Popular conceptions of slavery in the United States center on the plantation house—it is easy to picture Tara, the white, colonnaded house in *Gone with the Wind* (1940), or any of the many preserved and restored plantation houses that are now museums and that often serve, incongruously, as wedding venues. Built to reinforce and project race and class superiority,¹ these “big houses,” whether ornate or simple, were often surrounded by fields and numerous outbuildings such as kitchens, barns, sheds, and slave dwellings. Many of the latter have been demolished or are in ruins, considered, like the history and lives they attest to, not worth preserving.

The fate of these slave dwellings serves as a metaphor for the legacy of slavery. Popular historical and media narratives focus on large plantations like those in the southern United States. These stories memorialize agricultural work, such as the production of cotton and sugar for trade, and the destruction of black families as individuals were sold in slave auctions, with members “sold down the river”²—a phrase that draws attention down the map, ever more south. Obscured by these south-focused narratives and by discussions of chattel slavery’s role in buttressing the economy thanks to large-scale free labor³ are the many variations the “peculiar institution” took in the north. These include the slavery-based economies of Rhode Island, which combined trans-Atlantic slave trade (slaves and sugar) and ancillary services (cheap fabric, distilleries)⁴ with enslaved labor in small-scale agriculture, industry, and trade in New York and New Jersey, among other northern states.⁵ The educational and public history messaging many contemporary people hear, in fact, is that a journey north—for runaways, for enslaved people
traveling with a master—was a journey toward freedom. Just as being sold “down the river” was very much a bad fate, this messaging implies that riding the Underground Railroad north meant freedom for enslaved people just as they crossed the Mason-Dixon line, the surveyed border between north and south. But this “north to freedom” narrative elides many complex racial ideologies as well as the complexities of abolitionism, and until recently many northern historic sites have shied away from presenting such messages and any artifacts of northern slavery. Such stories would disrupt the “north to freedom” narrative, disturb tourists who visit a historic house expecting to admire period furniture, and discomfit museum administrators. The “tough stuff of history” can be difficult to present to an unsuspecting general public.

I look at embodied tourist performance in the space of the historic site as one way for history museums to present this history. While history museums might employ costumed first-person interpreters to interact with visitors or construct second-person interpretations that offer activities and proscribed actions for visitors to try, sites that engage tourists by creating a sort of space-based embodied performance in the built environment can use movement and narrative to help these visitors be receptive to difficult history. Few museums might be willing or able to take an immersive role-playing approach like that of Connor Prairie, but the creation of spaces and conditions that allow tourists to physically enact the daily living and working habits of the enslaved (and other inhabitants) through active engagement with their material culture can help move visitors to empathetic engagement and at least partial acceptance of new narratives about place. Dominika Lasker explains Polish performance artist Jerzy Grotowski’s theory of acting as the use of bodily movement to uncover memory and find meaning. The body holds memories of the past, and the actor’s movement can help release these memories and recover meaning. For example, South Carolina’s now-closed Slave Relic Museum encouraged visitors to handle or
even wear the slave shackles in its display, feeling their weight and their effect on bodily movement, as one material-based way of creating historical understanding and empathy.  

In this paper, I consider how tourist performance— provisionally defined as embodied experiences—at northern historical sites can help visitors engage with the difficult legacy of slavery, which has traditionally been ignored, hidden, or inadequately interpreted. The built environment of the museum can provide insight into the conditions of past lives of such venues, and help visitors create empathy for the historical other. As secretary of the Smithsonian Lonnie Bunch writes, “history must tell the unvarnished truth.” In addition to a survey of literature on museums, the changing nature of historical interpretation about slavery at museums, and a consideration of built space and somatic knowledge, I develop a case study involving a Slave Dwelling Project sleepover at Morven Museum and Garden in Princeton, New Jersey. I conclude with an attempt to explore the potential for such an approach, and a discussion of implications for museums and visitors.

