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ABSTRACT

This thesis explores the process of facilitating the creation of a community museum in Chiquilá, Quintana Roo, Mexico. The growing presence of tourists travelling to Holbox Island, achieved by going through Chiquilá’s port, makes this project timely. Working with the Proyecto Costa Escondida (PCE), the Chiquilá Community Museum Project (CCMP) aspires to identify the dynamic relationship between the coastal inhabitants and the changing landscape, both past and present, through scientific investigations and local knowledge and make this knowledge accessible to the public. It is the accumulation of information through aforementioned means that allow us to collaborate with the Chiquilá community and other regional stakeholders to create a museum exhibit that aspires to do three things: empower the local population through collaboration, serve the community as a reliable source of information, and provide an adaptable and manageable platform for sustainable development. While this project focuses on the initial stages of this process, it is foundational for the development of the Chiquilá community museum.
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1 INTRODUCTION

This thesis is part of the Proyecto Costa Escondida (PCE), an interdisciplinary research project directed by Jeffrey Glover and Dominique Rissolo. The PCE is collaborative in nature and seeks to investigate the nature between coastal inhabitants and the natural environment of Mexico’s Yucatán Peninsula (Figure 1). As part of PCE and in collaboration with Tim Murtha and Nathania Martinez of the University of Florida (UF), I worked on launching a community museum in Chiquilá, Quintana Roo, Mexico. This thesis discusses the steps involved in getting this project off the ground as well as provides some foundational ideas about museum content, although I recognize that the final decisions about museum content should be driven by community interests (Figure 2).

The modern fishing town of Chiquilá is located on the north coast of the Yucatan Peninsula (Figure 2), in an area known as the Yalahau region (see Figure 1). It is at the center of this town that the Chiquilá Tourist Parador Project (CTPP) was designed to include: a center building on the glorieta (roundabout), a small park, and what is now the alcaldia (mayor’s building). Following the completion of construction, the opportunity arose in May of 2018 to propose the Chiquilá Community Museum Project (CCMP). This came after a series of meetings with the National Institute of Anthropology and History (INAH), the National Commission of Natural Protected Areas (CONANP), the Municipality of Lazaro Cardenas, the state office of the Secretary of Tourism (SEDETUR), and the Mayor of Chiquilá. Since then, the project has gone through phases of slow movements and quick progressions, which I discuss here.
Figure 1 Location of the Yalahau Region (after Glover 2012: 272)

Figure 2 The Yalahau Region with sites and modern towns (after Glover 2012: 273)
1.1 Outline of this Thesis

Chapter 2 discusses the theoretical foundation for this thesis. Although highly interconnected, this chapter is broken down into three main topics: community or public archaeology, tourism, and museums. Since the large-scale development of Cancun on the Yucatan Peninsula beginning in the 1970s, tourism has been the largest contributor to the region’s economy. Understanding and acknowledging both the positive and negative effects of tourism and its various forms is significant to this thesis. Tourism development and the commodification of culture and heritage is not something that can be avoided in this part of Mexico. However, we can raise awareness and facilitate in the production of more sustainable practices in places like Chiquilá.

Chapter 3 provides the historical background of the Yucatan Peninsula, the Yalahau region, and Chiquilá. An introduction to Proyecto Costa Escondida (PCE) offers a brief insight to the investigations behind the culture history of Chiquilá and its legacy in the present. The following sections are then discussed chronologically from earliest evidence of human occupation, Spanish contact, to modern times. The more recent history, late 19th Century to now, is emphasized due to its impact on the current socio-political environment and our interactions with the various stakeholders.

Chapter 4 is an overview of the methods implemented before and during my project. This section identifies the various stakeholders within the project, the collaborative work with Tim Murtha and Nathania Martinez from the University of Florida (UF), and the forms of community engagement that we’ve utilized. Chapter 5 discusses the community museum project in more detail and presents the results from the methods we’ve employed. It includes information about the interactions with the identified stakeholders, the stories of engaging various members of the Chiquilá community, as well as the creative process of the Chiquilá Community Museum Project.
This chapter also breaks down the content for each of the proposed space(s) and discusses the thematic categories and associated content experts who will hopefully contribute to the project.

The final chapter offers my concluding remarks about this process and the future of the project. While this project documents and contributes to the initial stages of the Chiquilá Community Museum Project (CCMP), it by no means presents a finished product. The process of this museum project will be long and arduous, but one that will hopefully be fulfilling for all involved.
2 THEORY

2.1 Introduction

This project is about building a community museum in Chiquilá, Quintana Roo, Mexico using the knowledge gained from the PCE archaeological research, ecological knowledge from other scientists, and oral history of the community. My research is interdisciplinary in nature and thus draws on methods from applied and public archaeology, museum studies, and literature from tourism anthropology, among other fields. The final product contributes to the discussion on community-based museums, public engagement, tourism, and decolonizing practices.

In this section, I clearly define the following topics, as they are related to or used in my project: heritage tourism, development, archaeotourism, public engagement, community archaeology, applied archaeology, and community-based participatory research. These terms each have a distinct meaning that differentiates their placement within this thesis. To complement these terms and topics, I made a conscious effort to draw on case studies from Latin America, often close to Chiquilá, when I was able. While tourism is a cross-cultural phenomenon, the ways in which it has developed in Mesoamerica provides a more consistent and analogous set of examples for this thesis.

With a growing interest to partake in the tourism industry, communities have, at times, altered their towns to conform to a commercialized and standardized aesthetic. While this development may initially bring an influx of cash, discrepancies in who actually benefits from it are revealed over time (Walker 2009: 48). Development is thus not always seen as a positive thing and does have considerable dangers without proper management plans in place. Negative side effects become apparent through things like mismanaged or unsustainable tourism services and practices, lack of infrastructural development, or the homogenization of identity to name a few.
The homogeneity of a national identity can be ascertained through a critical examination of heritage tourism, which is premised on the commodification of a shared cultural heritage to make a profit (Muñoz-Fernández 2015: 70).

In contrast, public archaeology works with communities to determine more sustainable ways of benefiting from heritage tourism based on their interests. Public archaeology has thus emerged as a practice to collaborate with communities, educate the public and promote education with locals instead of for them (Bollwerk et al. 2015: 179). For this project, public archaeology is defined as the sharing of archaeological interpretations with the public (Atalay 2012: 50). While public archaeology is similar to community archaeology in that it engages the community, neither are necessarily community driven nor based on the equitable sharing of authority (Atalay 2012: 51). Community-based participatory research (CBPR), on the other hand, employs decolonizing methodologies to produce knowledge through equitable partnerships with the community (Atalay 2012: 11). Much like CBPR, applied archaeology aims to utilize emancipatory praxis through dialogues between insider-participants and outsider-consultants. Community involvement and collaboration in projects is thus a significant methodology in community-based research and applied projects.

Although this thesis mainly centers on the initial phases of the Chiquilá Community Museum Project (CCMP), this work can help raise awareness about the dangers of development and can aid in the implementation of sustainable and adaptable management plans. The CCMP has many stakeholders, each with a different level of authority and available resources. Due to the current socio-political situation that exists in Chiquilá, my goal is to provide a comprehensive proposal that could be implemented if the community decides to do so and provide an adaptable outline for future academics who may wish to pursue similar lines of work.
2.2 Anthropology of Tourism

Tourism is a cross-cultural, commercial industry that has become an important component of the global economy. It has become easier for people and nations to participate in tourism as technology has eased the barriers between language and transportation. Over the past three decades, anthropologists have begun to study tourism in its own right; how it has emerged around the world, and its impact on places and people. Amanda Stronza (2001: 262) suggests the current literature is conceptually divided into two parts: one that centers on the origins of tourism, focusing its studies on tourists; while the other analyzes the impacts of tourism and centers on locals. This results in a partial analysis that reflects the disciplinary biases towards focusing on the negative impacts of tourism, instead of providing a holistic approach that addresses both positive and negative influences that it can have for communities. Like many other large-scale development projects, tourism provides a variety of pros and cons.

