-owners.

E: Based on your-all's own backgrounds, which re-enactors or interpreters would you say
you related to most directly? Across any of the days of the performances.

M: The guy who did Washington did a good job--but it was his acting over the wo-

E: I thought that the black lady who talked about the slavery in yesterday's performance-
--the uncertainty. Herself, her children who were coming of age that she talked about.

E: All right and last question: how do you all think the story of CW relates to America
today?

M: I think it should, but my guess is for the average citizen, it doesn't. It's meaningless
for them I mean.

W: A glamorous way of life.

M: It's just kind of like, well, that was 250 years ago. It has little or no bearing on today. I
mean they're dead wrong.

W: Yeah, because, everything is really neat and clean around here. I can't fathom that it
was like that.

M: We did join the CW society, for the magazine, mostly. I remember reading that they
were going to let the paint start falling off. But they keep it prim and proper. It took a lot
of money and labor and they maintain it. I know they tried to look at a lot of
archaeological samples to get a good sense of how it must have been. It seems fairly accurate.

[END]

Interview 8 (6/5/2012, Tuesday performance)

E: You all said you've been here four times. Do you remember when your first trip was?

M: 1993

E: I'm curious. How do you think you've seen the story that CW tells change since 1993, if at all?

W: It's improved. I think it's improved.

E: So do you think the message has pretty much stayed the same then?

W: We get more of the behind facts that we've heard and seen.

E: What's your primary reason for coming to CW?

W: The coffeehouse [laughs]. The weather is very nice, the exhibits are well presented, the information seems quite factual, it's a lovely place of the country to be.

M: I like the historic trades.

W: The historic trades are very accurately presented. Everything's informative, very informative.

E: All right. What sort of opinions about the revolution did you all hear enslaved Africans express, just during the RC part.

W: I didn't hear any, honestly.

E: Thinking again then, just about the performance that you saw, what economic or social class do you think most of the people were portraying?

W: Oh, they were definitely portraying the upper-middle, upper class.

E: Ok. What would you say your overall impression of early America was from this visit? How do you think life was for most people?

W: Oh, a HUGE class system, just a huge class system.
E: And do you think you see that pretty accurately represented here?

W: Yep.

E: All right. You all are Canadians, right?

W: Oh, absolutely.

E: Cool, you're actually the first non-Americans that I've talked to here, so this might be a bit different. But, based on your own backgrounds, which re-enactors in RC do you think you would relate to most directly.

W: I don't know--I can't think of any honestly. We're not high class and we're not tradesman. I don't we really connected to any of them. Sorry...

E: No problem at all. Last one: how do you think the story of CW relates to America today?

W: Uh, history not remembered is doomed to repeat itself. You have to understand where you were to progress to the future. We've taken for granted, both America and Canada what struggles there really were and we cannot forget those struggles.

[Interview 9 (6/6/2012, sound file corrupted, Wednesday performance)]

W: There's a lot questions there. And I hadn't even though about what should talked about: that someone told her that they would become free if the colony's were free. And then she found out that, no, they weren't going to be free, that was just for the regular colonists. So we learned a lot of history--a lot of history that I didn't know about, and some things you don't normally think about, and stuff that's not talked about that much in the history books.

E: Right. Two more questions, I'm sorry: what's your overall impression of early American life from this visit. How do you think life was for people?

M: Well, I think it was a hard life and very stressful for them. The people at Jamestown, you know, they had a drought. They had a cold winter, and that caused a lot of stress.

W: it was just a difficult time. And then a very difficult time before and during the Revolutionary War, because they were all British citizens, trying to determine whether or not they should go and break with the king. I think that was brought-up very clearly during the performance--the difficulty of it all. And then, the talks, you learned a little bit more about the reasons for breaking away, more than just the little blip that you get in your history books. You get a little more personal insight.
M: We heard Jefferson twice...

[END]

**Interview 10 (6/7/2012, Thursday performance)**

E: So you all said you've been here 7 times? Do you remember when your first visit was?

M: Many years ago.

W: Well, I remember when my first trip was--we weren't together then.

M: That was probably thirty years ago.

E: Ok. So thinking to back then--to that first visit and what you can remember from it, how do you think you've seen the story that CW tells change? Do you think it's a different message you get know than when you first came? Or has it remained similar?

M: I think its very similar for myself, but I think it's been embellished with more drama and…

W: Don't you think the slavery issues?

M: And the slavery issues, also.

W: African-Americans are definitely more to the forefront than they were at our beginning.

E: Ok, yeah. I think that's been one of their big goals. Just thinking here about the RC bit-the performance--what was your take-away message from it? If any. Sorry, I know that’s a bit of a tough question.

W: No, I don't find it tough at all! We've been talking about this.

M: We find that as today there are differences of opinion that and it's not sometimes easy to make up your mind, which is the right way to go. And things haven't changed--that's still the story today.

W: And they did present different perspectives and gave you food-for-thought. Yesterday, Benedict Arnold…

E: Oh, you saw the one yesterday, too?
W: Yes, and some of the things he said just hadn't dawned on me. And even today...and, um, with the British man yesterday who was going to be brought to trial for some of the things he said--you know, it's not all black-and-white, and there certainly are injustices on both sides. So, it makes you think more in-depth about the whole cause and its not just that every Brit was bad and every American was good.

E: Right. It's interesting, the politics of the whole story.

W: The politics: absolutely!

E: All right. So what sort opinions about the revolution did you all hear enslaved Africans express--during Revolutionary city. But maybe you all missed that part; did you get to go back behind the coffeehouse?

M: Well, yeah. The upset and the disappointment by the one fellow that he wasn't permitted to be free because he wasn't working for a Torrie houses.

W: And I never even knew that freedom was even offered to any of the slaves, trying to sway which way things would go. So, I did not know that.

E: Um, all right. Thinking again about just what you've seen here in the Rev. City bit, what economic or social class level would you say most of those people were portraying? Or may you think it was a variety?

M: It definitely was a variety. I mean, you had the Randolph's today, which were obviously very affluent, and other people showed up who were struggling economically.

W: And what about that young couple that had lost their place--was that earlier today or yesterday? (It had been today, the Hoys) The young couple who had lost their place and he decided to go away to war just to make a few dollars.

E: The Hoys, yeah.

W: That's right, the Hoys. And you know, so, just the talk about the economy and how poor things were, and people joining the service--so much of it rang true. And taxes, how high taxes became to support everything, are you better off then, are you better off now? I mean.

M: And that wasn't the only issue.

W: History certainly does repeat itself--if only we were smart enough to pay attention.

E: Ha! Um, so what sort of attitudes did you hear female re-enactors express about the revolution.
M: Ah.... again, pro and con. Often concerned about their spouses or their fiancés, that they were putting their lives at risk.

W: And certainly, definitely, it was a man's society and women were in the background. Their dependence was on the men and if something happened to them...They were very concerned, but their concern seemed to be in a more immediate fashion for their family and how its going to effect their family and children, I think.

E: Yeah, I think that's something that the Rev. City part does really well. Because, you're right, I mean, for a large part women were stuck in the background. But, at the same time, they had hard challenges and choices of their own to make, and I think one can see that especially well, like you mentioned with that Mrs. Hoy.

W: As she becomes a camp follower and you see her at the end, and she's just distraught and her children are all gone.

E: Right. Two more questions, I'm sorry. Based on your all's own backgrounds, which re-enactors in Rev. City do you think you relate to most directly?

M: I don't know who I related to most directly, but I was most impressed by Benedict Arnold. He was very quick with his responses, he made in many cases a lot of sense and in other cases, and certainly he was contrary...

W: He was very good; he played his part very well.

M: We didn't even realize that he was here in Williamsburg. We've studied a little bit about him, and the last we heard he went to England. To see him show up here and to express himself so deftly, was a surprise and an interesting one.

W: I had wanted to see some of the things on Mrs. Washington. But they ended up just not fitting. I would have liked to: there were two things that we had wanted to go to that we had just missed. I think that I would have enjoyed learning more about Martha Washington.

E: Yep, time always seems to run out fast. Last question: how do you all think the story, or the message of Colonial Williamsburg relates to America today? And I guess you've touched on this a couple of times already.

M: Absolutely [laugh]. Nothing's changed. [As in the past is just like today].

W: Here we go again. If anything this trip because we were alone on this trip and not with children (we've brought a lot of our grandchildren here), but this trip was a much more adult trip, and we've been talking every night at dinner about things that happened during the day and how you could so relate to the times even though there are hundreds of years in between. How many things we still face today.
Interview 11 (6/8/2012, Friday performance)

E: Alright, so you said you've been here 5+ times?

W: I believe, yeah.

E: Do you remember what year your first trip was, what year maybe?


E: There's been a lot changes at CW, I think since 1983. Um, and I'm just curious how do you think you've seen the message or the story the CW tells change over that time, if at all?

W: Well, you didn't have any...there wasn't any African American participation when I first started coming, and I've seen that as a positive change. I've seen more buildings and changes and tradesmen, too.

E: More of them being open, or?

W: Well, actually, the one I remember that changes, they used to have like soap-making and soap and candles and they had inventory for forever, and that closed down. I always liked that one. So that was a change. And I've seen more now, recently, new buildings open.

E: So, thinking back to yesterday, as best as you can remember, at least, from the Revolutionary City performance, what do you think your take-away message was from it? If you had to pinpoint something.

W: Well, it was a turbulent time and people were split over whether to join the Revolution or not.

E: Alright, and going back to slavery for a second, what sort opinions about the Revolution did you hear enslaved Africans express?

W: They were hoping for freedom out of it, they thought King George was going to give them freedom.

E: So what's your overall impression of early America from this visit--how do you think life was for people?

W: Well, if you were gentry it was fine...still kind of a hard life if you're not--living in some kind of cabin…
E: Based on your all's own backgrounds which re-enacters in Revolutionary City do you think that you could relate to most directly?

W: I'm not sure how to answer that one. I don't know.

E: Yep, that's fine. How do you think the story of CW relates to America today? That's kind of a loaded one.

W: Nah, I think it gives a grasp on history. Politics is always in turmoil; then and now.

E: Right, and last one: what sort of attitudes did you hear female re-enactors express about the revolution?

W: Um, they had concerns. Concerns about whether the men should go to war, concerns about the disruption in going back to England and their way of life (Randolph mother/daughter scene).

E: Great, thanks so much!

[END]

Interview 12 (6/9/2012, Saturday performance)

E: Alright, so you said this was your second trip to CW. Do you remember what year your first visit was in?


Woman 2: Mind would have been in the mid 70's.

E: Oh, wow. Well, since '91 or the 70's, um, how do you think the story of CW (woman1 interjects "evolved"), yeah evolved or changed, if at all? How would you characterize that?

W1: If my memory's right, it seems to me like there were more people talking about relationships, and characters, and people now--more than just the commercial business. That's what I remember more of there being from my original trip.

W2: I also feel like the interpreters are really relating where we are as a country now, to our beginnings.

E: Yeah, ok. From the portion of Rev City that you saw, what do you think your take-away message from it was, if you had any at all?

W1: We're repeating history, basically.
W2: Yes, I just feel too that, um, as the United States of America citizens, it's our responsibility, um, to really remember our history and to share it with others.

W1: There was a guy walking up-and-down here (DoG street) that had some really good things to say: that 'House of Burgesses' (unintelligble) were just the cradle of independence and it was more relatable than just reciting simple documents.

W2: And it wasn't just "it happened on this particular day that we decided we were going to do it"--there was a whole background, a process.

E: So that was over at the Capitol then?

W1: Oh, no, he was just walking up and down the side of the street. (One of the 'unscripted' bits of RC)

E: Oh, ok. So you all almost related more to that, then, than any of the formal actors you saw.

W2: Right. Although, there were definitely people both in the capitol and the gentlemen in the governors palace that were...they gave a lot of background, they were very much telling us how we got to this point in colonial times and then what happened.