General statements can be made about slavery in the north and in the south, but each individual historical site has a unique history due to nuances of geography, ownership, religious beliefs, and more. Focusing on both the general trends and the particular instances helps create a nuanced image of each site, and also provides context. Although the particular conditions of enslavement varied by plantation and state, slavery in the south can very broadly be considered agricultural, with large numbers of enslaved people performing similar work in the fields. In the north, however, because of the greater number and types of abolitionist movements, the more varied economies, and the early establishment of a racial virtue discourse establishing “white” as “good,” slavery took different forms and was governed by a variety of narratives. As several scholars have noted, northern slavery also developed a nuanced economic form that both
perpetuated and supported slavery.\textsuperscript{16} It not only traded people and used them for labor, but also participated in a sub-industry of supply and administration. Christy Clark-Pujara notes that Rhode Island served as a major base for ships (manufacturing and as a harbor) engaged in the trans-Atlantic slave trade, and became deeply embedded in something like a service industry supporting slavery, manufacturing many goods used in its administration. Enslaved people in New York built infrastructure, such as roads; worked on farms; and were bought, sold, and rented as investments.\textsuperscript{17} In New Jersey, enslaved people worked on farms of various sizes, but also worked as builders, craftsmen, in animal husbandry, and in industry.\textsuperscript{18} Slavery also thrived in urban areas, as Clifford Ellis and Rebecca Ginsburg write, noting dynamics in mid-Atlantic states such as Virginia.\textsuperscript{19} Because this more varied engagement with slavery prevents the development of a single narrative, it is difficult to create a single image, such as the south’s iconic (and fictional) Tara. It also makes the localized specifics of northern slavery important to interpret for a contemporary audience. E. Arnold Modlin Jr. notes that in historical education, people trust museums more than teachers, and this authority is grounded in the material culture of the specific location, the place history happened. The material culture of the museum, however, from its built environment to its artifacts, makes the history that is portrayed look natural, unmediated. This “natural” look, the illusion that “this is how things really were,” obscures the work of the curator, the deliberately constructed, pre-interpreted nature of museum displays.\textsuperscript{20} This makes the deliberate, localized development of exhibits at small, locally oriented history museums that interpret time periods coincident with slavery even more important.

Exhibits at such places can change local understanding of history and place. James Banner writes that we engage with history to “discover meaning in the past and create meaning in the present.”\textsuperscript{21} Public historians formulate these present meanings with the public good in
mind, to educate and bolster an informed democracy. Edward A. Chappell pushes for a public history that attends to social history, to the lives of all people, not only elites: a history that tells us not only how buttons are attached to a chair, but where the materials came from and who attached those buttons—as well as who sat in the chair. Visitors absorb the narratives of the place in the space that history happened; the space they move through creates the experience, and influences how and what they “learn” while they are there. Dean MacCannell writes that tourists are concerned with “heritage and tradition.” In this formulation, space is implicit: We travel to sites of history to be “in” that history. But in MacCannell’s theorization, although tourist sites can be superficial, tourists themselves are looking for authenticity, the “truth” of a place. In presenting a social history, an “excavated” space, history museums can help visitors find not “the truth” but many truths, the multifaceted strands of history that encountered each other in a single place. Theresa Singleton points out that focusing on one strand of the history of a site or object does not preclude the development of other narratives about the same site; the various people who lived in the place all made a mark and should be included in interpretation.

In the last few decades, many American historical sites have begun to tell the stories not just of the “great men,” but also, as best they can considering the extant evidence, the stories of enslaved people who lived in the same spaces. These tourist sites are finding new stories and new ways to tell them, as a way of rectifying the “symbolic annihilation” of enslaved people’s material culture. Despite the “absence of material structures,” museums should, says Jorge L. Giovanetti, “take into account the enslaved…it is a moral imperative to speak out, and represent, the relations of power and socio-racial inequality that ruled in plantation society in order to understand the unequal racial relations in the Americas today.” Scott Magelssen also calls for museums to engage present-day social justice: “if [museum experience] does not offer strategies
for conducting one’s behavior and working for justice in the present, it falls short.”31 These writers want to bring power dynamics to the fore, retrieving social history while downplaying heroic individual stories,32 and use artifacts as tools to “excavate the realities” of all lives. Derek Alderman and Rachel Campbell hope to push past the “symbolic annihilation”33 of history, where uncomfortable stories are simply not told, even in the face of evidence that enslaved people worked and lived on a site.34 They argue for an “artifacts politics” recognizing that artifact preservation has a history of bias and that a single artifact can have multiple histories. They look for memory work, the “excavation” of stories, the “active construction and representation of the past.”35