2.2.1 Heritage Tourism

A byproduct of tourism can be commodification of local heritage, culture, and traditions. Heritage is a component of the industry that drives sectors of the tourist economy globally. This can be seen in popular tourist cities like Rome and Paris, which have and continue to benefit from their unique heritage. Heritage tourism in commercially developed cities like Cancun, Mexico promotes two converging narratives, Maya heritage and its Caribbean location (Muñoz-Fernández 2015: 70). Coinciding significantly with the established “sun, sea, sand, and sex” tourist attractions (Walker 2009: 37), these narratives have been fetishized and presented to the public in order to actively and prominently participate in the global economy. In tourist destinations like Cancun, the homogenization of heritage as an objectified entity can overwhelm the viewer to the point of indifference, lowering the perceived market value and increasing commercial competition and
intensity. In this way, the Mexican hotspot trivializes Maya heritage and transforms it into an affordable product used to entertain and attract foreign capital (Muñoz-Fernández 2015: 70). This can be seen when visiting Chichen Itza with vendors that line the walkways, selling almost identical items and marketing them as if their origins are as homogenous as the current commercialized Maya heritage and history.

Although tourism has been lauded as a catalyst for facilitating the development of unrecognized areas into thriving service-based economies, it has also introduced new social problems. In some cases, tourism disregards the education, health, and welfare needs of the local populations and has been associated with environmental degradation, luxury spending, and overcrowding. Tourism has thus evolved into a pioneer of neocolonialism (Stronza 2001: 268; Walker 2009: 101). Development and preservation are significant to the discussion on tourism because they are the foundation for the type of tourism that will take place. Archaeological site development and preservation are thus complex processes that require time, patience, funding, a diverse group of collaborators, and the knowledge to do so while also preserving and conserving any cultural material remains that exist in a place. These cultural material remains include, but are not limited to ceramics, tools, building structures, and burials. Issues concerning heritage tourism become more convoluted when local communities collide with the interests of outside developers and initiatives.

Driven by the global market for wealthier audiences, heritage tourism can be a romanticized endeavor that pressures museums, archaeologists, local communities, and heritage sites, bringing about “feelings of estrangement[s], alienation and identification that are pivotal to the touristic experience” (Herrera et al. 2013: 276). In Peru, there are rising concerns within the community about the environmental sustainability of tourism as overcrowding and site
mismanagement become serious issues (Herrera et al. 2013: 285). These concerns became reality in Keushu, Peru. Keushu is a glacial lake that is surrounded by monumental ceremonial and mortuary architecture, dating back to the Initial Period (ca. 2000-900 BCE) (Herrera et al. 2013: 287). In 2006, the director of the local Natural History Museum spearheaded an initiative that had an Inca re-enactment ceremony at its core despite the site having no known relationship to the empire (Herrera et al. 2013: 287). The reinvented ritual was called Raymi Killa, a reference to the Cusco Inti Raymi religious ceremony honoring the Inca sun god (Herrera et al. 2013: 287).

The program was formed by the creation of alliances with certain families, bypassing the official community leadership and relied heavily on the sector of Huarca that claims Keushu as part of its territory (Herrera et al. 2013: 287). The results challenged the preconceived viability of the enterprise and failed to take into consideration the history and role of Keushu as a major ceremonial site as well as its relationship to the local community groups (Herrera et al. 2013: 288). Performers and equipment were brought in from outside the community, which resulted in limited job opportunities and spurred local indifference. In fact, the festival was only held twice and ultimately failed as an initiative (Herrera et al. 2013: 288). The deliberate use of an unassociated ancient ceremony at an archaeological site shows how the development of heritage tourism is not always positive. In the case of Keushu, locals became indifferent to the initiative and increased intra-community divisions by neglecting to contact local dancers and musicians, forbidding the sale of chicha maize beer, and ignoring official community leadership. The lesson to draw from this case study is that without the involvement or interest of locals, heritage tourism in smaller communities are less likely to succeed.
2.2.2 *Archaeotourism*

Archaeotourism, or archaeological tourism, is defined as the visitation of archaeological sites as part of a person’s tourist activities (Griffith and Griffith 2012: 524). Unlike heritage tourism which commodifies heritage for profit, archaeotourism aims to promote and encourage public interest in archaeology and the preservation of sites, material remains, and history. As a facilitator in promoting or assisting in the conversion of heritage sites into tourist attractions, archaeology can be used as a powerful tool to construct systems of meaning that connects the past to the present (Brighton 2011: 345). This is especially apparent in Mexico, where the appropriation of ancient monuments and archaeological sites have been made into the national Mexican history instead of indigenous history (Ardren 2002: 380). The misuse and misrepresentation of their ancestors in the country’s broader narrative has disconnected descendent groups from their heritage (Castañeda 1997: 129; Ardren 2002: 380).

With the establishment of the Mexican state’s tourism ministry (FONATUR) in the 1960’s, the industry has drastically expanded and has demonstrated a willingness and ambition to pursue tourism development, and despite opposition, with little local involvement (Ardren 2002: 384-85). It is encouraged by the states on the Yucatan Peninsula, because it is the surest way to receive infrastructural support from the government and has potential economic benefits that accompany it (Ardren 2002: 385). Although these are influential incentives, tourism initiatives run the risk of suspending local culture into an idealized ethnographic present or an overly romanticized past (Griffith and Griffith 2012: 523) and raises ethical issues among anthropologists.

While the tourism industry in the Yucatan Peninsula is largely based on a heavily commercialized form of Maya cultural heritage, it is something imposed upon by the state and not necessarily initiated on a local level (Ardren 2002: 385). The Pakbeh Regional Economy Program
(PREP) is an archaeological project situated in Chunchucmil, a Classic Maya urban center in northwestern Yucatan, Mexico. While the project was originally concerned with studying the nature of an ancient Maya trading enclave, it has shifted to a more collaborative plan of research and development using academic archaeological inquiry as a foundation from which to generate tourism within local communities (Ardren 2002: 380). The modern village of Chunchucmil is made up of four ejidos (communal land grants): Kochol, primarily agricultural with farmer shifting from traditional crops like maize to cash crops like papayas; Coahuila and San Mateo are small agricultural communities with less active use of their ejido lands; and Halacho, located a bit farther from the ruins of Chunchucmil and mainly uses their lands for the pasturage of range cattle (Ardren 2002: 383). While the ejido communities of Chunchucmil were originally interested in the wages for project assistants, dialogues emerged with village elders and interested community members about what happens on archaeological projects and who ultimately benefits (Ardren 2002: 386).

Conversations such as these abandon the traditional dynamic of academic authority in favor of a more balanced dialogue in which everyone present is entitled to an opinion (Ardren 2002: 386). By going a step further to share with and include community members in the process of producing archaeological knowledge, they foster more meaningful interactions and a profound sense of trust. Their research and excavation strategies have been shaped by on-going dialogues between the Pakbeh project and community members of Chunchucmil to focus their excavations on the consolidation of household groups. This was deemed as the best chance to attract tourism as no other Maya tourist sites demonstrates the experience of day to day life (Ardren 2002: 388).

Following this came the suggestion of a living museum. Residents would, on a rotational basis, spend time “living” in reconstructed residential mounds. This would not only provide a basis for a thorough modern exploration of an ancient Maya household, it would make significant
contributions to the discussions about explaining and translating the concept of tourism to the community (Ardren 2002: 390). The living museum has potential to expand on local understandings of who tourists are or what they might pay to see and could provide a new form of interaction with them. The Pakbeh project’s collaboration in sharing and generating archaeological knowledge alongside the creation of a living museum shows how archaeology connects present Indigenous Maya communities to past sites and peoples, and how collaborative research can positively impact local communities.

2.2.3 Tourism as Major Determinant for Change

The adverse side effects of tourism are not just limited to heritage and culture but can also physically impact archaeological sites. The consequences of reckless development are clearly seen at two large cave sites in the Dominican Republic: Cueva de las Maravillas and Cueva Borbón. Lacking proper government involvement, human remains were removed from the former cave in the interest of making the site more accessible to tourists. Despite protests, modifications were made that included: cement walkways, an artificial lake and stream, floodlights, an electric lighting system, an elevator, a marble floor, and multiple skylights (Griffith and Griffith 2012: 527). This treatment interfered with the site’s qualifications for the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) recognition, threatened the cultural patrimony of the Dominican Republic, and irrevocably altered the nature of the cave environment and the historical record (Griffith and Griffith 2012: 526).