E: Alright, now, thinking just about the performance, RC, what economic or social class levels did you think most of those people were portraying? Similar, or a range?

W1: Well, it was a range. You could tell by their dress. Some were upper-echelon, and some were servants...

W2: And those who were actually with the military the force that was trying to get the spirit and the commitment from the rest of the community.

W1: So, I think that part was good, because all those different people were all in the same place.

W2: And also all the actors, whether they were military or just someone from the community, they actually all stood out there and conversed with each other, too. That was interesting. It was like we weren't even here, they were just doing their own thing.

E: What sort of opinions about the revolution did you all hear enslaved Africans express, during the performance. Though you might've missed that part if you didn't go back behind the coffeehouse.

W2: We did. Um, however, you (W1) pointed out when this was over and gentlemen, dressed in military uniform came over, and there was a slave behind him, really sort of mocking him. He was acting cocky.
W1: And then we ran in to different people where we ate, who were dressed in class costumes, whether they were black or white. And then, they did that in the Raleigh Tavern too.

E: Ok. Then based on your all's own backgrounds, which re-enactors in RC did you think you related to most directly?

W1: [laughs]

W2: The fife and drum corps!

W1: The shooters (end of performance), they seem really more like country people.

E: I guess that's a question I really need to tweak a bit. I think you can take that in two ways: either somebody who you think you would be if you were in the past, or somebody who really you want to emulate, who reached out you the strongest.

W1: See based on our background, we'd have to go with some old middle-class women!

W2: I really liked the prissy ladies.

E: Alright, and last one: how do you think the story of CW relate to America today—all-inclusive, everything you've seen so far during your visit to CW.

W1: In a lot of ways it’s the same.

W2: My first reaction was, and I heard this over and over, we were, back then, loyal subjects of England--and we wanted that! But, it got to a point where we couldn't tolerate it anymore and that's what was happening, I think (gets cut-off)

W1: But the defiance is what has lived on--all Americans are defiant.

W2: Definitely--even now as a nation, we love, when we're up against somebody else, we are Americans. You know? But there's so much going on in our lives with our country now that we don't like, but we're not ready to just throw it all away.

W1: But we're all defined as Americans, and at the same time conservative. All though (laughing) my family is Scottish, so I'm really tense here.

[END]

Interview 13 (6/13/2012, Monday performance—Sound file corrupted/transcription incomplete)

W: Okay, let the poor guy finish his questions.
E: Two more questions, I'm sorry. Based on your all's own backgrounds which of the re-enactors or interpreters in Revolutionary City do you think you would relate to most directly?

W: The Frenchman.

E: Oh, Lafayette?

W: Yes.

W2: No, the first guy, who rode up and said: 'We're going to declare independence,' I would relate more to him.

E: Would that have Craig? I missed the first part of that performance today.

M: Well, the mic system was terrible, kept cutting on and off.

M2: No, it was the man who was upon the stage who was going to give us important news. I mean he brought it up to where you wanted (emphasis) to listen to this guy.

E: Okay, Gotcha. Last one: how do you all think the story of CW relates to America today?

W1: Oh yeah, it relates to everything that's happening now-a-days.

E: To current events?

W2: Yes it does. We are going through the same things.

W1: Just, like they say history repeats itself.

M1: Or, even better, whatever goes around comes around.

[END]

Interview 14 (6/12/2012, Tuesday performance)

E: You mentioned that you've been here 9 times. Do you remember what year your first visit was in?

W: I was 7, so that would be 1997, I guess.

E: Thinking back to '97 as much as you can, how do you say you've seen that CW gives change over that time, if at all?
W: I guess its experiencing it as a child instead of experiencing it as an adult. So, when I was a little kid I participated in all the kids activities and learned all the kids games, and how their lives would've been. And now that I'm an adult, I find that I'm learning about the political motivations and struggles and the daily life of adults, and I guess that's how changed for me personally. I'm not really sure how it changed for the foundation.

E: Right, well it's hard to gauge that sort of thing when you're so young. Thinking just about the RC bit, what do you think your take-away message was from the performance?

W: I think it would be about the difference in opinion between the residents of Williamsburg--the disagreements between those who were loyal to the king and how some people would have wanted to follow the independence route. Even within families there was these different positions.

E: Ok. What sort of opinions about the revolution did you hear enslaved Africans express, just in the RC portion of your visit.

W: Um, Ok, well, the one guy kept saying 'God Save the King'--so that would make me assume that he was against the revolution. The other one, they were talking about how their masters were for the revolution. It seems like their opinions were fairly evenly split, and often what they thought depended on their masters. I don't really know.

E: Thinking about all the different re-enactors and performers in RC, what different sorts of economic or social class level did you notice that they were portraying RC? Similar levels? A range?

W: I would say there was a range. There were definitely the well-off women, who were the Nicholas family and the Randolphs. And then, some of the people who walked through the crowd seemed very genteel, while others were wearing work, dark clothes and aprons, and then the enslaved people as well.

E: So you think the big marker of social class for you, was the way they dressed more so than the opinions they expressed?

W: Oh, definitely. That's how I was determining what station they were. For example, that one girl who was delivering a letter, her dress was much less fancy and intricate than the lady she was delivering it to.

E: Thinking just about what you've seen in CW, what's your overall impression of early America--how do you think life was for people?

W: It seemed pretty nice, actually. The houses are large and well-equipped. I know they had no a/c (laughs). But overall, everything seems nice and sturdy and like they aren't suffering. They've got everything they needed from farming, weaving, and all sorts of trades.
E: What sort of attitudes did you hear female re-enactors express in RC about the revolution.

W: I thought that was really interesting. There were a couple women, the 'screamer' lady, who went around screaming, saying 'Oh! Help him! He's going to die!' and I'm like, whoa--a woman really wouldn't have been yelling like that in the middle of a public square during a highly-charged political action. I didn't think she should've been doing that, and I'm not sure how accurate that is either. And then, I felt like the reaction from the Randolph mother, who was more like, 'Be quiet, this is none of your business, you need to stop, go back and follow your father to England' and 'We'll talk about this at home and don't go yelling at the shop lady.' She was expressing a political opinion in private, and that's what I would've expected woman to do. And the fact there were women around expressing political opinions surprised me in public. Would women really even be watching a public hearing and trial? I wouldn't have expected them to express anything if they were watching.

E: You express a little bit of doubt about the accuracy of it all then?

W: Right, well, that's all just based on my perception--which might not be totally historically accurate.

E: Based on your own background, which of the re-enactors or interpreters do you think you relate to most directly? In RC?

W: As someone I admired, I'd probably pick Peyton Randolph, who decided to go against his family for his beliefs. I think that's something I would do--follow my beliefs rather than family. That's really a representation of the 'new America' following your convictions to wouldn't have held in England. On the other hand I liked the guy who almost got tarred and feathered, as he was fighting for his freedom of speech, even if I disagree with what he was saying. Not that he made his case very well, but I think arguing for what you believe in, in any scenario, is very respectable.

E: They made you relate to a loyalist then? But also a defiant 'patriot'? They accomplished a lot. How do you think the story of CW relates to America today?

W: Well, I think it's similar to what all these characters were doing--standing up and speaking and thinking about what you believe in. It's the ability to express yourself. I guess beyond that, I really don't know how I think it relates to America today.

E: Yeah, that's fine. Not having an answer is a good response!

W: So how was the performance different from what you expected it to be? I expected it to be more famous people that I knew—famous folks. I know the Randolph name, and vaguely who the Dunmore guy was, but I really didn't recognize many of the names, other than those Washington and George Mason. I expected more famous people to be there. So I think it was interesting that they chose to do normal everyday people who
were experiencing the Revolution. While they might not have been particularly writing the declaration, but they were affected and players in everything going on.

W: At points, it definitely seemed like people's rights were getting squashed and America was the bad guy. And I thought "wow, this is weird", but now think that it's interesting that they showed it all.

**Interview 15 (6/12/2012, Tuesday performance)**

E: You've been here a lot of times then--do you remember when you first visits was?

W1: Yeah, it would have been in 1994.

E: Ok, and since '94 then--and either of you all can answer any of these [questions], of course--since your first visit, how do you think you've seen the message that Colonial Williamsburg tells change, if at all? Or do you think it's remained pretty steady though the years? I know, at least I think, there have been lots of changes in the way they tell it, but maybe more focusing on the message itself?

W1: I think it's been pretty consistent. The message is consistent.

E: Ok. thinking just about the Rev City bit, that you all saw yesterday, then, what do you think your take-away message from the performance was? If you had one.

W1: Mine was that, I was fascinate by all the varied opinions. That was very clear--they had people interspersed around, and they all had different opinions; no two people [re-enactors] had the same opinion. That was probably accurate, at the time.

E: A hard thing to display too, I ...

W1: It was, but I thought it was well done. It wasn't just an entire uprising, it wasn't like that--nothing's quite that easy. So, I thought they did that...and I was just like standing in the crowd [opposed to the few men brought up on stage to act as jurors], but even during the whole tar and feathers bit, like they made a point of 'yeah, the bar tender, he was just full of hot air, we're not going to tar and feather him; he is what he is.' They displayed a wide-range of opinions and I think that was fairly accurate. That's what I took away from it.

E: Thinking just about the Rev. City bit again, what sort of opinions did you all hear enslaved Africans express about the revolution? If any?

W1: Um, I thought, the only one that I remember, and it surprised me a little bit, as it was a fairly negative opinion. An African-American was uh...you, know I forget what he thought, but I remember I was surprised. The revolution sounded to me like it might be popular with African-Americans, in theory. But, I think, in reality, he at least was expressing the opinion that he liked the status-quo. He knew what it was...
W2: The devil that you know is better than the devil that you don't know.

E: Yeah, and that's something they talk about too, isn't it?

W1: That was the one that stuck out in my mind.

E: Back there behind the coffeehouse then? Maybe? In the little stage area, is that where you heard this?

W1: No, that was up-front by the tavern. But it was also back by the coffeehouse, when they talked like: 'you all [revolutionaries] aren't really freeing everybody' and then idea of well, 'free is better? but maybe it isn't.'

W2: Not if it separates families, its not. [Scene over women arguing about keeping children]

W1: And one of 'em said: Let's just get free and figure the rest of it out later, and the other wasn't too thrilled with that idea--figuring it all out after the fact. She kind of wanted to know what she was getting into. Anyways, I thought that did a pretty good job of displaying it. Slaves weren't necessarily all in favor of being in the revolution...

W2: Or, of being free.

W1: Or of being free, because what does that mean to them?

E: Well, I think CW's not always been so great about talking about slavery--I mean it's hard, I think, but there's no way around it, though.

W2: They were talking about that today in one of the presentations [not Rev. City], that they didn't really want to talk about.

W1: But, now, in the Revolution, I don't think it was near the issue that was a hundred years later in the Civil War. That's when people had to talk about it. Slavery here [both time and place?], it just wasn't what the issue was. It was a sort of by-product of the issue, it was just a fact of life here in southern VA. Plantation-country, you know? And this state is still making its money off of tobacco plantations, and we wouldn't be here if it weren't for the slaves. So that wasn't their issue--slavery as an issue was used as more of a pawn,'oh well, I'll free your slaves, I'll do this to them' you know, but it wasn't about the slaves it was about punishment or reward for the white people. It didn't have much with them.

E: Alright. So what economic or social class levels do you think you saw people portraying in Revolutionary City performance? A range? Or do you think most of the re-enactors were socially pretty similar?
W2: No, I think there was a range. There was the military, and there was the higher officials, there was the bar maid, and the drunkards, and the shop-keepers. A little bit of everybody, really.

W1: We were pretty observant about it.

E: Yeah, yeah! You are. What was your overall impression of early America from this visit? How do you think life was for most people?