Such interpretations seek to find a way to create a narrative with enslaved people as actors, people in the fullest sense, with lives, relationships, and hopes. The use of built space, the houses, outbuildings, and landscapes that survive, can help tourists build a concept of what lives were like, since, as Dumas writes, spaces and housing shape culture. As she puts it, houses are “a literal framework for our daily, intimate lives” and therefore, documenting and studying slave dwellings can “help us understand the very formation of African-American culture.”36 In contrast, Robert Weyeneth writes that the “architecture of racial segregation,” the built spaces that separate and control movement of certain designated groups, reveals ideology. To build space is to build culture—and in a sense, to enter the space, even at historical remove is to experience that culture and its assumptions.37 This preservation of culture makes the preservation of such spaces, from slave dwellings to Civil Rights–era buildings, a significant part of recovering and recognizing the variegated histories inherent in a single structure, of recognizing the different bodies that have lived and moved through specific places.
Katherine Johnson notes that traditional history’s adherence to archival sources and dismissal of somatic knowledge correlates to a neglect of marginal populations, “writing them out of history.” Experience is a type of knowledge, an interpretive lens, she says. Similarly, Magelssen claims that one value of second-person interpretation, wherein the visitor “acts” as a historical person, is that “bodily experience can do a much better job than visual or textual communication in connecting twenty-first-century individuals with the material existences of their counterparts in the past.” Museums that create ways for visitors to experience the lived, physical realities of enslaved people can, through this bodily movement, create new knowledge and understanding.

Tourists in the space perform as the built environment enjoins them to do, and this creates performative conformity to the ideologies embedded in architecture. The built environment of slavery created a system of control; therefore the built experience of slavery tourism can replicate this feeling, but in an effort to educate visitors and reveal new narratives of local history. Alderman and Campbell write that “the body itself can be viewed as…a medium for (re)writing the history of slavery.” Museums can, for example, build on Rebecca Ginsberg’s insight that masters and slaves developed distinct cognitive orders based on their orientation to the world: while masters had full access to all roads and places, providing them with something like a view from above, enslaved people were embedded in the landscape, with limited geographic cues, a perspective that kept them from traveling freely and escaping. How people inhabit space influences how they know the world and how they can act in it. Inhabiting the space of another can help in understanding, in creating empathy. Entering the historical space of a person can create somatic knowledge and open the door to future historical learning and engagement, by, as Banner wrote, “creating meaning in the present.”
By creating both the built environment of the past and the conditions for visitors to physically enact the daily lives of the real historical people who lived and worked in those spaces, museums can open new pathways into history. I experienced one such moment at the Slave Dwelling Project’s visit to Princeton, New Jersey’s Morven Museum and Garden in October 2018.

The house that would become known as Morven was, according to the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS), built in 1758 near what was then known as Prince-town, New Jersey. A two-story structure made of brick, it was built in the Palladian style by Richard Stockton, the first of five generations of Stocktons to live in the house and the father of Richard “The Signer” Stockton, whose nickname marks him as the signer of the Declaration of Independence. George Tatum, writing on Morven’s architecture, says that the use of the Palladian style in early America demonstrates the milieu of a landed, wealthy, family. In a letter, Richard Stockton referred to Morven as a plantation dwelling, which reflects his self-conception as a “gentleman who directed the farming of extensive lands by slaves on a scale common enough in England but usually associated in this country with the Southern states….this area seems to have shared in the plantation economy of the South to an extent which has not always been recognized.”