Initiatives were in place to begin similar development at the second cave, however photos of the changes were taken and revealed to the public and the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS). The development program at Cueva Borbón was quickly terminated when it received a critical mass of negative feedback / publicity, neither cave has ever been opened for
tourism (Griffith and Griffith 2012: 529). Although the project was ambitiously conceived, it accurately illustrates how poor execution and uninformed development can affect the integrity of an archaeological site and any present or future research. The unsustainable and damaging nature of the cave’s modifications proves that a project must be careful with constructions lest they severely damage a site to the point that it is unable to be accurately displayed or even open.

Similar concerns have arisen with the cenotes and caves in eastern Quintana Roo, Mexico. In many ancient towns, cenotes were often the sole source of water and on occasion, there are still remains of miniature temples inside these sacred places. These cave shrines sites reside in one of the most rapidly expanding tourism zones in North America, placing many of the archaeological structures in danger (Rissolo et al. 2017: 613). The development of the environment as a tourist attraction has caused thousands of years’ worth of artifacts to be removed from cenotes in order to make them more swimmable (pers. comm. Rissolo, April 2019). Some sites are even being blasted or jackhammered to make way for stairways or paths, similar to modification made in Cueva de las Maravillas. This serves as a contrast to heritage tourism. In this case, heritage is purposely being destroyed or displaced for the intention of providing active or outdoor tourist services, like swimming or ziplining. These services, in conjunction with the more mainstream ones like visiting archaeological sites, is meant to capture a broader audience and thus increase cash flow.

While not as destructive for the natural environment and archaeological resources, another failed initiative occurred in Solferino (Figure 2) with the Puerta Verde (Green Door) cooperative. Founded in 1996, Green Door brought together seven communities, 250 direct beneficiaries, and twelve organized groups between Cobá and Holbox Island to promote sustainable tourism and protect the area’s natural and cultural resources (Glover et al. 2012: 515). Four of the seven communities include Solferino and its closest neighbors: Chiquilá, San Angel, and Holbox. The
goal was to promote sustainable tourism in the area that would help better protect the cultural and natural resources (Glover et al. 2012: 516). Strongly promoted by a non-profit organization based in Cancun, there were several cooperatives in Chiquilá affiliated with the Green Door initiative that utilized environmental tourism to generate profit (Glover et al. 2012: 515). This alternative form of tourism took advantage of the Yum Balam Protected Area but lacked tourism infrastructure and neglected the region’s archaeological sites (Glover et al. 2012: 516-17). Despite the initial agreement and interest in the cooperative, *Puerta Verde* seemingly failed due to limited or lack of equitable sharing of funds.

Holbox Island and the people that live there have also been greatly affected by the development of tourism. A recent study by Rubio-Cisneros and colleagues (2019) discusses how the Yucatan Peninsula’s growing anthropization threatens the coastal habitats and resources. The population on Holbox Island (Holbox) and the port of Chiquilá increased in the 1960’s when the government began organizing people into cooperatives (Rubio-Cisneros et al. 2019: 12). In the 1980’s, Chiquilá’s population grew when Mexico experienced an agricultural crisis that encouraged human coastal migration to exploit fishing and generate income (Rubio-Cisneros et al. 2019: 12). Population growth due to migration has increased the number of active fishers which has in turn led to a widespread “race to fish” that has depleted the local resources (Rubio-Cisneros et al. 2019: 16).

The fishermen who were interviewed identified tourism as a major determinant for change in the following four ways (Rubio-Cisneros et al. 2019: 13). The first being the growing demand of fishery resources. Fish species previously considered unfavored have since gained commercial significance during peak tourist seasons (Rubio-Cisneros et al. 2019: 13-14). They are used to prepare “ceviche” mainly for the tourists that go on whale shark tours. Second, the rapid
development of tourism on Holbox Island has generated a series of socio-environmental and landscape threats. These threats include water pollution, excessive plastic trash, toxic wastes, loss of the natural environment due to development, and more (Rubio-Cisneros et al. 2019: 14). This has contributed to the decrease in Holbox’s fishery resources.

The third way tourism is affecting life on Holbox is through the tourism jobs that are emerging on Holbox for fishers. The problem is that these jobs as boat captains, crew members, or whale shark swimming guides are mainly seasonal (Rubio-Cisneros et al. 2019: 14). Year-round employment comes in the form of “classic tours” which takes tourists to Yalahau’s iconic sites. Fishers commonly alternate these classic tours with fishing and there are some who work part-time as golf cart taxi drivers on the island (Rubio-Cisneros et al. 2019: 14). Fourth and finally, tourism development has affected the evolution of sociocultural values. The major conflicts revolve around the issue of selling communal land (ejido), a decision supported more strongly by young islanders than the older generations. This has created generational disparities in the valuation of money and given rise to new conflicts within the community, among families, and with government authorities (Rubio-Cisneros et al. 2019: 15).

Due to the limited governance, lack of fisheries stewardship by the community, and weak government enforcement, the authors recommend the establishment of management plans on Holbox Island for tourism and urban development (Rubio-Cisneros et al. 2019: 17). The development occurring on Holbox sets a precedence for tourism development in Chiquilá and towns in similar locations. If tourism continues to develop the way it has for the past 30 years, the exploitation of the coast’s cultural and natural landscape and the island’s environment will continue to decline. Rubio-Cisneros et al.’s (2019: 18) article highlights the increasing awareness
of the island’s growing environmental crisis and raises the possibility for better marine management policies that can contribute to positive conservation measures.

2.3 Archaeological Practice and the Public

2.3.1 Presenting the Right Aesthetic Effect

Depending on the local context, community members can also take up active modes of determining what gets presented to the public. For some, it can be an empowering process in which they can redefine who they are and downplay or highlight preferred aspects of their identities (Stronza 2001: 273). Tourism can improve infrastructure, increase development and cash flow, and may also valorize local cultural traditions (Griffith and Griffith 2012: 523). Tourism is a means by which a nation or group can become popularized, homogenized, and made understandable, to both its own people as well as visitors (Díaz-Andreu 2013: 235). This is seen through the explicit and intentional selection of attributes that draw on popular and prevailing archetypes about certain groups of people by said people.

Evans-Pritchard’s (1989: 96) research on the Native American Pueblo and Navajo silversmiths in New Mexico studies their reactions to growing tourism. While they often use ethnic-based humor to ridicule tourists, the Native Americans consciously capitalize on stereotypes that tourists hope to see – intentionally “use[ing] traditional figures and symbols to create the right aesthetic effect” (Stronza 2001: 273). This enterprising behavior capitalizes on tourist’s desire to find meaning and cultural significance in the things they encounter. The Native Americans are cognizant about what is “authentic” and what is spurious, fully regulating the exposure of the meaningful symbols and rituals of their private lives (Stronza 2001: 273). The Native Americans are thus able to present the past and invented traditions in a controlled
environment, allowing them to maintain their cultural identity and values without compromising their cultural integrity.

2.3.2 Working with the People

Although its definition varies across projects, the goals and methodologies used in public archaeology is relatively constant. Public archaeology draws on community collaboration to address the interests and needs of a community, increase the likelihood of long-term interest and engagement from locals, and empower groups through inclusion (Atalay 2010: 419; Thomas 2017: 15). Public archaeology slightly differs from community archaeology, which encompasses a broad range of practices that aims to actively engage the community with the local archaeology, primarily in the fieldwork stage (Atalay 2012: 49). These two methodologies are similar to community based participatory research but have been critiqued because neither are “fundamentally community-driven [n]or gives substantive control and decision-making authority to communities” (Atalay 2012: 51).

Community based participatory research (CBPR) is concerned with sustainable and reciprocal research within communities (Atalay 2012: 5). It is a central facet of decolonizing approaches to archaeological research. CBPR provides a methodology that is community-driven and ethically minded that involves community members in a respectful and participatory way, producing knowledge through full and equitable partnerships (Atalay 2012: 11). CBPR challenges the notion that archaeologists are the only or the best stewards of archaeological knowledge. This set of practices work to create equitable partnerships and promote respectful relationships to acknowledge the rights that communities have to be active participants in the creation of knowledge (Atalay 2012: 44); to assert that both descendant and non-descendant communities
have an ethical right to not only be involved in the production of knowledge but also to the benefits of the research (Atalay 2012: 45).