W2: For most people, very difficult.

W1: But surprisingly advanced for the upper-few percent. Like very comfortable if you were in that top 2% or 4%.

W2: I think there was a range, like 2-5% or something like that?

E: Were they talking about that at the Randolph house, or?

W1: They talked about that all over, but over at the Everard Place too they mentioned it. Yeah, and in the Randolph house, they told you couldn't afford to live in Williamsburg if you weren't those elites. But life was surprisingly comfortable for the because of all the imports from England, etc. for the 4%. We probably could have lived very comfortably if we went about it like they did.

W2: Of course!

W1: But they made a point that that was the select few. But, you know, we don't really see the others. We see the Randolph house and the Governor's Palace, etc. We see that 4%.

E: But maybe not in Rev. City you said?

W2: Well, maybe a bit more in there, right. A wider-range, because you were in the area where the merchants were, so you're going to see the ones who work there, indoors.

W1: Right, so they might work there, but we don't see their daily living stuff because they lived there.

W2: True, we haven't seen the places that the lower echelon lived.

E: Right, they're not here [in CW]. There these buildings that stand empty that no-one's doing tours of, which is very political in and of itself. But, anyways, 3 more questions, I'm sorry. What sort of attitudes did you hear women re-enactors express about the revolution?

W1: Well, I thought they were mouthier than they would have been back-then.
W2: I don't think they would've been as outspoken as they were in the re-enactment.

W1: Yeah, I think they would've kept it [their opinions] to themselves more.

W2: But, now, I was pretty proud of Mrs. Randolph for not marrying again after the Mr. died. She would have had to give up everything, and she obviously knew that.

W1: Yeah, they [women] were no less smart.

W1: I think that they were probably expressing the opinions of the women accurately and there were a wide range of them, just not expressed out loud in public.

E: And um, how do you think the story of CW relates to America today?

W2: The story of Williamsburg, well, I think we're still struggling with classes. There's still too many people that don't look at everyone as free and equal. There's still too much prejudice, that's what I'm trying to say.

E: That's very fair

W1: I'd like to think that we're more aware of it nowadays. We haven't fixed it--we've left plenty for your generation to fix.

W2: More of us are more aware. We try to be more fair and less judgmental. I try too....it's a work in progress.

W1: We see more of people.

E: But you say, 'a work in progress' would you say a work that started here, maybe?

W2: Well, I think it started here. I'm in the DAR. I'm not sure I would've had the same bravery that my ancestors did.

W1: Glad I didn't live then.

E: Me too.

[END]

**Interview 16 (6/15/2012, Friday performance)**

E: You said you've been to CW 15 times. Do you remember when you would've first visited?

M: In fifth grade, I was 12.
E: Thinking back to then, how do you think you've seen CW's message change?

M: I couldn't tell you. Granted, as I've gotten older, I pay more attention and understand what's going on.

E: Thinking just about the performance aspect of Rev City, what do you think your take-away message was from the performance?

M: That the revolutionaries were bad, that we should've stayed with England, and that the capitol needs to be burned.

E: So you didn't hear any pro-Revolution sentiments expressed?

M: I didn't feel that, no. While there were good things that happened at the end of it all, it was still because there was so much bad happening.

E: What sort of opinions about the Revolution did you hear enslaved Africans express?

M: All sorts. There was the guy who didn't trust any white people (why should he?). There was the one women who was going to risk things to gain freedom. There was a woman who decided that she couldn't risk anything. There was a good portrayal of the different types.

E: What do you think the enslaved peoples primary motives were for either being pro- or anti-revolution.

M: Freedom was potentially on the line, they could change their lot in life. The woman was also having a baby, though she wasn't even guaranteed at the time that the child was going to survive past the age of one.

E: What sort of economic or social class levels did you see people portraying?

M: Um, middle class and some military people who were hard to gauge. That's about it. I don't think I saw the governor or many poor people at all. Excluding the slaves.

E: So what was your overall impression of early America from this visit? How do you think life was for most people?

M: Disastrous. I mean, it's all pretty and nice around here, but listen to what they're saying and you can hear that they are miserable.

E: Three more. What sort of attitudes do you think women expressed in RC about the revolution?
M: I guess we most only heard about how it affected them by affecting their husbands and male family members.

E: Based on your own background, which interpreters from the performance do you think you'd relate to most directly?

M: The guy who went to war and left his wife behind. He's doing what he can to provide for his wife. He was really [unintelligible]

E: How do you think the story of CW relates to America today?

M: I think that RC was not very pro-America. I think this is in contrast with America today, which is very pro-itself, they think very highly of ourselves.

[END]

Interview 17 (6/15/2012, Friday performance)

E: So you said you've been to Colonial Williamsburg seven times. Do you remember when your first visit was?

M: No, I don't. Elementary school.

E: Ok. Thinking back then just to the Revolutionary City performance, what do you think your take-away message was? I you have one at all--it's fair not to.

M: The overall message or theme: that while America might've had problems that its history bends towards justice and all that is great in this world.

E: Ok, interesting. What sort of opinions did you hear enslaved Africans express during RC?

M: That they had hard lives but they understood the fight for freedom. And they said that through the end of slavery, but also a focus on religion.

E: Yeah, so what economic or social class level did you see represented in RC?

M: I think they aimed for a majority to be a middle class or a typical, average median income.

E: That's interesting because if you go tomorrow's performance, you see a love story between two of Williamsburg's elites--including a Randolph.

M: I feel like it did show a wide range, but that they were really trying to depict a median.
E: What was your overall impression of early America from this visit? How was life for people? If you visit anything other than RC, you're more than welcome to bring that in to the conversation as well for this question.

M: Day-to-day life would have been more difficult than it typically is today, but there was a lot of hope and inspiration in the people.

E: Ok. What sort of attitudes did you hear female re-enactors express about the revolution?

M: Um, how many women did we actually see? The first one was about her husband going off to fight--she was the most prominent [Hoys]. And she was against them fighting for personal reasons, but that's honestly about it--we only saw her ideas through her husband.

E: Fair--based on your own background, which re-enactors or interpreters would you say you related to most directly? Could you pull anyone of the performance out specifically and say "hey, that really reached out to me?"

M: If it's how I relate to them through my own personal pre-dispositions, it would be none of them, because I believe each character was engaging with a message that was meant to be given by Colonial Williamsburg, and they were all too one-dimensional for me to relate to.

E: So you don't think any of the characters were very deep?

M: No.

E: That's very interesting.

M: I believe that each one served a purpose to give a certain message or give a certain principle.

E: How do you think the story of CW relates to America today?

M: I believe the message that they're trying to give off is that, while America is not always perfect it is getting better. And that, as people say, history has an arc towards justice. The message is that America has an arc towards justice itself too.

E: Can you explain that arc a bit more?

M: As history goes on and time moves forward, laws, customs, society evolves towards a more "right society"

E: Ok, and so you think that CW is throwing that perspective back in time, utilizing it to analyze the "American past"?
M: I do. You can definitely see that in RC. They were even questioning when would slavery end. The response was always 'in due time' or 'when God says' that mean to show that as time goes on, America gets better. While we have faults we're moving towards justice.

E: Ok. What did you think about Benedict Arnold?

M: It was so easy just brush everything he said aside. He was telling us how England already had so many of the things that we were fighting for. But, he brings up such negative connotations, then and now, that you can just discount whatever he says. He's 'evil, a traitor.' As an audience member, I feel like I don't have to take what he says as objective truth or principle--you can just trash it. He's also the only one that questioned the War on a theoretical level. Why are we fighting this war, and why should we be against it? The woman (Hoy), she was against fighting but only because she was worried about her husband, the safety of her family. Even the slaves as well, the only reasons they were against it was for their safety while he was the only who was against for theoretical reasons, elitist: the King's no different from the Continental Congress, he said.

M: They didn't show any "average Joe" who was against the Revolution for theoretical reasons. I think a lot of people presume that it's right. Without allowing more dissenting arguments, it doesn't do this whole "complicated story" thing justice. There's no argument.

M: The message Benedict Arnold gave is one that you also hear today, too: about strong government and being ruled by elitism. You can see that through people not wanting a strong federal government today. Same argument. He was questioning why people would be against the King when they were fighting for a strong government in the shape of the continental congress.

E: So you felt like it was all a bit canned, or overtly thematic?

M: Oh, yes. They used so many buzzwords too. Look at their speeches, they were all buzzwords. There are bumper stickers slogans all the time.

E: Like what?

M: Well, I can't recall any right now, but they used "liberty" all the time. I feel like they used buzzwords a lot more often than what you'd hear on the average day.

[Interview 18 (6/16/2012, Saturday performance)]
E: Ok, so you said you've been to CW three times. Do you remember when your first trip was?


E: Great. Thinking back to the Rev City performance, what would you say your take-away message was? If you had one?

M: That Williamsburg was a site of revolution and conflict between patriotic and loyalist sentiments.

E: Thinking again just about the RC stuff, what sort of opinions about the revolution did you hear enslaved Africans express?

M: I think the main thing that I got from that was that they were excited about freedom because of owners that were separatists.

E: So what economic or social class levels did you see people in RC portraying? Similar or different levels

M: I think the majority was either the top or the bottom. I think we saw some head honchos and some slaves, I guess.

E: Who did you see that you think would've counted as a head honcho?

M: The Randolph family.

E: What's your overall impression of early America from this visit. How do you think life was for people?

M: I don't really think that the quality of life was a major component of RC. That was hard to take-away from this performance. I didn't learn much about that.

E: What sort of attitudes did you hear female re-enactors express about the Revolution?

M: Um, female re-enactors? I thought they for the most part played a secondary role in the performance. Yeah, although that one scene by the coffee shop, and really overall, the women were portrayed as more emotional characters rather than anything else. They portrayed stereotypically as more emotional rather than analytical. Especially the African-American women were portrayed as loud and gossipy.

E: Based on your own background which of the re-enactors or interpreters do you relate to most directly?

M: I didn't see many 20-year-old males out there, but I thought I was most drawn by the blue coat guy, gathering the troops.
E: How do you think the story of CW relates to America today?

M: Should I base this on the performance or general knowledge?

E: Drawing on all of your experiences, but particularly thinking about the performance.

M: I guess it relates to America historically and as a starting place for America, yeah, I don't know.

[END]

Interview 19 (6/16/2012, Saturday performance)

E: This was your first trip to CW. Thinking just about the performance bit, Revolutionary City, what was your take away message from it? If you had one at all?

W: Yeah, I didn't really get one, I feel like it was really reinforcing what I had already learned about the revolution in the primary documents. They took a small family and kind of showed the way they would've gone through that time, I guess. It was re-affirming general knowledge. Using that family as a central focus, an example, allowed people watching to connect to what was going on. It was interactive and needed to connect to the audience.

E: Great. What sort of opinions about the revolution did you hear enslaved Africans express during the performance?

W: um, they definitely had mixed feelings, but I'm not really sure it was representative or accurate. The entire play had one scene with African Americans in it. At first, in the beginning of that scene they were happy and then they realized that the new law [about freedom] wouldn't apply specifically to them, but only other African Americans who were willing to fight on the side for America. They didn't have a real, collective, definitive position on the revolution.

E: Ok, and so you felt like they were pretty under-represented too?

W: Oh, yes. One scene at the very end? Not cutting it.

E: Yeah. So what economic or social class level did you feel like most of those people were portraying in RC? Or a range?

W: Not really a range, it was just more of two sects: some indentured/enslaved people, and the very wealthy. There was very little talk between them. Really, it was only the prominent people that we heard very much from--government officials, who were of a like mind, even if arguing on political ideas. They were still in the same group. I saw no really poor white people.
E: What would you say your overall impression was of early America from this performance--how do you think life was for most people?