Richard the Signer also owned people, but curators have not been able to determine how many or to find all their names. One source estimates that the household included as many as 10 enslaved people, plus indentured servants, but because of several fires and many rounds of renovation and remodeling that destroyed records, the particulars of the house’s history are uncertain. Due to the location of a brick oven in what is now called the West Wing, however, it
is believed that this was the first section built, and current museum administration believe
enslaved people slept in this area. Morven first opened as a museum in 1982 and was remodeled in 2004, with an
interpretation that focused, as current executive director Jill Barry notes, on the “the patriarchs,”
the generations of Stockton men and, very secondarily, their families. Barry came to Morven in
2016, having discussed plans for a reinterpretation of the Morven story with stakeholders during
her interview process. The new interpretation, spearheaded by Barry, includes all people who
lived at Morven, including servants and enslaved and indentured people.

Part of the grand reopening of the first-floor exhibit in 2018 featured a visit by Joseph
McGill, founder of the Slave Dwelling Project (SDP), plus an overnight stay for about eight
people. McGill, an African-American Civil War reenactor and part-time tour guide at South
Carolina’s Magnolia Plantation, travels throughout the United States holding these “sleepovers”
at historic sites, and this was his first in New Jersey. These sleepovers began as an effort to raise
awareness of the need for preservation of slave dwellings, but currently McGill seems just as
interested in creating dialogue among participants. Part of the effort is having museum visitors
experience the space of the enslaved, to be “in the place” and therefore create understanding.

Sleeping in a slave dwelling creates a performance, an embodied empathy across time. Of
course, no one can understand what it was like to be enslaved in early America, but the SDP
offers one way to gain this perspective: to experience the material circumstances of a discrete
place where enslaved people lived, to see what their conditions were like, to see where they kept
their possessions, watched their children, and carried out all the small actions of life. Alderman
and Campbell write that symbolic excavation, the “process of moving the enslaved from the
realm of being forgotten to the realm of being remembered and recognized publicly…Excavation
requires, of course, a greater emphasis on talking about the enslaved as important historical actors.” 55 Similarly, Elizabeth Chew notes that Montpelier’s exhibit on slavery took as a priority a mandate to emphasize “the humanity of enslaved people.” 56

I took part in a Slave Dwelling Project sleepover at Morven in October 2018. The sleepover was part of a weekend of events focused on the new interpretation including enslaved people. It began with a walking tour of segregated Princeton and ended with a breakfast the morning after the sleepover. Other events included self-guided tours of the exhibit, a dinner, a talk by Joe McGill, and a campfire conversation among community people, Morven staff, and the “sleepers.” McGill says “sleeping is easy; conversations are hard,” and the campfire conversation demonstrated this. The group was mostly white and middle class, local to the Princeton-Lawrenceville area, and included several people who described themselves as racially mixed. Although we were gathered around a fire on the grounds of a history museum, drawn to the spot by a history of slavery, the conversations were focused on the present: legacies of slavery, segregation, and servitude; racial incidents; personal stories of discovering dark truths about slavery; questions about educating students and others about the realities of the nation’s past. Rather than feeling haunted, the people engaging with issues around history focused on the future.

The sleepover took place in the West Wing, and there were eight sleepers. The original brick cooking fireplace is visible through a glass-covered opening in the plaster walls, but little else brought indicated that enslaved people had lived and worked there, and in fact, it is not certain where in the house or on the property enslaved people lived, according to Barry. 57 Against Alderman and Campbell’s call for excavation, the venue seemed stripped of material culture. However, awakening in the predawn hours amid other sleeping or semi-sleeping bodies,
watching the light gradually increase outside the window, and thinking about rolling up my bedding and entering a busy day, I tried to imagine what it might be like several hundred years before, to be in the same space, to see the same light growing outside, to think about stoking a fire in the brick oven. I also thought about what it might have been like to be the mistress of the house: Would she have been attuned to the waking of her human possessions, hearing them rekindle the fire, haul water, talk to each other? Another participant reflected: “To sleep in a place where one knows that enslaved people slept, even after all of the work that was done to downplay and erase these peoples’ existences and their experiences, felt triumphant and transformational in some small way.” The space and the circumstances were at once highly evocative and revealing of my personal ignorance, as well as the difficulty, temptations, and necessities in making connections across time. Although I emerged from the sleepover with questions, it had intensified my awareness of the complex history of the site.