Atalay (2010, 2012) discusses the CBPR project in Çatalhöyük, Turkey to demonstrate its collaborative model and methodology for democratizing research. Establishing the community as a research partner followed a series of steps: determining the community’s interest in becoming a partner and their level of interest, increasing the scientific and archaeological literacy and community capacity for research, and working with the community to prioritize archaeological education (Atalay 2010: 422-23). Although the CBPR project at Çatalhöyük is not quite prepared for conducting archaeological, heritage-related, or cultural tourism research, steps are being taken to build the framework to make it possible, including “an annual festival, archaeological lab-guide training for village children and young teen residents, a regular comic series (for children) and a newsletter (for adults)” (Atalay 2010: 423). As a result of positive community support, the project recently expanded to include a paid internship and an archaeological community theatre program.

The former was initiated to build confidence among community members as partners in developing collaborative research projects with the archaeologists on site (Atalay 2010: 424). The project took on and trained two interns from the local town of Küçükköy who both facilitated and assisted the women’s meetings of the town, the establishment of their own group led programs, and increasing the acquisition of cultural-tourism related experience among women (Atalay 2010: 424). The program with its thorough and extensive reach not only provides the community with informed representatives, but also builds a “cohort of local residents who are knowledgeable about heritage management issues, cultural tourism and its challenges and grant-writing practices” (Atalay 2010: 425). The latter was spearheaded by the Küçükköy school principal, Mehmet Ali Selçuk, who suggested the idea of using Çatalhöyük as the subject for a children’s theatre
performance at the annual children’s festival (Atalay 2010: 425). The program was meant to include aspects of cultural tourism, site management, and local development, addressing two things: the education of local schoolchildren on Çatalhöyük through their performance in the play, drama workshops, and active participation of the script; and engage the adults from Küçükköy and surrounding villages on the aforementioned topics (Atalay 2010: 425-26).

While Atalay’s role in these programs is to develop the theatre script and work with the interns, she speculates its success may have “widespread and long-term positive educational and financial impact[s]” (Atalay 2010: 426). The CBPR project will ideally “develop mutually beneficial collaborative projects with local communities”, moving out of her hands and further into those of the local Turkish communities (Atalay 2010: 426). In her book *Community Based Archaeology* (2012: 15), Atalay explains how the collaborative project did not follow the path she expected but has continued to grow, expanding on the community’s interest and trust in the research process. As each project progressed, they built community capacity for research and fund-raising while also increasing the local involvement in the protection, management, and heritage tourism at the Çatalhöyük site (Atalay 2012: 15). Atalay’s (2010, 2012) work at Çatalhöyük provides a good model for the practices used to involve a community during the archaeological process and collaborate with them to build community capacity for stewardship and research.

### 2.3.3 Applied Archaeology

Archaeologists who practice applied anthropology understand that the materials they work with are inherently involved in contemporary contexts that must be understood and engaged in those contexts (Silverman 2011: 157). Applied archaeology is about emancipatory praxis that promises a synthetic analysis of everyday actions based on discussions between insider-participants and outsider-consultants (Warry 1992: 160). This dichotomy, however, does not
encompass those who can be considered intermediaries, a third group that is both an insider-participant and an outsider-consultant while not fully conforming to either. Applied archaeology is a sub-discipline focused on developing the abilities to navigate the socio-political realms of a given community caused by the inherently political undercurrents of archaeology. Community collaboration is a methodology meant to involve and engage the public in the fate of their cultural heritage (Thomas 2017: 25), to democratize archaeological interpretations (Silverman 2011: 154), and serve as a link between the archaeological enterprise and different publics (Colwell-Chanthaphonh et al. 2008: 1).

This technique is not exclusive to applied anthropology, anthropological museums have also faced a growing mandate to make themselves more accessible to the public(s) they supposedly serve (Bollwerk et al. 2015: 180; Colwell-Chanthaphonh et al. 2008: 1). Successful engagement necessitates an exchange of information and knowledge between a museum and a community, creating a relationship instead of a hierarchy (Bollwerk et al. 2015: 180). In public archaeology, this is defined as a powerful tool in the decolonization process (Hoobler 2006: 457), serving as a way to empower local groups of people in becoming active partners, creating an equal and reciprocal partnership, and broadening the “methods used to assign value to physical objects” which extends beyond the physical and integrates the stories of collective identities of both the past and present (Bollwerk et al. 2015: 183).

By not including the community in which archaeologists are working, we are simply continuing the colonial practices and philosophy used to establish this discipline. It is very easy for a practicing archaeologist to verbalize their goals and motivations to work with a community, it is another thing to turn those words into reality. Using a methodology that draws on community participation throughout the research process gives community members the power to create and
share knowledge as it is of relevance and use to them (Atalay 2012: 7). It is a promotion of research with, by, and for indigenous and local communities.

2.4 The Role of Museums in Tourism and Anthropology

Alongside heritage sites, museums can be significant establishments within communities because they can be local organizations (Born 2006: 10) that can validate their contents and can serve as way to assume control of the archaeological stewardship (Hoobler 2006: 443). In Oaxaca, the southernmost state of Mexico, a group of community museums were founded to retain the archaeological finds recovered by archaeological projects within local areas. They are community driven cultural institutions that reaffirm local identity, preserve artifacts and history, and are utilized as an educational tool for both tourists and locals (Hoobler 2006: 444). They do so by storing local artifacts, employ locals to manage, and present information through community accepted means. Teresa Morales Lersch and Cuauhtémoc Camarena, two anthropologists from Mexico City, began working at the Oaxaca INAH office in the 1980’s and were enlisted to help the museum associated with the archaeological project in Santa Ana (Hoobler 2006: 448). Museo Shan-Dany in Santa Ana was initiated by the town and became economically self-sufficient by staffing through the local governmental system (Hoobler 2006: 449). This has created a mutually beneficial relationship between the locals and the institution, allowing these museums to continuously be community driven from beginning to end.

Museums establish the very ground from and on which various conceptions of the past are contested (Barker 2010: 299). Modern museums can thus be understood as a “theater of the real” as Quetzil Castañeda (1997: 103) puts it, in which the representation of the world is evoked through realist images of objects and the interpretation presented by the institution / experts. Museums confirm the selective production and reinforcement of information coinciding with the
expectations of tourists, what locals think tourists want to see, and what corporations think locals should be doing to attract more capital (Castañeda 1997: 129). Castañeda dubs this the “economy of invention” in which archaeologists, tour guides, tourists, and artesanos and vendedores cycle between reaffirming and inventing Maya culture at Chichen Itza in Mexico; it is an “imaginary machine that orchestrates its own invention through the orchestration of heterogeneous practices as its data” (1997: 128-30).

For the Mexican government, Chichen Itza was created as a national park to reinforce a nationalist heritage and has been converted into a center for heritage tourism (McGuire 2008: 12). This designated national identity is naturalized through the daily experience of school education, bank notes, and other materials that are founded on the symbolic nature of objects within a museum. When a homogenized identity constitutes the majority of objects integral to day-to-day life and reinforced through a filtered historical narrative, a nation solidifies a controlled representational image. It is through these symbols and evoked feelings that tourism establishes itself within a place (Díaz-Andreu 2013: 235), generated on the very image a nation projected. While a homogenous national identity is part of nation building, it is important to acknowledge that it is rooted in colonial practices and exploitation.

Decolonizing practices utilized in archaeology can also be assimilated into the museological field and enforced through the representation of objects and content to combat colonial perspectives. The display of human remains and sacred objects has been and is currently being contested as rules and principles are interpreted differently by disciplines and individuals. This can be seen at a site outside Mexico City, in which descendants of the pre-Aztec city-state capital of Xaltocan have begun reclaiming their Indigenous identities and history (Overholtzer and Argueta 2018: 512). They insist on participating in the production of narratives about the histories
that were rewritten during the Aztec conquest. For the residents of Xaltocan, a largely Indigenous community, collaborating with archaeologists is one of the ways they fight to have a voice in the process of historical production.

After enlisting Elizabeth Brumfiel’s help and granting her permission to work in 1987, the Xaltocan community has seen three full generations of scholars directing independent projects, established positive relationships, and had a regular and seasonal archaeological presence (Overholtzer and Argueta 2018: 513). The engagement of Xaltocan community members has likely had a significant impact on how they “negotiate their own identities and histories and their use of archaeological material culture, including the skeletons of their ancestors” (Overholtzer and Argueta 2018: 513). In maintaining control over the removal or display over material and human remains, the Xaltocan community is able to work against the silencing perpetuated and expropriated by nationalism (Overholtzer and Argueta 2018: 514).