W: Well, we talked about not seeing poor whites, and I think maybe that was kind of representative of reality during that time. These problems of taxation and rights and representation were only real problems for people who were prominent, who were nobles, who were white. It was portrayed here as a privileged persons war.

E: What about female re-enactors? What sort of attitudes did you hear them express about the revolution?

W: Nothing new. The only thing that they did was show us how women were only concerned about the revolution in concern to their private lives. So the most prominent thing was the lovers' scene. You know, she respects her fiancé’s ideas and wants to go off to war, but only up to the point that it affects her. It wasn't so much about her ideas regarding the revolution, but about how the revolution is affecting her personal life through him. It was all in the spirit of love and marriage. Women weren't depicted as political, and worse, weren't shown to be very analytical either. The only thing they were shown to have as an asset was emotion, in the domestic sphere.

E: Based on your own background then, which re-enactors or interpreters would you say that you related to most directly?

W: Um, I really can't say. It didn't really draw me in, I didn't feel involved. Don't get me wrong: it was interesting to watch and see how they used the space, but I was just a spectator.

E: Ok, so how do you think the story of CW relates to America today?

W: It fits the patriotic/nationalistic fervor that is very prevalent. You can't really go around America, saying that you hate, as that's considered un-patriotic and you don't appreciate what your country has done for you. So, CW definitely fosters that type of sentiment, that long-time tradition, of binding people to the country, their native homeland. This could serves as the foundation for a modern sense of nationalism in the US.

[END]

Interview 20

E: So you said you've been to Williamsburg ten times? Do you remember when your first visit was?

E: Since 2002, then, how do you think you've seen the message that CW tells change or shift?

W: It didn't engage me the first few years, and I don't know why. I would come over here and try to get in to it, and ended up being bored. And the last two years, I've found that I really enjoy being in the colonial part. Last year, I heard Marquis de Lafayette and Patrick Henry's speeches, both very informative and engaging, they started getting my interested. I wasn't receiving the message at all those first years. It's more the people than the physical location that engage me. I think the Rockefeller aspect, Bassett Hall, what Goodwin was selling to Rockefeller, have really encouraged me to appreciate the fact of CW and those 45 minute character portraits. This isn't Disneyland, we live in Georgetown, and old town Alexandria before that, so it's like, when I would come here from old town Alexandria, it looks really similar to this. I was numb to a 'colonial landscape.' I think it's through the Rockefeller story that I've learned to appreciate the facts of Colonial Williamsburg.

E: Ok, great. What sorts of things was Lafayette talking about this morning?

W: Well, one of the things that really shocked me was how only one-third of the people were in favor of the revolution. It really reminds you of politics today. I'm a psychologist, so it's made me think about these militia men who would be called up to leave tomorrow, like in RC, on a two week march. It makes it much more provocative.

E: Alright, so just thinking about the portions of Revolutionary City that you saw, what was your take-away message from that, if you had one at all?

W: That the 'end was near;' everything was going to work out. Virginia didn't really get involved into the Revolutionary War right until the very end. Another important theme or struggle, then, was about local men having to join the struggle, the war, becoming soldiers. You know, they had been hearing about the war, even supplying it and caring about it all the years. But now, all of the sudden, they were going to have to pick-up their guns and walk out of town, hoping that they were coming in on the end.

M: For me, it was the tenuous nature, that there was this divide, one-third loyalist, one-third revolutionary, one-third undecided, and they had it so rough in the early settlements, like at Jamestown, with people dying and that kind of thing. They really enjoyed having the mother country backing them.

W: The whole idea of the revolutionary war that has made it more interesting, is the idea that it wasn't a given, it wasn't a necessary result; it could've gone either way. I mean, I'm originally from Mississippi, you know? We tried to secede and it didn't work out the way wanted. The north achieved what Britain was not able to achieve. It's always been interesting to me, the way between the states is like a continuation of the Revolutionary War, but the northerners had changed their position on what man's inalienable rights are.
M: There might even be a DNA or philosophical predisposition by the nature of coming over here [to the colonies], and by being here we are basically a bunch of risk-takers anyway. What do you mean there might be Indian attacks, who cares about that (ha!)

W: That's a really good point. Right, the people that wanted everything to stay the same never came over here.

M: Exactly. We're here, you know? Who are you to tell us to do this or to do that? So the philosophical predisposition is to say "hell, yes let's get it done!"

E: Ok. So based on your all's on backgrounds, which re-enactors in RC do you think you relate to most directly?

W: Well, there weren't very many actors. We've got the choice of Benedict Arnold or George Washington or the head of the local group?

E: That's true--you all did get an abbreviated performance since it's Sunday. Normally, there are more people. Ok, so last question: how do you think the story of Colonial Williamsburg relates to America today?

W: The sense that it's not going to be a majority rules kind of thing.

M: There might even be a term, a psychological term: it's tyranny of the minority. So, the minority on any issue can run the show, if you work it the right way. A few voices can easily seem like many, you know, if there's enough sniveling and whining from even a smaller number, you can get it done. This country is a work in progress--so is the world.

W: The importance of leaders and leadership, I think. Tolstoy--War and Peace, have you read it? You should. He struggles with the question: are there great men? or are there great times that the men who are cast in those roles ad become great because of the time they're in power. We just seem like we're in a really high stakes game in America today. Things are so determinative, it just really feels like things are going to go one way or another, it's not a status quo time in history. Colonial Williamsburg is showing us the same things happened in the 18th century. Who our leaders are will determine which way things go.

M: Things are different--things are the same. Revolution, but of a different sort.

[END]

Interview 21 (6/18/2012, Tuesday performance)

E: Ok. So you all got to see the slavery scene today then--they were getting ready to be auctioned off. It got rather graphic and a little bit, in my opinion uncomfortable. So
thinking about that then, what sort of opinions about the revolution did you hear enslaved Africans express?

Woman: Freedom for who? The right for who to pursue happiness? Not them [the slaves]. It was all for the white *man* And when they were selling off the family, because the father had tried to escape and got caught and so they sold off the children and sold off the wife to Costa Rica, where they wouldn't be able to talk to anybody about the family that had owned them, who they of course had intimate knowledge about.

E: So, emotionally did you find that very affecting? Did it affect you? There was some pushing and shoving, physical violence going on at the end.

W: And that poor woman was pushed right down the stairs--everything was very rough. Even shackles. And he drew a gun on the man [slave], because he wasn't going to cooperate.

E: So, today was the first time I had seen that as well. What was your overall impression from that scene? What was your take-away message from that? That's difficult to talk about, I think, especially for CW.

W: Well, I'm sure that this was just one inkling of the brutality that many slave people endured at the time. We're from Delaware and Delaware had an auction block in old Newcastle where they sold slaves There's a lot of information about that out there.

M: Really, things haven't changed that much today--sometimes people are still brutally beaten for no reason at all by authorities. So we still don't have the problem solved. That kind of brutality is still going on. It's hard to believe that that happened in America. And when you sit down there (on DOG street) and you listen to it, it's hard to believe that that's the way we treated human beings.

W: I mean, you can read about it in books and whatever, and make your mind up easily. But, boy, when you see that in front of you, it's like ohhhhh!

E: And do you think you saw anything else in your visit that discussed slavery that was nearly as effective in getting the message across as the auction?

W: Well, there were different messages that were given. They weren't all brutal like that. One of them freed their cook, someone else sold theirs when they died.

M2: How about the worrisome part of African-Americans when Randolph died? Were they going to be sold? Would they be separated? I mean, that's got to be a wrenching kind of thought, uncertainty.

W: It really came across that you don't have any control over what your future is going to be--it rests in the hands of other people. So, even if they were not beaten (like in RC auction today), just the fact that they were enslaved was bad enough.
Eli. Right, very interesting I think. Three more questions, all rather general. You all have been here a few days, and have seen lots of the exhibits. So just thinking about all of CW that you've seen, what do you think your overall impression of early America was? From this visit, how do you figure life was for most people?

W: Um, I think that it was hot and dirty and [laughs] not easy. I'm glad I didn't live then, not that there weren't exciting things happening, but wow, if you weren't upper-class. It was even hard for the upper crust, though, too!

M1: A lot of people seemed to be self-sufficient too. Almost every home seemed to have a garden of some type, where they could raise there own foods. They had someone that would make the clothing for them.

W: I think too that there was a much greater sense of community then, than what we have now. I mean we hardly know our neighbors now. Back then, they depended on their neighbors. They watched out for each other, and they taught their kids from the time they slipped out of the womb to rely on each other.

M1: Each family wanted to be honored. They wanted the respect of others.

W: Well, because if they didn't have the respect of others they couldn't, um, transact, have any interchange or dealings with the other people. You were essentially ostracized from the rest of the community of you lost your reputation. That whole deal about getting your ear nailed to the stockade was a little brutal, too [life was not just brutal for the slaves].

M2: One of them was saying, that 70% of people walking down the street would have been slaves. Not the upper class.

W: They were the ones carrying out the work of the day. Going here, going there.

E: So with the re-enactors and interpreters that you all have seen walking down the street since you've been here, do you feel like that ratio is accurately portrayed?

M1,2 and W: Well NO!

W: 90% of them are white and aristocrats, well dressed. There are also, the others as well though. You see some poorer ones and the African Americans.

M2: A few years ago when we were here. You wouldn't see as many people dressed up in the proper garb. There's quite an improvement.

E: Oh, so you've noticed a change then over the times that you've been here?
M2: Oh, yes. We've been here 42 years ago--1968. We've come here fairly often. We really enjoy it. I've seen a lot of changes just in the way that they conduct tours and everything.

E: Oh, that's another thing that I'm really interested in.

M2: For one thing, they said they are not going to do anymore cooking in the homes. When we were here in Feb. they were making chocolate in the palace, Brunswick stew, etc. That's what you come to see, really, what people are/were actually doing. Not necessarily to walk through a house with a bunch of people, saying "ok, you look at this room, you look over there."

E: So you feel like interpretation has been scaled down then?

M2: Very much so. I think.

E: Since 1968, do you think the story itself has changed? You've already said you've seen the methods change.

M1 and 2: No, not really.

W1: I do. I think it's changed. I think that I don't remember hearing anything about Africans in 1972.

M3: I think one thing that has changed, and I think that you'll agree with me, is that one thing that has most definitely changed over the years, are the impersonations they do of the great men: Patrick Henry, Thomas Jefferson, and the like. That, adds a great deal of flavor in explaining what was going on at the time and towards developing a much clearer explanation. When I came early on, you did get to see what everyday life was like: you got to visits stores, taverns, craftsmen, but not a lot of great deal of attention went to the actual political issues that were taking place at that time that caused change.

M2: The only time you got it was when you would visit the capitol. In the rest of the town you didn't get that feel. In the courthouse you found out things about women's rights and all that. But nothing about independence or anything. They expected people to come with more background knowledge when they came.

E: Hunh. So was that a well-founded assumption?

W: Not in my case.

E: So these shifts in CW. You've said that it's gone for all trades stuff and little politics, to more political history, and now you all wish that they explored more of the everyday life sort of interpretation.
M3: I think it should. It should be a nice blend of all of it. It has to be a good mixture. The pendulum has got to come back more towards the quotidian.

W: Compare it to Sturbridge, where they do an excellent job of the everyday, but no sense of the politics.

[END]

**Interview 22 (6/20/2012, incomplete/sound file corrupted, Wednesday performance)**

M: ...part of that, one of the one's who I thought did a really good job was the guy who also was out here and kind of inspected his troops too. I don't remember his name, I just know he was a colonel.

E: Oh, right.

M: He did a great job.

E: How do you think the story of CW relates to America today?

M: It's our history, it's our past. A lot of the things that they were going through, relate to use today because we have a lot of our freedoms because they were willing to fight for them.

W1: I think every American should come visit.

E: Alright. And you were making a cyclical motion there.