Being in the space of the people of the past at a museum helps a visitor visualize and “feel” the historical experience. Modlin makes a case for a “spatial curation” wherein attention to the segregated or differently used areas of a plantation house or estate can provide visitors with insight into the perspective of the enslaved. What might it be like to wake up in a slave cabin, to repeatedly carry water from the pump to the kitchen, to walk from cabin to field, to suffer physical punishments and indignities? Attention to the “spatial ideology,” the assumptions embedded in the built environment, as Weyeneth indicates, creates a new narrative. Spending time in a place creates the somatic knowledge that helps tourists envision the history they thought they knew a little differently. Magelssen believes second-person interpretation, the “hands-on activities and programming offered by living history museums through which visitors may try out various practices,” will provide visitors with “agency in determining the trajectory of
their encounter with history.” Sleeping in a slave dwelling, feeling the weight of shackles, physically encountering the relics of slavery, and occupying the built space of history engages tourists in an experiential way and helps them “witness” uncomfortable history. Visitors can enter the slave dwelling as tourists, but occupying the space from the slave perspective can let them change the narrative. Aided by interpretation at the site, visitors can use the spatial experience and knowledge of the site—both intimate and personal yet public and cultural—to construct a new kind of narrative of the site and of slavery in the United States. Less overarching than the image of Tara and the plantation big house, it might prove to be more personal and present to those who have engaged with the spaces people of all kinds lived and acted.

Michel-Rolph Trouillot writes about the production of history, how it is told and re-told according to the needs of the present and according to who is doing the telling. “Historical representations,” he writes, “must establish a relationship to knowledge.” During a period in which historical understandings are changing—from the patriarchs to the people, as it were—it’s to the task of interpretation to ask: Why this change, now? Dean MacCannell’s image of the global tourist involves a sort of postmodern ungrounding of history. Tourist sites can be obviously inauthentic, MacCannell says, but he claims tourists find authenticity in the fact that performances are staged. Authenticity engages us as actors and narrators; in the space of the museum, tourists are both. A kind of bodily engagement with history museums opens visitors to new stories, and lets museums tell stories that help people participate in “difficult conversations.” The space of history helps ground the experience (along with archives and context). Enacting history in the built environment reaches into what might be considered “reality” to excavate all the actors in history, especially those symbolically annihilated by a traditional focus on the patriarchs and the masters.
The space of the plantation museum, writes Julia Rose, replicates inequality just as the plantation itself did; the slave cabins remain at a remove, the people who lived in them anonymous, in contrast to the residents of the main house. But recognizing that people lived there shows a growing awareness of an “integrated identity.” Writing of Colonial Williamsburg, Valerie Casey echoes MacCannell, Rose, and Trouillot, noting that visitors enjoy the “uncrumbling” of the museum display, the revelation of the inauthentic, the constructedness of not just the museum but also of history. This “unmasking” of power helps build a new narrative. While Morven’s new interpretation does not eliminate narratives of the patriarchs, it does add more lives and names to the site’s history and to the understanding of the locality. The Slave Dwelling Project offers the dialogic space to re-envision the enslaved lives and recontextualize the patriarchs’ narrative. As Elizabeth Chew says in writing of president James Madison’s Virginia plantation, Montpelier, and Alderman and Campbell write of excavating objects of slavery, museums interpreting slavery want to create an encounter with humanity, the people who lived in the space and used the objects. Incorporating bodily performance into a visitor’s experience of a historical site might help achieve this.
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