As their collaborative work continued and with explicit permission from the Xaltocan community, the human remains discovered at the site were used as a focal point of interest for the local museum as well as public dissemination (Overholtzer and Argueta 2018: 516). When residents showed interest in further developing the local museum, a small exhibit was created in 2009 followed by a newer one in 2012. The descendent community strongly desired to study and display the human remains in publications, websites, videos, and museums (Overholtzer and Argueta 2018: 516). Since the museum has no colonial past as an institution, is established and entirely run by community members, and has displays and content specifically requested by the descendent community, it has faced no criticism in Mexico.

However, the Xaltocan museum exhibition was met with criticism when presented and disseminated internationally. The project has been criticized and censored by North American
academics for emphasizing human remains (Overholtzer and Argueta 2018: 516-17). After Overholtzer submitted an article with a supplementary video that also focused on a group of burials to the *Advances in Archaeological Practice* (an SAA journal) it was cited as having unacceptable photographs. The editor told them to either pixelate the pictures or remove them altogether (Overholtzer and Argueta 2018: 517). The authors agreed that publicizing the collaborative project was more important than fighting for what the Xaltocan community “perceived as censorship from the imperial power to the north” (Overholtzer and Argueta 2018: 517). It should be noted that the censorship is due to the guidelines set by the SAA in order to respect, protect, and acknowledge the rights of Native Americans in North America to their material culture and human remains. While this may the case, the case of the Xaltocan community illustrates how academic policies have yet to expand the definition of who constitutes as a person of indigenous descent and the policies associated with their culture. Regardless of the censorship, the project went on to conduct an investigation into the perception of death within the Xaltocan community.

An ethnography was undertaken in the area focused on the topic of death and how locals perceived it. The overarching consensus pointed to death’s omnipresence and its influence on contemporary Mexican culture. It is something that should be celebrated in order to bring people together, this is most commonly seen in the Day of the Dead celebrations across Mexico. These ideas correlate to the lack of fear or apprehension Xaltocan residents have towards their dead and the remains uncovered through the archaeological process. The negative and critical reactions by of the North American academics prevent the Indigenous Xaltocan residents from defining their own identities and reclaiming their ability to construct and define their own histories. Regardless, the work being done in Xaltocan with the local community to create exhibits based on the archeological investigations is significant. It illustrates an arduous process the results in a
successful museum founded on the interest and enthusiasm from the Xaltocan community. In this case, museums are an empowering establishment that allows the community to be an authority over their own history and ancestral remains without compromising their identity and heritage.

2.5 Theory in Relation to the Chiquilá Community Museum Project

Understanding the various modes in which tourism develops within a place is significant in raising awareness for the risks and opportunities involved. Whether this is accomplished through the use of archaeology, heritage as it might be more broadly construed, or museums, understanding the effects is crucial in creating more sustainable long-term management plans. This is especially true when working with small-scale communities whose conceptions of tourism are based on the “success” of nearby and large-scale business endeavors. This is not to say that the development or success of tourism in a larger location is bad, nor that a successful product cannot be produced in a smaller community. While large-scale tourism development usually has the initial funding and support from various stakeholders, small-scale developments do not always have the same financing.

The difference in funding and resources becomes obvious when comparing the Chiquilá Community Museum Project (CCMP) to the commercialization of tourism in other parts of the Yucatán like Cancun. The aforementioned case studies provide various means by which tourism is developed – to serve as cautionary tales in some instances and models to emulate in others. Case studies like the caves in the Dominican Republic (Griffith and Griffith 2012) illustrate how reckless development and unsustainable constructions can compromise archaeological sites and cause irreversible damages. Whereas the project at Çatalhöyük (Atalay 2010, 2012) demonstrates how community-based participatory research can build community capacity for research and stewardship by involving and collaborating with locals throughout the investigative process.
Hopefully, the practices used at Çatalhöyük have continued on a decade later. These theoretical perspectives contribute to conversations about how tourism can be cultivated in and tailored to small communities without endangering or compromising the local history and heritage, which are extremely valuable in a place like Chiquilá.
3 BACKGROUND

This chapter offers an introduction to the rich cultural history of the Yalahau region and Mesoamerica at large. The section begins with information about previous archaeological investigations that have greatly contributed to our knowledge about the occupational history of this region. This is followed by a section on the Maya in pre-Columbian periods, contact and historical periods, and the modernization of the Yucatan peninsula with the creation of the Cancun project and development of the Maya Riviera. The chapter is concluded with specific history about Chiquilá and its development.

3.1 Previous Archaeological Research

The sites of Vista Alegre and Conil were first documented by William T. Sanders when he visited the area in 1954. He performed test excavations and ceramic surface collections (Sanders 1955). After Sanders came Jack Eaton in 1968, who briefly visited Vista Alegre but did not conduct any archaeological work (Andrews 2002: 143). Anthony Andrews visited the area in 1976 and conducted a brief tour of Conil, a site he called Chiquilá after the neighboring town (Andrews 2002: 143). Susana Gurrola and Eugenia Romero recorded the site in greater detail when they returned to the area as part of their research on Holbox Lagoon and coastal trade in 1987 and 1988 (Gurrola Briones 1988; Romero and Gurrola Briones 1991, 1995).

The Yalahau Regional Human Ecology Project (YRHEP) was established in 1993 by Scott Fedick and Karl Taube of the University of California, Riverside to study ancient Maya settlement patterns, land use and political organization in northern Quintana Roo (Fedick and Mathews 2006: 33). Glover and Rissolo first visited Vista Alegre in 2002 on a short exploratory trip of the nearby Sabana Zanja (Glover et al. 2017: 9). Their documentation of a large serpent head monument carved at the base of a large pyramidal structure on site triggered an interest in the port’s role
during Terminal Classic and Postclassic period trade along the Peninsula (Glover et al. 2017: 9). This led to a short field season in 2005 as part of Glover’s PhD research and prompted the creation of the *Costa Escondida* Project (Glover et al. 2017: 9). In 2006, the first map of the site was published as part of Glover’s doctoral study (Glover 2006) and that map has been expanded during subsequent field seasons, specifically in 2008, 2011, and 2016.

The *Proyecto Costa Escondida* (PCE; the Hidden Coast Project) has been conducting archaeological research on the north coast of Quintana Roo, Mexico since 2006 under the direction of Jeffrey Glover, Dominique Rissolo, and many other contributors (Glover et al. 2012: 513). While the long-term goal of the project is to understand how the pre-Columbian and historical populations lived along the northern coastal region of Quintana Roo, the project researches both the environmental and social factors to understand the limits of and opportunities for adaptation in a dynamic and transforming coastal landscape through time (Glover et al. 2012: 513; Glover et al. 2017: 9).

The interdisciplinary project has four major research objectives (1) archaeology, (2) paleoenvironmental research, (3) fisheries studies, and (4) sustainability and community development. Archaeological research has focused on the pre-Columbian sites of Vista Alegre and Conil along with a few historical sites, like that of San Eusebio (Figure 2). The analysis of artifacts has revealed approximately 3,000 years of occupation, although there is evidence that the occupation was not consistent throughout this timespan (Table 1). It is the subsequent correlation between population declines and periods of reoccupation within broader socio-political and environmental processes that is a major component of the project’s research. Recent work by PCE members has focused on the Maya ports of Vista Alegre and Conil, two major coastal sites in Quintana Roo. The sites’ involvement in coastal maritime trade played a significant role in both
the politics and economy of the Yucatan peninsula and in connecting the northern coast with other trade networks in Mexico and Central America.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vista Alegre Chronology</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Date Ranges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vista Alegre I</td>
<td>Middle Preclassic</td>
<td>800/700–400 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depopulation</td>
<td></td>
<td>400–75 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista Alegre IIa</td>
<td>Terminal Preclassic / Early Classic</td>
<td>75 BC–AD 400/450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista Alegre IIb</td>
<td>Middle and Late Classic</td>
<td>AD 400/450–700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depopulation</td>
<td></td>
<td>AD 700–750/800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista Alegre IIIa</td>
<td>Late Classic</td>
<td>AD 750/800–850/900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista Alegre IIIb</td>
<td>Terminal Classic</td>
<td>AD 850/900–1050/1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista Alegre IV</td>
<td>Postclassic</td>
<td>AD 1100–1550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1 Vista Alegre Chronology (after Glover et al. 2019: 4)*

PCE has encountered issues in the past in making the archaeological work and research accessible. Involving locals in the archaeological process through employment has helped in dispelling (but not eliminating) rumors about PCE’s work, a common issue on archaeological projects everywhere (Glover et al. 2012: 518). The researchers have disseminated their findings through a variety of different formats including copies of INAH issued permits, recent INAH reports, and any other relevant publications (Glover et al. 2012: 518). The demands and pressures of academia have transformed this process into an unrewarding task for one’s career as publications and promotions take precedence; this reflects the unilateral information exchange that currently exists within the academic world (Glover et al. 2012: 518). While unrewarding in terms of promotion and tenure, Glover and colleagues feel an ethical obligation to share this information with the community and have made a point to do so over the years.