W2: Yeah, that's right. It's all coming back around.

M: I think it's just a really neat thing that the Rockefellers did, and Mr. Goodwin. They had the insight/vision for this, really pretty amazing.

[END]

**Interview 23 (9/1/2012, Saturday performance)**

E: I see you've been to CW four times. Do you remember what year your first visit was in?

M: Yes, it was 2011.

E: One thing that I'm really curious about, since 2011 how do you think you've noticed the interpretation/story that CW tells change? If at all...
M: Um, I think for the most part it's been fairly standard. And I think that's a good thing, I wouldn't one them to change that much. They're trying to portray the past in a very unique way, and it's worked so far. I've only seen the Rev City once, so, I don't if that has changed. My interaction with the different shops/buildings has been pretty standardized the four or five times that I have been.

E: Great. These next couple questions are asking just about what you saw in RC. What sort of opinions did you hear enslaved Africans express?

M: At the beginning, I saw when Sergeant Innes, when he was marching on the Palace Green to confront Peyton Randolph, there were two slaves, who were gathered around the crowd, wondering what was going on. They struck me as very loud and emotional--emotive maybe. That one lady...

E: Right, you had someone who came-up to talk to you on a one-on-one basis.

M: Yeah, she asked me about the plant I was holding. Yeah, so I wasn't sure how that was going to work. I was thinking that they wouldn't have any interaction with the audience because they're trying to show something. That was unexpected. The other time I saw the slaves was when...wait. What was the question again?

E: How do you think the enslaved performers in RC felt about the Revolution?

M: Oh, right. Well I think they acted scared because they thought that they were being accused of rebellion--that the gun powder was taken out of the magazine so they could start a rebellion. Scared and also conflicted. Some of them were like, "yeah we should go rebel!" while other seemed more like "whoa, this is too risky, I don't know if I want this. You're going to risk your life." It was kind of shocking to see how the new law (Dunmore's proclamation) was going to free the slaves of master's that were against England.

E: You saw a variety of opinions expressed even among the slaves then, about the Revolution?

M: Yes.

E: What economic or social class levels of people did you see portrayed in RC?

M: I saw the very "noble" lords--Dunmore--the governor. I saw soldiers, who I guess were the middle-class, the slaves, and also the women, who were around the street.

E: Great. What was you overall impression or early America from this visit, how do you think life was for most people?

M: Um, I think that daily life was really straightforward. I got the sense that everyone in the community had a certain duty to fulfill. If you were a slave, you were going to do that
and there's no questioning about it. If you were in the army, you had a duty as well. There was a lot religious piety expressed as well. That must've been a big part of daily life, I think.

E: What made you say religious piety?

M: Every passionate statement by the actors, ended in 'God save the King'--so I do not if that was significant?

M: I also really enjoyed listening to how the upper class expressed themselves. They took lots of care in word-choice and appeared very educated/refined. That must've been considered the standard then, much more so than today.

E: So you saw speech as way that elites were distinguishing themselves from others? That's really interesting.

M: Yeah I thought it was really cool how they took care in knowing how to speak properly.

E: Right. So did you see any other ways in which social/economic class levels were demarcated? Or was speech the primary factor for you.

M: Definitely dress and attire. You could tell the army people dressed differently from the slaves and the governor. Maybe also bodily movements: how they would bow down in greeting.

E: Great. You saw the Saturday performance: "The Old Order Collapses." And specifically this Saturday performance, as you noticed, was particular to the day of the week. So, in this performance, did you hear any mention of Native Americans?

M: No, not at all.

E: What sort of attitudes did you hear female re-enactors express about the revolution? If you heard any?

M: Well, I heard from several female black slaves. And the one white woman at the beginning who was trying to point people in the right direction at the beginning of the performance.

E: The only white woman that you saw was the older lady trying to help find Peyton Randolph, then?

M: Yeah, really.

E: Good. Based on your own background, which re-enactors or interpreters that you saw in RC do you relate to most directly?
M: I like that question. Um, hmmm. I think that I identified more with Peyton Randolph. It seemed to me like when he was talking to Innes, he just came across as very balanced and rational. He was saying that we're not going to be all "passionate against England." Sure, Dunmore took our gun-powder, but that doesn't mean that we should go storm the palace right away! It just seemed like he very balanced--keeping passions in check. But he was obviously torn between both sides. I identified with his rationality. In an ideal world, I would like to think like that.

E: Just two more questions. What was your take-away message from RC, if you were to pinpoint one?

M: That's hard, because it covered so many different scenes at different time points.

E: Well, if you have multiple ones, that's good, too.

M: Um, it ended with the Declaration of Independence, so we all know what happened after that...I mean it was very resolved in away. The atmosphere of the entire cast reading the declaration, the patriotic spirit. It really made feel like, 'oh! it's all good. Everything's ok, you can go home." Everything is all happy now. But at the same time, I realize now that this is when, candidly, the shit hits the fan. I guess the take-away message is that there is a strong feeling in Americans, at that time, against this royal authority. It's important for us to maintain our rights.

E: The taking of the gun powder from the town magazine was really sort of the central conflict of it all for you?

M: Yeah, but it's about more than that. I think that's meant to speak to the right's of Americans at that time. The gun-powder is just on of those incidents.

E: Ok. And last question: how do you think the story of CW relates to America today? You can think beyond just RC for this one.

M: We have to recognize that it's a very important part of our history. So much politics happened there and many key events, that would later shape the curve of contemporary American politics. It was one of those little seeds that laid down the foundation for what we believe--the constitution, etc. I think we are doing a good job in remembering all of this. Not just in books, but it's meaningful and nice to see it in "3-D."
APPENDIX B: CONSENT FORMS AND DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Interview 1

ANTHROPOLOGY 350: ETHNOARCHAEOLOGY
“Revolutionary City” Project

Interview Location: ____________________________

Information to be voluntarily completed by respondent:

Sex:  M  F  Group of 3 - 1 primary respondent

Age Range—Circle One: 18-29  29-40  41-50  51-64  65+

Where do you live? __________________________

How many times have you visited Colonial Williamsburg? _____ Once_____

Have you taken any guided tours of buildings or workshops this trip? Which ones?

Yes—Palace of a few Taverns

Did you watch the entirety of the ‘Revolutionary City’ program?____

Yes

Did you visit any exhibits that discussed slavery? No

The King’s Government (Collapse 1765-1776

T, TH, S
ANTHROPOLOGY 350: ETHNOARCHAEOLOGY
“Revolutionary City” Project

Interview Location: Coffee House

Information to be voluntarily completed by respondent:

Sex: ☐ M ☐ F

Age Range—Circle One: 18-29 29-40 41-50 (51-64) 65+

Where do you live? Willoaighty Hills, OH

How many times have you visited Colonial Williamsburg? 12

Have you taken any guided tours of buildings or workshops this trip? Which ones?

Palace, Capital, St. George Tucker House

Did you watch the entirety of the ‘Revolutionary City’ program?

Yes

Did you visit any exhibits that discussed slavery? Not yet

2 June 2012
Sat.
Interview 3

ANTHROPOLOGY 350: ETHNOARCHAEOLOGY
“Revolutionary City” Project

Interview Location: RACHEL TAVONU

Information to be voluntarily completed by respondent:

Sex: M F

Age Range—Circle One:  18-29  29-40  41-50  51-64  65+

Where do you live? FREDERICK MD

How many times have you visited Colonial Williamsburg? 20+

Have you taken any guided tours of buildings or workshops this trip? Which ones?

Did you watch the entirety of the ‘Revolutionary City’ program?

Did you visit any exhibits that discussed slavery? Never
Interview 4

ANTHROPOLOGY 350: ETHNOARCHAEOLOGY
“Revolutionary City” Project

Interview Location: [redacted]

Information to be voluntarily completed by respondent:

Sex: M F

Age Range—Circle One: 18-29 29-40 41-50 51-64 65+

Where do you live? [redacted]

How many times have you visited Colonial Williamsburg? [redacted]

Have you taken any guided tours of buildings or workshops this trip? Which ones? Capital, Palace, Betty House, Coffin Shop, [redacted]

Did you watch the entirety of the ‘Revolutionary City’ program? [redacted]

Did you visit any exhibits that discussed slavery? [redacted]

[Note: Handwritten text: “How many times have you visited Colonial Williamsburg?”]
Interview 5

ANTHROPOLOGY 350: ETHNOARCHAEOLOGY
“Revolutionary City” Project

Interview Location: [Handwritten location]

Information to be voluntarily completed by respondent:

Sex: [M] [F] [C]ouple

Age Range—Circle One: 18-29  29-40  41-50  51-64  65+

Where do you live? [Handwritten address]

How many times have you visited Colonial Williamsburg? 10+

Have you taken any guided tours of buildings or workshops this trip? Which ones?

Yes — all ones I took of lessons

Did you watch the entirety of the ‘Revolutionary City’ program?

Yes

Did you visit any exhibits that discussed slavery? Not this time

(Carter’s srove several years ago)
Interview 6

ANTHROPOLOGY 350: ETHNOARCHAEOLOGY
“Revolutionary City” Project

Interview Location: Raleigh, North Carolina

Information to be voluntarily completed by respondent:

Sex: M F

Age Range—Circle One: 18-29 29-40 41-50 51-64 65+

Where do you live? South Carolina

How many times have you visited Colonial Williamsburg? 5

Have you taken any guided tours of buildings or workshops this trip? Which ones?

Not yet this year

Did you watch the entirety of the ‘Revolutionary City’ program?

Didn’t see Created Equal

Did you visit any exhibits that discussed slavery?

Yes during previous visits
Interview 7

ANTHROPOLOGY 350: ETHNOARCHAEOLOGY
“Revolutionary City” Project

Interview Location: Raleigh, NC

Information to be voluntarily completed by respondent:

Sex: M F Couple

Age Range—Circle One: 18-29 29-40 41-50 51-64 65+

Where do you live? Ohio

How many times have you visited Colonial Williamsburg? 4-5

Have you taken any guided tours of buildings or workshops this trip? Which ones?

Yes (most of not all)

Did you watch the entirety of the ‘Revolutionary City’ program?

Yes

Did you visit any exhibits that discussed slavery? Yes
Information to be voluntarily completed by respondent.

Sex: [ ] M  [ ] F  [ ] Couple

Age Range—Circle One:  [ ] 18-29  [ ] 29-40  [ ] 41-50  [ ] 51-64  [ ] 65+

Where do you live?  EDINBURGH  ALBERTA  CANADA

How many times have you visited Colonial Williamsburg?  4

Have you taken any guided tours of buildings or workshops this trip? Which ones?

GARDEN TOUR / GOVERNOR'S PALACE / COURTHOUSE

Did you watch the entirety of the ‘Revolutionary City’ program?

YES

Did you visit any exhibits that discussed slavery?

GOOD
Interview 9

“That the Future may learn from the [reconstructed] Past’
An Anthropological Study of “Revolutionary City”
Eli Dollarhide, College of William & Mary

Interview Location: Duke of Gloucester Street

The general nature of this study entitled “That the Future may learn from the [reconstructed] Past: An Anthropological Study of Colonial Williamsburg’s ‘Revolutionary City’ Program” conducted by Eli Dollarhide has been explained to me. I understand that I will be asked to complete a survey and answer additional interview questions. My participation in this study should take a total of about 10 minutes. I understand that my responses will be confidential and that anonymity will be preserved and that my name will not be associated with any results of this study. I know that I may refuse to answer any question asked and that I may discontinue participation at any time. Potential risks resulting from my participation in this project have been described to me. I am aware that I may report dissatisfaction with any aspect of this experiment to the Chair of the Protection of Human Subjects Committee at the College of William & Mary. Dr. Lee Kirkpatrick, 757-221-3997 or consent@wm.edu. I am aware that I must be at least 18 years of age to participate.

Do you wish to participate? Yes

Information to be voluntarily completed by respondent:

Sex: M F Coupe

Age Range—Circle One: 18-29 29-40 41-50 51-64 65+

Where do you live? New Mexico

How many times have you visited Colonial Williamsburg? 1st time

Have you taken any guided tours of buildings or workshops this trip? Which ones? (Capital Building, Palace, Taverns, Homes, Museums)

Yes most buildings with tours, Blacksmith, Spinning

Did you watch the entirety of the ‘Revolutionary City’ program? Yes

Did you visit any exhibits that discussed slavery? Yes

THIS PROJECT (PHSC-2012-04-18-7678-nlnorman) WAS FOUND TO COMPLY WITH APPROPRIATE ETHICAL STANDARDS AND WAS EXEMPTED FROM THE NEED FOR FORMAL REVIEW BY THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE (Phone 757-221-3998) ON 2012-06-06 AND EXPIRES ON 2013-06-06.
Interview 10

‘That the Future may learn from the [reconstructed] Past’
An Anthropological Study of ‘Revolutionary City’
Eli Dollarhide, College of William & Mary

Interview Location: Raleigh Tavern

The general nature of this study entitled “That the Future may learn from the [reconstructed] Past: An Anthropological Study of Colonial Williamsburg's ‘Revolutionary City’ Program” conducted by Eli Dollarhide has been explained to me. I understand that I will be asked to complete a survey and answer additional interview questions. My participation in this study should take a total of about 10 minutes. I understand that my responses will be confidential and that anonymity will be preserved and that my name will not be associated with any results of this study. I know that I may refuse to answer any question asked and that I may discontinue participation at any time. Potential risks resulting from my participation in this project have been described to me. I am aware that I may report dissatisfaction with any aspect of this experiment to the Chair of the Protection of Human Subjects Committee at the College of William & Mary, Dr. Lee Kirkpatrick, 757-221-3997 or consent@wm.edu. I am aware that I must be at least 18 years of age to participate.

Do you wish to participate?  Yes

Information to be voluntarily completed by respondent:

Sex: M  F

Age Range—Circle One:  18-29  29-40  41-64  65+

Where do you live?  South Carolina

How many times have you visited Colonial Williamsburg?  7

Have you taken any guided tours of buildings or workshops this trip? Which ones?
Basset Hall, Wethburns Tavern,  etc.  Bruton Church

Did you watch the entirety of the ‘Revolutionary City’ program?  90%

Did you visit any exhibits that discussed slavery?  Yes

THIS PROJECT (P1HC-2012-04-18-7678-nlnorman) WAS FOUND TO COMPLY WITH APPROPRIATE ETHICAL STANDARDS AND WAS EXEMPTED FROM THE NEED FOR FORMAL REVIEW BY THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE (Phone 757-221-3966) ON 2012-06-06 AND EXPIRES ON 2013-06-06.
Interview 11

‘That the Future may learn from the [reconstructed] Past’
An Anthropological Study of “Revolutionary City”
Eli Dollarhide, College of William & Mary

Interview Location: Capitol

The general nature of this study entitled ‘That the Future may learn from the [reconstructed] Past: An Anthropological Study of Colonial Williamsburg’s ‘Revolutionary City’ Program’ conducted by Eli Dollarhide has been explained to me. I understand that I will be asked to complete a survey and answer additional interview questions. My participation in this study should take a total of about 10 minutes. I understand that my responses will be confidential and that anonymity will be preserved and that my name will not be associated with any results of this study. I know that I may refuse to answer any question asked and that I may discontinue participation at any time. Potential risks resulting from my participation in this project have been described to me. I am aware that I may report dissatisfactions with any aspect of this experiment to the Chair of the Protection of Human Subjects Committee at the College of William & Mary, Dr. Lee Kirkpatrick, 757-221-3997 or consent@wm.edu. I am aware that I must be at least 18 years of age to participate.

Do you wish to participate?  
YES_________

Information to be voluntarily completed by respondent: Disruption 98

Sex:  M  O

Age Range—Circle One:  18-29  29-40  41-50  51-64  65+  

Where do you live?  Virginia

How many times have you visited Colonial Williamsburg?  5

Have you taken any guided tours of buildings or workshops this trip? Which ones?

YES – Governors Palace

Did you watch the entirety of the ‘Revolutionary City’ program?

YES_________

Did you visit any exhibits that discussed slavery?  No – wish to

This project (PHSC-2012-04-18-7678-nlnorman) was found to comply with appropriate ethical standards and was exempted from the need for formal review by the College of William and Mary Protection of Human Subjects Committee (Phone 757-221-3966) on 2012-06-06 and expires on 2013-06-06.
Interview 12

'That the Future may learn from the [reconstructed] Past'
An Anthropological Study of "Revolutionary City"
Eli Dollarhide, College of William & Mary

Interview Location: 

The general nature of this study entitled 'That the Future may learn from the [reconstructed] Past. An Anthropological Study of Colonial Williamsburg's 'Revolutionary City' Program' conducted by Eli Dollarhide has been explained to me. I understand that I will be asked to complete a survey and answer additional interview questions. My participation in this study should take a total of about 10 minutes. I understand that my responses will be confidential and that anonymity will be preserved and that my name will not be associated with any results of this study. I know that I may refuse to answer any question asked and that I may discontinue participation at any time. Potential risks resulting from my participation in this project have been described to me. I am aware that I may report dissatisfaction with any aspect of this experiment to the Chair of the Protection of Human Subjects Committee at the College of William & Mary, Dr. Lee Kirkpatrick, 757-221-3997 or consent@wm.edu. I am aware that I must be at least 18 years of age to participate.

Do you wish to participate? Yes

Information to be voluntarily completed by respondent:

Sex: M F

Age Range—Circle One: 18-29 29-40 41-50 51-64 65+

Where do you live? TEXAS

How many times have you visited Colonial Williamsburg? 2

Have you taken any guided tours of buildings or workshops this trip? Which ones?

Yes Governor's Palace Capitol lalligh Fawne

Did you watch the entirety of the 'Revolutionary City' program?

All but behind coffee house

Did you visit any exhibits that discussed slavery? Yes

THIS PROJECT (PHSC-2012-04-18-7678-nlfrom) WAS FOUND TO COMPLY WITH APPROPRIATE ETHICAL STANDARDS AND WAS EXEMPTED FROM THE NEED FOR FORMAL REVIEW BY THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE (Phone 757-221-3966) ON 2012-06-06 AND EXPIRES ON 2013-06-06.
Interview 13

Sound File INCOMPLETE
SEE NOTES

‘That the Future may learn from the [reconstructed] Past’
An Anthropological Study of “Revolutionary City”
Eli Dollarhide, College of William & Mary

Interview Location: Raleigh

The general nature of this study entitled “That the Future may learn from the [reconstructed] Past. An Anthropological Study of Colonial Williamsburg’s ‘Revolutionary City’ Program” conducted by Eli Dollarhide has been explained to me. I understand that I will be asked to complete a survey and answer additional interview questions. My participation in this study should take a total of about 10 minutes. I understand that my responses will be confidential and that anonymity will be preserved and that my name will not be associated with any results of this study. I know that I may refuse to answer any question asked and that I may discontinue participation at any time. Potential risks resulting from my participation in this project have been described to me. I am aware that I may report dissatisfaction with any aspect of this experiment to the Chair of the Protection of Human Subjects Committee at the College of William & Mary. Dr. Lee Kirkpatrick, 757-221-3997 or consent@wm.edu. I am aware that I must be at least 18 years of age to participate.

Do you wish to participate? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Information to be voluntarily completed by respondent:

Sex: [ ] Male [ ] Female [ ] Did not record

Age Range—Circle One: [ ] 18-29 [ ] 29-40 [ ] 41-50 [ ] 51-64 [ ] 65+

Where do you live? [ ] Sayreville, NJ 08872

How many times have you visited Colonial Williamsburg? [ ] 3 (3rd visit)

Have you taken any guided tours of buildings or workshops this trip? Which ones? [ ] Yes— as many as open

Did you watch the entirety of the ‘Revolutionary City’ program? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Did you visit any exhibits that discussed slavery? [ ] Yes [ ] No

This project (PHSC-2012-04-18-7678-ninorman) was found to comply with appropriate ethical standards and was exempted from the need for formal review by the College of William and Mary Protection of Human Subjects Committee (Phone 757-221-3966) on 2012-06-06 and expires on 2013-06-06.
Interview 14

"That the Future may learn from the [reconstructed] Past"
An Anthropological Study of "Revolutionary City"
Eli Dollarhide, College of William & Mary

Interview Location: 

The general nature of this study entitled "That the Future may learn from the [reconstructed] Past: An Anthropological Study of Colonial Williamsburg's 'Revolutionary City' Program" conducted by Eli Dollarhide has been explained to me. I understand that I will be asked to complete a survey and answer additional interview questions. My participation in this study should take a total of about 10 minutes. I understand that my responses will be confidential and that anonymity will be preserved and that my name will not be associated with any results of this study. I know that I may refuse to answer any question asked and that I may discontinue participation at any time. Potential risks resulting from my participation in this project have been described to me. I am aware that I may report dissatisfaction with any aspect of this experiment to the Chair of the Protection of Human Subjects Committee at the College of William & Mary, Dr. Lee Kirkpatrick, 757-221-3997 or consent@wm.edu. I am aware that I must be at least 18 years of age to participate.

Do you wish to participate? 

Information to be voluntarily completed by respondent:

Sex: M F
Age Range—Circle One: 18-29 29-40 41-50 51-64 65+
Where do you live? Richmond, VA
How many times have you visited Colonial Williamsburg? 9
Have you taken any guided tours of buildings or workshops this trip? Which ones? NO

Did you watch the entirety of the ‘Revolutionary City’ program? YES

Did you visit any exhibits that discussed slavery? NO

THIS PROJECT (PHSC-2012-04-18-7678@lnorman) WAS FOUND TO COMPLY WITH APPROPRIATE ETHICAL STANDARDS AND WAS EXEMPTED FROM THE NEED FOR FORMAL REVIEW BY THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE (PHONE 757-221-3966) ON 2012-06-06 AND EXPIRES ON 2013-06-06.
Interview 15

‘That the Future may learn from the [reconstructed] Past’
An Anthropological Study of “Revolutionary City”
Eli Dollarhide, College of William & Mary

Interview Location: [Handwritten]

The general nature of this study entitled “That the Future may learn from the [reconstructed] Past: An Anthropological Study of Colonial Williamsburg’s ‘Revolutionary City’ Program” conducted by Eli Dollarhide has been explained to me. I understand that I will be asked to complete a survey and answer additional interview questions. My participation in this study should take a total of about 10 minutes. I understand that my responses will be confidential and that anonymity will be preserved and that my name will not be associated with any results of this study. I know that I may refuse to answer any question asked and that I may discontinue participation at any time. Potential risks resulting from my participation in this project have been described to me. I am aware that I may report dissatisfactions with any aspect of this experiment to the Chair of the Protection of Human Subjects Committee at the College of William & Mary, Dr. Lee Kirkpatrick, 757-221-3997 or consent@wm.edu. I am aware that I must be at least 18 years of age to participate.