A site preservation grant application was submitted in 2014 to assist with the development of sustainable tourism infrastructure for the ancient Maya port site of Vista Alegre (Figure 2). Funding was requested for three specific goals: (1) securing funds for the construction of an access and observation tower to be built adjacent to a major pyramidal structure; (2) the design and
maintenance of hiking trails to develop a regionally based cultural and natural resource preservation plan working with the local community; and (3) to develop a system of signage in the region and at Vista Alegre. This application was drafted in collaboration with Tim Murtha who was working at Pennsylvania State University (PSU) at the time. Unfortunately, the grant was not successful; however, it did initiate the collaboration with Murtha.

A Collaborative Design Research (CDR) grant application was submitted in 2017 to PSU to collaboratively engage and design a long-term natural and cultural preservation plan for the area surrounding the town of Chiquilá. The proposed research incorporates graphic design, archaeology, anthropology, landscape architecture, and geodesign to: (1) collaboratively engage stakeholders and community members in Chiquilá, (2) integrate the scientific information produced by ongoing research within a community based geodesign planning project, (3) develop a long-term master plan of preservation priorities, and (4) to create materials (like signage) to support and communicate the aforementioned plan. The application was accepted while Murtha was the director of the Hamer Center for Community Design at PSU and followed him to the University of Florida (UF). Murtha where his continued collaboration on the project along with that of his graduate student Nathania Martinez (UF) have been fundamental to the Chiquilá Community Museum Project (CCMP).

The research of PCE and their predecessors illustrates and contributes to discussions about the complex and dynamic history of the Yucatan Peninsula from pre-Columbian periods to modern times. The following sections expound on the culture history of the Yucatan beginning with the beginning of archaeologically datable evidence up to the modern town of Chiquilá.
3.2 Preclassic Period (2000 BCE – 250 CE)

With the adaptation of agriculture and sedentism in Mesoamerica that marks the transition from the Archaic period to the Preclassic (or Formative) period, came the rapid increase in populations and the development of socially and politically more complex societies (Demarest 2008: 14). After 2000 BCE, a shared identity among the Preclassic Maya can be seen through the political and religious leadership of early chiefdoms made manifest in shared ceramic styles and site-planning principles. By 1500 – 1200 BCE some societies had public constructions, long-distance trading systems, and social hierarchies. The development of complex information systems included the beginnings of monumental art, iconography, and the calendric and writing systems (Demarest 2008: 14). These were later built upon by the Maya in the Classic period and other Mesoamerican societies.

Between 1000 to 400 BCE, the early complex societies transitioned into archaic states with more centralized political and religious authority, monumental art and public architecture, economic complexity, and social stratification (Demarest 2008: 15). This contributed to the continued development of the pan-Mesoamerican complex of information structures like the calendric, astronomical, iconographic, and writing systems. States with distinctive regional variants of Mesoamerican civilization begins emerging in the Maya region and elsewhere by 400 BCE (Demarest 2008: 15).

3.2.1 The Preclassic Period in the Northern Maya Lowlands

Centers in both the Maya highlands and lowlands had large populations, monumental architecture, and complex political structures (Demarest 2008: 15) by the Middle Preclassic. A number of these sites have been identified across the northern parts of the Yucatan Peninsula. The Middle Preclassic (800/700 – 200 BCE) period in the Yalahau region marks the earliest
archaeologically detectable occupation of the region (Rissolo et al. 2005: 74; Glover et al. 2018: 4). The presence of ceramics in this period indicates that the first inhabitants of the Yalahau region rapidly developed their own ceramic traditions (Rissolo et al. 2005: 74), although these traditions were connected to the broader Nabanche tradition in the northern lowlands. Materials uncovered at the site of Vista Alegre (Figure 2), however, suggest people migrating from the eastern Petén-Belize regions (Glover et al. 2011b: 70) based on the similarity between some of the materials recovered at Vista Alegre and the Mamom tradition of the southern Maya lowlands. This is of particular interest because it demonstrates how coastal sites have perhaps always been places that have broader connections than their inland neighbors; a pattern repeated through time. The site’s population decreases between 400 to 75 BCE but sees a surge in population density from 75 BCE to 400/500 CE (Glover et al. 2018: 4).

3.3 Classic Period (250 – 1050/1100 CE)

The Classic period has been traditionally viewed as the “golden age” of ancient Maya society (Demarest 2008: 89). While this has been traditionally marked by the presence of monumental constructions and complex information systems, it is now known that these features began to emerge centuries earlier at some centers in the Maya highlands and lowlands. Classic Maya cities, however, do show evidence of social stratification with a distinct ruling class and an increased interconnectedness between religion, politics, and the elite.

While rulers may have had a limited role in the infrastructural management of their respective states (a topic that continues to be debated among archaeologists), their central role in major religious ceremonies and rituals is displayed in architecture, iconography, inscriptions, and artifacts (Demarest 2008: 206). They take on a shamanistic role associated with the rites of communication with deities, ancestors, and sacred forces. The ruler appropriated for themselves
the position as the city or state’s sacred center, embodying and ultimately becoming the axis of the universe (Demarest 2008: 207). Ideology was the major source of state power and a central element in the origins of Maya kingship. It is the dynamic relationship between rulers, the elite, religion, and other components of the state that manifests through monumental constructions, craft specialization, long-distance exchange trade, and information systems.

The end of the Classic period is usually identified as the “collapse” of ancient Maya, however, this notion underestimates and undermines the complexity of their civilization (Demarest 2008: 274). In reality, the Classic Maya civilization decline can be ascribed to various causes: collapsing states and political disintegration, migrating populations, environmental stresses, decreased resources, warfare, among others. This “collapse” is not a uniform phenomenon and has regional variability and is largely confined to the southern Maya lowlands. These Maya kingdoms were linked through kinship, communication, alliances through exchange networks, and shared cultural traditions. Their fluorescence in the Late Classic period, in conjunction with the expansion of an economic infrastructure that supported, was both the apogee of lowland Maya civilization and the foreshadowing of its collapse (Demarest 2008: 111).

3.3.1 The Classic Period in the Northern Lowlands

The culture history of the northern Maya lowlands is distinct from that of the southern lowlands. In fact, the Late Preclassic / Early Classic period (75 BCE – 400/450 CE) shows a significant surge in population density, an increase in the construction of monumental architecture and ceramic production in the Yalahau region (Glover 2012: 279). However, the region’s population begins declining circa 400 CE, much earlier than the commonly discussed Classic period “collapse.” Interestingly, the only site that does not conform to this is Vista Alegre which continued to function as a domestic settlement. Vista Alegre was reoccupied in the Late Classic
period (750/800 – 850/900 CE) by an unknown group of people. In the century following this reoccupation there is evidence of strong connections to the political economic network centered at Chichen Itza (Glover et al. 2018: 9).