Do you wish to participate? Yes

Information to be voluntarily completed by respondent:

Sex: M [Handwritten]

Age Range—Circle One: 18-29 29-40 41-50 51-64 65+

Where do you live? [Handwritten]

How many times have you visited Colonial Williamsburg? 60

Have you taken any guided tours of buildings or workshops this trip? Which ones? Yes: Peters. [Handwritten]

Did you watch the entirety of the ‘Revolutionary City’ program? Yes

Did you visit any exhibits that discussed slavery? Yes

THIS PROJECT (PHSC-2012-04-18-7678-nilnorman) WAS FOUND TO COMPLY WITH APPROPRIATE ETHICAL STANDARDS AND WAS EXEMPTED FROM THE NEED FOR FORMAL REVIEW BY THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE (Phone 757-221-3966) ON 2012-06-06 AND EXPIRES ON 2013-06-06.
Interview 16

‘That the Future may learn from the [reconstructed] Past’
An Anthropological Study of ‘Revolutionary City’
Eli Dollarhide, College of William & Mary

Interview Location: Capetown

The general nature of this study entitled ‘That the Future may learn from the [reconstructed] Past: An Anthropological Study of Colonial Williamsburg’s ‘Revolutionary City’ Program’ conducted by Eli Dollarhide has been explained to me. I understand that I will be asked to complete a survey and answer additional interview questions. My participation in this study should take a total of about 10 minutes. I understand that my responses will be confidential and that anonymity will be preserved and that my name will not be associated with any results of this study. I know that I may refuse to answer any question asked and that I may discontinue participation at any time. Potential risks resulting from my participation in this project have been described to me. I am aware that I may report dissatisfaction with any aspect of this experiment to the Chair of the Protection of Human Subjects Committee at the College of William & Mary, Dr. Lee Kirkpatrick, 757-221-3997 or consent@wm.edu. I am aware that I must be at least 18 years of age to participate.

Do you wish to participate? Yes

Information to be voluntarily completed by respondent:

Sex: [ ] M [ ] F

Age Range—Circle One: [ ] 18-29 [ ] 29-40 [ ] 41-50 [ ] 51-64 [ ] 65+

Where do you live? Florida

How many times have you visited Colonial Williamsburg? 15

Have you taken any guided tours of buildings or workshops this trip? Which ones? No

Did you watch the entirety of the ‘Revolutionary City’ program? Yes

Did you visit any exhibits that discussed slavery? No

This project (PHSC-2012-04-18-7578-nlnormal) was found to comply with appropriate ethical standards and was exempted from the need for formal review by the College of William and Mary Protection of Human Subjects Committee (Phone 757-221-3966) on 2012-06-06 and expires on 2013-06-06.
Interview 17

‘That the Future may learn from the [reconstructed] Past’
An Anthropological Study of "Revolutionary City"
Eli Dollarhide, College of William & Mary

Interview Location: Capital

The general nature of this study entitled "That the Future may learn from the [reconstructed] Past. An Anthropological Study of Colonial Williamsburg’s 'Revolutionary City' Program" conducted by Eli Dollarhide has been explained to me. I understand that I will be asked to complete a survey and answer additional interview questions. My participation in this study should take a total of about 10 minutes. I understand that my responses will be confidential and that anonymity will be preserved and that my name will not be associated with any results of this study. I know that I may refuse to answer any question asked and that I may discontinue participation at any time. Potential risks resulting from my participation in this project have been described to me. I am aware that I may report dissatisfaction with any aspect of this experiment to the Chair of the Protection of Human Subjects Committee at the College of William & Mary, Dr. Lee Kirkpatrick, 757-221-3997 or consent@wm.edu. I am aware that I must be at least 18 years of age to participate.

Do you wish to participate? Yes

Information to be voluntarily completed by respondent

Sex: M F

Age Range—Circle One: 18-29 29-40 41-50 51-64 65+

Where do you live? Staunton, VA

How many times have you visited Colonial Williamsburg? 7

Have you taken any guided tours of buildings or workshops this trip? Which ones?

No

Did you watch the entirety of the ‘Revolutionary City’ program? Yes

Did you visit any exhibits that discussed slavery? No

THIS PROJECT (PHSC-2012-04-18-7678-nlnorman) WAS FOUND TO COMPLY WITH APPROPRIATE ETHICAL STANDARDS AND WAS EXEMPTED FROM THE NEED FOR FORMAL REVIEW BY THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE (Phone 757-221-3966) ON 2012-06-06 AND EXPIRES ON 2013-06-06.
Interview 18

'That the Future may learn from the [reconstructed] Past'
An Anthropological Study of "Revolutionary City"
Eli Dollarhide, College of William & Mary

Interview Location: Raleigh Bobe Shop

The general nature of this study entitled "That the Future may learn from the [reconstructed] Past. An Anthropological Study of Colonial Williamsburg's 'Revolutionary City' Program" conducted by Eli Dollarhide has been explained to me. I understand that I will be asked to complete a survey and answer additional interview questions. My participation in this study should take a total of about 10 minutes. I understand that my responses will be confidential and that anonymity will be preserved and that my name will not be associated with any results of this study. I know that I may refuse to answer any question asked and that I may discontinue participation at any time.
Potential risks resulting from my participation in this project have been described to me. I am aware that I may report dissatisfaction with any aspect of this experiment to the Chair of the Protection of Human Subjects Committee at the College of William & Mary, Dr. Lee Kirkpatrick, 757-221-3997 or consent@wm.edu. I am aware that I must be at least 18 years of age to participate.

Do you wish to participate? Yes

Information to be voluntarily completed by respondent

Sex: ( ) M ( ) F

Age Range—Circle One: 18-29 29-40 41-50 51-64 65+

Where do you live? [ ]

How many times have you visited Colonial Williamsburg? 3

Have you taken any guided tours of buildings or workshops this trip? Which ones?

Yes The Palace

Did you watch the entirety of the 'Revolutionary City' program?

Yes—completely

Did you visit any exhibits that discussed slavery? No

This project (PHSC-2012-04-18-7678-nhnorman) was found to comply with appropriate ethical standards and was exempted from the need for formal review by the College of William and Mary Protection of Human Subjects Committee (Phone 757-221-3966) on 2012-06-06 and expires on 2013-06-06.
Interview 19

‘That the Future may learn from the [reconstructed] Past’
An Anthropological Study of “Revolutionary City”
Eli Dollarhide, College of William & Mary

Interview Location: Raleigh Bake Shop

The general nature of this study entitled ‘That the Future may learn from the [reconstructed] Past. An Anthropological Study of Colonial Williamsburg’s ‘Revolutionary City’ Program’ conducted by Eli Dollarhide has been explained to me. I understand that I will be asked to complete a survey and answer additional interview questions. My participation in this study should take a total of about 10 minutes. I understand that my responses will be confidential and that anonymity will be preserved and that my name will not be associated with any results of this study. I know that I may refuse to answer any question asked and that I may discontinue participation at any time. Potential risks resulting from my participation in this project have been described to me. I am aware that I may report dissatisfaction with any aspect of this experiment to the Chair of the Protection of Human Subjects Committee at the College of William & Mary, Dr. Lee Kirkpatrick, 757-221-3997 or consent@wm.edu. I am aware that I must be at least 18 years of age to participate.

Do you wish to participate? Y

Information to be voluntarily completed by respondent:

Sex: M  F

Age Range—Circle One: 18-29  29-40  41-50  51-64  65+

Where do you live? [Redacted] VA

How many times have you visited Colonial Williamsburg? [Redacted]

Have you taken any guided tours of buildings or workshops this trip? Which ones? Y

Did you watch the entirety of the ‘Revolutionary City’ program? Y

Did you visit any exhibits that discussed slavery? N

THIS PROJECT (PHSC-2012-04-18-7678-nlnorman) WAS FOUND TO COMPLY WITH APPROPRIATE ETHICAL STANDARDS AND WAS EXEMPTED FROM THE NEED FOR FORMAL REVIEW BY THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE (Phone 757-221-3966) ON 2012-06-06 AND EXPIRES ON 2013-06-06.
Interview 20

‘That the Future may learn from the [reconstructed] Past’
An Anthropological Study of “Revolutionary City”
Eli Dollarhide, College of William & Mary

Interview Location: ____________

The general nature of this study entitled “That the Future may learn from the [reconstructed] Past. An Anthropological Study of Colonial Williamsburg’s ‘Revolutionary City’ Program” conducted by Eli Dollarhide has been explained to me. I understand that I will be asked to complete a survey and answer additional interview questions. My participation in this study should take a total of about 10 minutes. I understand that my responses will be confidential and that anonymity will be preserved and that my name will not be associated with any results of this study. I know that I may refuse to answer any question asked and that I may discontinue participation at any time. Potential risks resulting from my participation in this project have been described to me. I am aware that I may report dissatisfactions with any aspect of this experiment to the Chair of the Protection of Human Subjects Committee at the College of William & Mary, Dr. Lee Kirkpatrick, 757-221-3997 or consent@wm.edu. I am aware that I must be at least 18 years of age to participate.

Do you wish to participate? ______________

Information to be voluntarily completed by respondent

Sex: M [ ] F [ ]

Age Range—Circle One: 18-29 29-40 41-50 51-64 65+

Where do you live? Washington, DC

How many times have you visited Colonial Williamsburg? ______

Have you taken any guided tours of buildings or workshops this trip? Which ones?

Yes – Bassett Hall & Governors Palace

Did you watch the entirety of the ‘Revolutionary City’ program? ______________

Did you visit any exhibits that discussed slavery? ______________

THIS PROJECT (PHSC-2012-04-18-7678-nlnorman) WAS FOUND TO COMPLY WITH APPROPRIATE ETHICAL STANDARDS AND WAS EXEMPTED FROM THE NEED FOR FORMAL REVIEW BY THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE (Phone 757-221-3966) ON 2012-06-06 AND EXPIRES ON 2013-06-06.
Interview 21

‘That the Future may learn from the [reconstructed] Past’
An Anthropological Study of “Revolutionary City”
Eli Dollarhide, College of William & Mary

The general nature of this study entitled “That the Future may learn from the [reconstructed] Past: An Anthropological Study of Colonial Williamsburg’s ‘Revolutionary City’ Program” conducted by Eli Dollarhide has been explained to me. I understand that I will be asked to complete a survey and answer additional interview questions. My participation in this study should take a total of about 10 minutes. I understand that my responses will be confidential and that anonymity will be preserved and that my name will not be associated with any results of this study. I know that I may refuse to answer any question asked and that I may discontinue participation at any time. Potential risks resulting from my participation in this project have been described to me. I am aware that I may report dissatisfaction with any aspect of this experiment to the Chair of the Protection of Human Subjects Committee at the College of William & Mary, Dr. Lee Kirkpatrick, 757-221-3997 or consent@wm.edu. I am aware that I must be at least 18 years of age to participate.

Do you wish to participate? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Information to be voluntarily completed by respondent

Sex: [ ] M [ ] F

Age Range—Circle One: 18-29 29-40 41-50 [ ] 51-64 [ ] 65+

Where do you live? Delaware

How many times have you visited Colonial Williamsburg? 4

Have you taken any guided tours of buildings or workshops this trip? Which ones? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Did you watch the entirety of the ‘Revolutionary City’ program? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Did you visit any exhibits that discussed slavery? [ ] Yes [ ] No

THIS PROJECT [PHSC-2012-04-18-7678-nlnorman] WAS FOUND TO COMPLY WITH APPROPRIATE ETHICAL STANDARDS AND WAS EXEMPTED FROM THE NEED FOR FORMAL REVIEW BY THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE (Phone 757-221-3966) ON 2012-06-06 AND EXPIRES ON 2013-06-06.
Interview 22

‘That the Future may learn from the [reconstructed] Past’
An Anthropological Study of “Revolutionary City”
Eli Dollarhide, College of William & Mary

Interview Location: Courthouse

The general nature of this study entitled “That the Future may learn from the [reconstructed] Past. An Anthropological Study of Colonial Williamsburg’s ‘Revolutionary City’ Program” conducted by Eli Dollarhide has been explained to me. I understand that I will be asked to complete a survey and answer additional interview questions. My participation in this study should take a total of about 10 minutes. I understand that my responses will be confidential and that anonymity will be preserved and that my name will not be associated with any results of this study. I know that I may refuse to answer any question asked and that I may discontinue participation at any time. Potential risks resulting from my participation in this project have been described to me. I am aware that I may report dissatisfaction with any aspect of this experiment to the Chair of the Protection of Human Subjects Committee at the College of William & Mary. Dr. Lee Kirkpatrick, 757-221-3997 or consent@wm.edu. I am aware that I must be at least 18 years of age to participate.

Do you wish to participate? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Information to be voluntarily completed by respondent

Sex: [ ] Male [X] Female

Age Range—Circle One: 18-29 29-40 41-50 [X] 51-64 [ ] 65+

Where do you live? [ ] San Antonio [X] Texas

How many times have you visited Colonial Williamsburg? [X] First Time

Have you taken any guided tours of buildings or workshops this trip? Which one:

[ ] Ghost House Museum [ ] Breech Hall

Did you watch the entirety of the ‘Revolutionary City’ program? [X] Yes

Did you visit any exhibits that discussed slavery? [X] Yes

THIS PROJECT (PHSC-2012-04-18-7678-nlnorman) WAS FOUND TO COMPLY WITH APPROPRIATE ETHICAL STANDARDS AND WAS EXEMPTED FROM THE NEED FOR FORMAL REVIEW BY THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE (Phone 757-221-3966) ON 2012-06-06 AND EXPIRES ON 2013-06-06.
Interview 23

‘That the Future may learn from the [reconstructed] Past’
An Anthropological Study of ‘Revolutionary City’
Eli Dollarhide, College of William & Mary

Interview Location:{'Date_of_interview': '9/1/2012'}

The general nature of this study entitled ‘That the Future may learn from the [reconstructed] Past: An Anthropological Study of Colonial Williamsburg’s ‘Revolutionary City’ Program’ conducted by Eli Dollarhide has been explained to me. I understand that I will be asked to complete a survey and answer additional interview questions. My participation in this study should take a total of about 10 minutes. I understand that my responses will be confidential and that anonymity will be preserved and that my name will not be associated with any results of this study. I know that I may refuse to answer any question asked and that I may discontinue participation at any time. Potential risks resulting from my participation in this project have been described to me. I am aware that I may report dissatisfaction with any aspect of this experiment to the Chair of the Protection of Human Subjects Committee at the College of William & Mary, Dr. Lee Kirkpatrick, 757-221-3997 or consent@wm.edu. I am aware that I must be at least 18 years of age to participate.

Do you wish to participate? Yes

Information to be voluntarily completed by respondent:

Sex: M ☑ F

Age Range—Circle One: [18-29] 29-40 41-50 51-64 65+

Where do you live? Puerto Rico

How many times have you visited Colonial Williamsburg? 4

Have you taken any guided tours of buildings or workshops this trip? Which ones? Yes, just Rev City

Did you watch the entirety of the ‘Revolutionary City’ program? Yes

Did you visit any exhibits that discussed slavery? No

THIS PROJECT (PHSC-2012-04-18-7678-nhorman) WAS FOUND TO COMPLY WITH APPROPRIATE ETHICAL STANDARDS AND WAS EXEMPTED FROM THE NEED FOR FORMAL REVIEW BY THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE (Phone 757-221-3966) ON 2012-06-06 AND EXPIRES ON 2013-06-06.
APPENDIX C:
PROGRAM BULLETINS
(Developed and published by Colonial Williamsburg Foundation)
The Challenge of Independence, 1776–1781

SUNDAY

Many tests and trials befall the people of America as they create a new self-governing society. Several key events move the people of Virginia toward founding a new independent republic. Join us for Revolutionary City and experience the turmoil and challenges that confront citizens while shaping a new society and government in the midst of war.

3:30 July 21, 1776 The Cause of America

In the summer of 1776, America has a great need for men to fight to gain her independence. A British army of 30,000 troops has invaded the city of New York and prepares to campaign against General Washington and his ragtag Continental forces. But, the decision to go to war is not one made easily. For many men it means leaving families who depend upon them for support and sustenance. [In front of Raleigh Tavern]

3:40 October 30, 1777 A Place Called Saratoga

The early years of the war for Independence have not gone well for the American side. General Washington has barely been able to keep the Continental Army in the field, recruitments are difficult, and provisioning near impossible. The new nation is in desperate need of a victory and of new heroes. Who might rise from obscurity to meet the challenge? [In front of Raleigh Tavern]

3:50 April 20, 1781 The Town is Taken! The British Occupy Williamsburg

The American turncoat—now British Brigadier General—Benedict Arnold seizes Williamsburg. Redcoats raise the British flag over the Capitol and announce the rules of occupation. [Capitol, South Side]

4:05 September 28, 1781 The Promised Land, or A Matter of Faith

Gowan Pamphlet, an African American Baptist preacher, talks about his hopes for the future in a new society where all citizens are equal and where there will be no state church connected to the government as the Church of England had been. A young soldier confronts him with questions of faith in the face of war and world-changing events. [Coffeehouse Backyard]

Conclusion

4:20 September 28, 1781 On to Yorktown, and Victory!

The allied American Army has been gathering in Williamsburg, eager to engage the British. As the time to march grows near, the general addresses the citizens concerning the final preparations and his resolve for victory at Yorktown. [In front of Raleigh Tavern]

All programs are weather permitting.
Times listed are approximate.
MONDAY

George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and Patrick Henry rank among Virginia’s historical giants. While these leaders were essential to winning independence and establishing a self-governing republic, many others also played critical roles. The often-overlooked people of history provided the shoulders on which the famous patriots stood. Preachers, house servants, farmers, actors, and artisans—both enslaved and free—built a new nation. Meet the full spectrum of nation builders, the men and women who helped shape their times and the American dream. See how their lives, like our own, are affected by the promises of the Declaration of Independence, whether realized or unfulfilled.

In addition to the dramatic scenes described below, there are, historic sites, trades, and activities associated with Revolutionary City, that you may experience today.

All contribute to Building a Nation.

3:30  JULY 25, 1776  Created Equal

News arrives from Philadelphia of the adoption of a new document called a “Declaration of Independence.” As celebrations begin, some people question if this document will truly allow all Virginians the enjoyment of life, liberty, and happiness. [In front of Raleigh Tavern]

3:45  AUGUST 1777  Lady Washington Visits the Capital

Martha Washington arrives in Williamsburg to great fanfare and celebration. She receives honors in her husband’s name for his service to “The Glorious Cause” of American liberty. [Capitol, south side]

4:00  FALL 1793  “Thy Red and Thy Stuff”

Gowan Pamphlet, a former slave, discusses his vision for the black Baptist church where he is pastor. He gains recognition for his congregations even as the shadow of slavery puts them all at risk. [Coffeehouse Backyard]

4:15  Looking Forward: A Founding Father Envisions the Future of the American Republic

One of Virginia’s famous patriots sums up his experiences in Williamsburg and expresses his hopes for the future of the young republic. [In front of Raleigh Tavern]

All programs are weather permitting.

Times are approximate.
A Colonial Williamsburg Adventure

The King's Government Collapses, 1765–1776

Tuesday, Thursday, Saturday

Events that occurred in Williamsburg were pivotal to the evolution of Virginians from subjects of a distant monarch to citizens of a self-governing republic. These events led Virginians to declare the colonies no longer under British rule but the free and independent United States of America. Join us today for Revolutionary City to experience the difficult choices facing the townspeople.

3:30 April 29, 1775 The Gale from the North!
After Lord Dunmore removed the gunpowder from the Public Magazine, some patriots threatened retaliation. Today, as Peyton Randolph, president of the Congress, prepares to leave for Philadelphia, news of the battles of Lexington and Concord arrives. [In front of Raleigh Tavern]

3:40 September 1775 Swordplay, a Lesson from Fencing Master
A young officer from the new Virginia Regiment seeks instruction from a fencing master who is renowned for his prowess with the sword, and for a noteworthy military career. The lessons to be learned may involve more than skills at swordsmanship. [In front of Raleigh Tavern]

3:50 September 3, 1775 A Court of Tar and Feathers
The men who answered Virginia's call for the defense of American liberty were proud, brave, and spirited. They were bound together by the ties of honor and love of country. Any who would challenge their rights and liberties had better beware! [In front of Raleigh Tavern]

4:05 A House Divided!
Ariana Randolph, a loyalist mother, warns her daughter Susannah that her father's loyalty to the British king may make the family a target for the growing violence of American protests. [In front of Raleigh Tavern]

4:15 July 1775 To Be or Not...
The love that Edmund Randolph and Elizabeth Nicholas share for each other has survived the turmoil of an intense family feud. His father is steadfastly loyal to the British king. Her father is firmly patriotic. Can their love now endure the prospect of war for American independence? [Coffeehouse Backyard]

4:25 November 17, 1775 Liberty to Slaves!
Enslaved Virginians meet and learn of news that could change their futures. Is it true that freedom has arrived? [Coffeehouse Backyard]

Conclusion

4:40 July 25, 1776 A Declaration of Independence!
The Declaration of Independence is our nation's founding document, announcing a vision of a new society in which "All Men are Created Equal!" Please join us today for our special interpretation, giving voice to "the People's" document. Historically, the news arrived only a few weeks after Virginia's representatives had adopted their own Declaration of Rights and a Constitution for the new state. Several readings occurred around the town after its arrival. [Capital, West Side]

All programs are weather permitting.
Times listed are approximate.
The Challenge of Independence, 1776–1781

Many tests and trials befall the people of America as they create a new self-governing society. Several key events move the people of Virginia toward founding a new independent republic. Join us for Revolutionary City and experience the turmoil and challenges that confront citizens while shaping a new society and government in the midst of war.

3:30  
**July 21, 1776  The Cause of America**
In the summer of 1776, America has a great need for men to fight to gain her independence. A British army of 30,000 troops has invaded the city of New York and prepares to campaign against General Washington and his ragtag Continental forces. But, the decision to go to war is not one made easily. For many men it means leaving families who depend upon them for support and sustenance. [In front of Raleigh Tavern]

3:45  
**June 18, 1779  War in the West**
Henry Hamilton, the British governor of Detroit, and other prisoners of war are being held in the Public Gaol. The charges against them are vague, and no evidence has yet been supplied. Hamilton resents being treated as a common prisoner, without the usual provisions allowed for officers and prisoners of war. [Coffeehouse Backyard]

4:05  
**September 15, 1780  In Desperate Circumstances**
Barbry Hoy, a local woman who followed her husband southward with the army, returns to Williamsburg. Her husband Alexander was captured in the siege at Charleston, and she now seeks work at the King’s Arm Tavern. She tells the story of the war in South Carolina and of the Americans’ grim defeats. [In front of Coffeehouse]

4:15  
**April 20, 1781  The Town is Taken! The British Occupy Williamsburg**
The American turncoat—now British Brigadier General—Benedict Arnold seizes Williamsburg. Redcoats raise the British flag over the Capitol and announce the rules of occupation. [Capitol, South Side]

4:30  
**July 4, 1781  Running to Freedom!**
News has spread that Lord Cornwallis and the British Army are planning to leave Williamsburg. Enslaved Virginians consider the option of joining them for the promise of freedom. How will this life-changing decision affect individuals within the enslaved community? [Coffeehouse Backyard]

4:40  
**September 28, 1781  The Promised Land, or A Matter of Faith**
Gowan Pamphlet, an African American Baptist preacher, talks about his hopes for the future in a new society where all citizens are equal and where there will be no state church connected to the government as the Church of England had been. A young soldier confronts him with questions of faith in the face of war and world-changing events? [Coffeehouse Backyard]

4:55  
**September 28, 1781  On to Yorktown, and Victory!**
The allied American Army has been gathering in Williamsburg, eager to engage the British. As the time to march grows near, the general addresses the citizens concerning the final preparations and his resolve for victory at Yorktown. [In front of Raleigh Tavern]

All programs are weather permitting.
Times listed are approximate.