Chichen Itza took advantage of the collapse of cities in the southern Maya lowlands. They become the dominant power in the northern lowlands by the 10th century CE (Braswell et al. 2018: 52), capitalizing on the disintegrating social, political, and economic systems. Chichen’s success can be attributed to its involvement in interregional coastal trade, its role as a religious pilgrimage center, and as a conquest state. Its ascendancy was short-lived and by the 11th century CE, Chichen began its decline as a dominating force. Inhabitants seemed to be deeply concerned with draughts and soil fertility which has been argued to have led to a declining population (Braswell et al. 2018: 55). Around the same time, there is a depopulation of Vista Alegre. The causes of this are still being investigated by PCE members, but there is no doubt that the collapse of Chichen played a role, but so might have rising sea-level (Jaijel et al. 2018). The north coast, however, is not abandoned, but the focus of coastal population seemed to shift to Conil in the Postclassic period.

3.4 **Postclassic Period (1100 – 1542 CE)**

After the decline of Chichen, Postclassic states were built on more flexible political and economic institutions and shared similarities to polities elsewhere in Mesoamerica (Demarest 2008: 277). Chichen’s fall gives rise to a new regional capital, Mayapan. Dating to 1100 CE, Mayapan was a distinguished dominating political center in the Maya lowlands region with a population of 20,000 people, and served as an administrative, religious, and economic urban center (Masson et al. 2014: 2). Mayapan suffered from abandonment in 1448 CE and was caused by a series of disasters that were difficult for any ancient state to overcome (Masson et al. 2014: 35).
Political power and religious authority shifted away from single individuals to lineages. These lineages re-emerged as the political and social unit of power (Demarest 2008: 278). Postclassic ceremonial centers were more modest compared to their Classic predecessors, while ancestral worship focused less on divine and royal ancestors to emphasize lineage and family shrines and idols. Centuries of warfare between sites had created long-standing enmity between the groups by the time of Spanish conquest. European discovery and subsequent conquest of the Maya kingdoms was the greatest trauma for the civilization (Demarest 2008: 286).

3.4.1 The Postclassic Period in the Northern Lowlands

Population in the Yalahau region increases again as people resettled in and around Terminal Preclassic / Early Classic sites during the Postclassic Period (1100-1550 CE) (Glover et al. 2018: 4). At this time, Vista Alegre’s function shifted to an important offertory or pilgrimage shrine-site (Glover et al. 2018: 6) while the main population center on the coast was Conil. Located 7 km west of Vista Alegre, the modern town of Chiquilá is in large part built upon the ruins of Conil. San Angel (Figure 2), a town 20 km south of Vista Alegre and Conil, might have been connected to the site of Conil if canoe travel was possible in Sabana Zanja as recorded in local oral history (Glover 2012: 281).

The conquistadors reported Conil being comprised of 5,000 houses (Andrews 2002: 142). While this estimate may be exaggerated it does illustrate the impression the town made on the Europeans. Conil has two features that made it unique in historic reports – the nearby wetlands and swamps. These features formed the “deserted” areas the Spanish came across before arriving at Conil (Andrews 2002: 143). Conil, a possible capital of coastal province in pre-Hispanic times, was greatly altered after being subjugated and conquered by the Spanish in the mid-16th century.
3.5 From Then to Now

3.5.1 Contact and Historical Period

On March 1, 1517 Francisco Hernández de Cordoba landed near the site of Ecab on the northeastern tip of the Peninsula. This established the first contact between the Spanish and the Yucatan Peninsula, as well as its “discovery” by the Occidental world. A year later, Juan de Grijalva visited Cozumel and the coastal site of Conil but quickly left (Andrews 1985: 139). In 1519, Hernán Cortés stopped in Conil and Cozumel before continuing on his route westwards to Veracruz and Tenochtitlan. The Maya were able to avert Spanish conquest and colonization in Central Mexico until Francisco de Montejo arrived. Previously a member of Grijalva’s and Cortés’ expeditions, Montejo led his own army and returned to the Yucatán Peninsula between 1527 and 1529. Montejo’s campaign was successful in conquering the Peninsula and marked with the establishment of Merida among the ransacked Maya city of Ti’ho on January 6th, 1542.

Following this came the violent and oppressive process of establishing land grants, or encomiendas (Glover et al. 2011a: 208), meant to create and enforce social hierarchies based on Old and New World lineages. Only six were granted in northern Quintana Roo (Kantunilkin, Conil, Ecab, Polé, Zama [Tulum], and Cozumel), but they were usually left ungoverned due to their remote location. Indigenous populations dramatically decreased in size (Andrews 1985: 140) following Spanish contact, as they were exposed to new diseases, resource shortages and scarcity, poverty, enslavement and enforced labor, and starvation. This encomienda system, coupled with their new living conditions, was not well received and led to an intense and aggressive response by the native Maya inhabitants of the region (Glover et al. 2011a: 208). Although the Great Revolt was initiated in 1546 and mercilessly put to an end in 1547, Spanish dominance was damaged (Glover et al. 2011a: 208).
Taking advantage of diminished control, the northeastern region of the Peninsula became a popular place for pirates to call home (Glover et al. 2011a: 208). By the mid-16th century, they presented an increasing danger to the remaining coastal towns as they endangered and engaged in the log wood industries (Andrews 1985: 140). The Spanish had a strategic military presence along the north coast to not only defend the area from but to also monitor the (in their view) heretical indigenous refugees and buccaneers (Andrews 1985: 140). The region, however, became a backwater location (Glover et al. 2011a: 209) after the Spanish decided to abandon the region in the 17th century (Andrews 1985: 140). This does not mean the area was without inhabitants. On the fringe of colonial authority, the dense forests served as a refuge for indigenous groups fleeing from the Spanish while the coast continued to offer harbors for pirating (Andrews 1985: 140).

The revolution for Mexican independence from Spain began in 1810 followed by 11 years of guerrilla warfare and the continued deterioration of living conditions for the Maya (; Gust and Mathews 2017: 145). Mexican independence was achieved on September 27, 1821 and Mexico became a federal republic in 1823 (Gust 2016: 55). Maya dissatisfaction with being suppressed led them to initiate the Caste War in July of 1847. The outbreak of the Caste War in the northern parts of Quintana Roo led to a stalemate in 1850, securing the eastern frontier for the Spanish and leaving the rebellious Maya groups to a self-proclaimed independent territory residing in the untamed forest of the East, what is now the modern state of Quintana Roo (Glover et al. 2011a: 209).

3.5.2 **Yucatán Peninsula After the Caste War**

After the Caste War and the threat of rebels abated, the Mexican government formed two large land grants to replace the existing smaller ones in the northeast of the Peninsula (Glover 2006: 238). These land grants were given to La Compañía Agrícola El Cuyo y Anexas in 1876 and
the other to Faustino Martínez in 1889. La Compañía Agrícola El Cuyo y Anexas was granted a total of 1800 km² including along the northern coast of the region, establishing company offices in the indigenous town of Labcah, now Solferino, and focused on the sugarcane processing plant 3 kilometers south of Chiquilá’s port in San Eusebio (Gust 2016: 89). Supervised by Cubans, the cane was harvested by non-Yucatec Mexicans, Koreans, and Afro-Caribbean populations (Gust 2016: 90). The company also constructed a railway to connect Solferino to Chiquilá and was involved in the production and exportation of bananas, cacao, *palo de tinte*, cotton, tropical hardwoods, and cattle (Glover et al. 2011a: 210). Martínez did nothing with his land grant, and it was later acquired by La Compañía Colonizadora de la Costa Oriental de Yucatán in 1896. The company established six bases and constructed narrow-gauge railways which were used to transport products from extraction sites and in between bases (Glover 2006: 242).

### 3.5.3 Extractive Industries

For many decades, Yucatecan elites explored establishing viable and profitable large-scale industries. Sugar production on the Peninsula was attempted by Montejo as early as 1540 but was abandoned when the Montejo family was stripped of their *encomienda* (Gust 2016: 51). By the early 1800’s various extractive industries were reestablished in the Yucatan Peninsula due to the ideal soils and climate. Labor for extractive industries was mostly accomplished using *encomiendas* founded on a peonage system. This system exploited laborers for the agricultural labor and tributes. The valuable goods produced at these large estates included sugar, mahogany, henequen, and *palo de tinte*.

Native peoples in the Yucatan opposed these developments and the few sugar-processing areas that did develop were located near Solferino and Laguna Yalahau (Mathews and Gust 2017: 146). Sugarcane was primarily processed for making *aguardiente*, a high-quality rum popular in
the area. *Aguardiente* was utilized as a commodity to generate debts among existing laborers and to entice new workers (Mathews and Gust 2017: 160). These debts bound workers by law to *haciendas*, managing a constant state of obligation and trapped in debt servitude. This continued the cycle of an exploitative labor and tribute-based system from the indigenous populations.

Besides sugar, the other extractive industries included: mahogany which was exported for building materials; *palo de tinte* was boiled down and amended with various metals for form multi-colored dyes, prized for its durability; and henequen which was used to make rope and other cordage (Gust 2016: 81). Henequen in the late 19th and early 20th centuries was mostly used to make bailing twine for the United States market and made Merida one of the richest towns in Mexico at the time. With the exception of sugar, most of the resources were being produced for export, leaving the fate of the Yucatec economy in the hands of foreign interests (Gust 2016: 81-2).

### 3.5.4 A Territory Becomes a State and Ejidos Are Formed

Ignoring the opinions of the Yucatecos, President Porfirio Díaz created the State of Quintana Roo on November 24, 1902. Due to economic underperformance, the state was returned to federal territory status in 1904. It was then annexed into the state of Yucatan by order of President Carranza in 1913, a decree that was reversed two years later. It was annexed again in 1931 to the state of Yucatan in the hopes of raising living and economic standards. In 1935, President Cárdenas (1934-1940) reestablished Quintana Roo as a territory, creating the boundaries we see today. As part of the land reforms in Mexico, Cárdenas dissolved the two large land grants and implemented the *ejido* system, in which the land was divided amongst the small communities and owned by them (Glover 2006: 244; Mitchell 2017).
Ejido landowners neither owned nor held title to the land, but rather had “usufruct rights to land and waters redistributed by the Mexican government” (Perramond 2008: 357). Despite the benefits of land redistribution, inequality and ethnic imbalances remained. These land reforms were not about rectifying past landholding imbalances in the Mexican countryside and was more about political patronage and creating new communal nuclei (Perramond 2008: 365). The population in northern Quintana Roo grew slowly over the next 50 years or so, with the first ejidos being established in Kantunilkin, Solferino, and Leona Vicario. In 1992 came new legal reforms that altered the nature of ejidos in which local communities are able to divide the land into individually-owned parcels that can be leased or sold at their discretion (García-Frapolli et al. 2007: 138).

3.5.5 The Cancun Project

When the Territory of Quintana Roo became a state of the Mexican Republic on October 8\textsuperscript{th}, 1974 (Glover 2006: 245), new doors opened for the development of tourist destinations. The Cancun project initially began in the 1970’s as a major federal initiative when the location was recognized as a potential attraction for tourism. It is a paradigm of development that represents the future hope of Quintana Roo (Torres Maldonado 2000: 179) and stands as a model for the development of future planning. Since it would require grand plans, modern technology, large-scale infrastructure, and massive investments, the development of tourism in Cancun was a different way of modernizing the region (Torres Maldonado 2000: 182-3). The project is a result of dynamic interactions of public, private, and social agents and the collaboration of federal, state, and municipal governance. The Cancun project was initially funded by two groups: 25.6 million USD dollars was contributed from the federal government; and 21.5 million USD was an approved loan from the Inter-American Development Bank (IABD) (Torres Maldonado 2000: 186).
From the very beginning, it was designed as a business venture meant to benefit from and integrate into the international market. The positive side effects on the Mexican economy and regional development came second (Torres Maldonado 2000: 194). The goal was to complete the project at the end of 25 years and in three stages. The first stage (1972-1981) began with the announcement of the project and included plans for its creation and implementation, financial arrangements, and political negotiations (Torres Maldonado 2000: 198). After construction commenced, buildings in Cancun began growing at a rate faster than anyone had anticipated. The second phase (1982-1990) consisted of the continued development and construction, along with the establishment of basic services (Torres Maldonado 2000: 201). In the 1980’s, amidst Mexico’s economic crisis, Cancun did not encounter the same financial difficulties, instead the city experienced an influx of cashflow brought on by incoming tourists. The third stage (roughly 1990-2000) concluded most of the major constructions, turning Cancun into a modern urban city with plenty of potential and room to grow (Torres Maldonado 2000: 219). Cancun’s development and its popularity as a tourism hotspot, greatly affects the development of tourism and how people conceive of it across the state of Quintana Roo.

3.5.6 Development of the Maya Riviera

The Maya Riviera, or the Cancun-Tulum corridor, is the stretch of road southbound from Cancun to the archaeological site of Tulum along the Caribbean coastline (Walker 2009: 40). The Maya Riviera was developed as part of the Cancun project. When plans were officially approved in 2003 to provide a home port for cruise ships, in addition to the pre-existing port in Cozumel, they were planned at three locations respectively: Xcaret, Playa del Carmen, and Puerto Morelos. Promoters for the cruise line argued that a home port would make Mexico a major provider for luxury liners, the fastest growing segment of the tourism industry (Walker 2009: 41). They
reasoned that the Maya Riviera communities would benefit because Carnival Cruise Lines promised to donate a share of their disembarkation fees to local governments for regional infrastructural needs (Walker 2009: 41).

On the other hand, opposition criticized the potential damage the massive ships could incur to the Great Maya Reef and warned that the new influx of tourists would push the indigenous Maya farther into poverty (Walker 2009: 41). In preparation for the construction of a home port at Xcaret, owners violated current ecological laws to transplant delicate coral. The Xcaret Home Port proposal created an “unlikely opposition alliance among Maya Riviera residents, environmentalists, Maya rights activists, and established tourism business providers” (Walker 2009: 41). They argued that the proposal threatened the economy and environment of the Maya Riviera.

An increase in cruise ships would lead to a reduction in flights coming and going from Cancun’s airport which would further reduce the occupancy level of the region’s hotels (Walker 2009: 41). Additionally, cruise ships don’t employ local citizens or pay local taxes, a decrease in hotel occupancy would result in a loss of jobs. Since the Maya Riviera generates 40 percent of Mexico’s total tourism revenue and 80 percent of the local economy – these losses would be devastating and widespread (Walker 2009: 42). The plans ended when it went before the Federal Fiscal Tribune of Judicial Power and was found to have made several violations that threatened the coral reef, endangered sea turtle colonies, failed to inform the local community of the planned development, and a few others (Walker 2009: 42).

Mass tourism along the Maya Riviera has been a major economic success for the Mexican government and its major investors, while plans for further development proceed despite widespread and growing awareness of the many problems associated with mass tourism (Walker
2009: 43). Although Quintana Roo has a reputation for being one of the wealthiest states in Mexico with the highest growth rate, it is also home to some of the nation’s poorest and most malnourished residents (Walker 2009: 43).

3.5.7 **Chiquilá**

The historic period town of Conil was reestablished as the town of Chiquilá in the 19th century (Glover et al. 2017: 7) and is part of the same *ejido* as the town of San Ángel. The area as it is known today has seen dramatic and dynamic changes over the last hundred years or so. Stories from some of the elders from the community recall how Chiquilá and Holbox have changed over the span of their lives (roughly 70 years). Don Villo and his wife, Doña Maria, recounted the white sandy beaches along the Laguna Yalahau shore before major infrastructure was developed in Chiquilá. Don Villo has also shared stories about how he used small boats to sail from Holbox to Chiquilá and back again, and how diverse and abundant the marine resources were. Don Chimay, another elder, has spoken of how Chiquilá was mostly abandoned more than 50 years ago and that his uncle used to be the only resident for a long time. When Chiquilá was first formed, it was established by small families from Holbox or the surrounding coast. Both Don Chimay and Don Villo have said that before the migration in the 80’s, the shore only had a couple wooden and thatched huts. Depending on the conditions along the shore, the location of different family’s huts changed. Don Villo moved his family more inland when his children were young because Dona Maria was bothered by the plethora of flies along the shore (pers. comm. Don Villo, March 2019). All three of them recall how the population and construction of Chiquilá changed about 40 years ago.

In the 1980’s, Chiquilá saw an influx of migrating groups from Veracruz, Campeche, and other Mexican states. There are a few reasons why this surge of people occurred. On one hand, the
development of Cancun as a tourist destination, attracted people seeking employment and economic benefits. On the other hand, coastal migration was promoted in the 1980’s by the federal government. Dubbed the “March towards the sea” initiative, this occurred when Mexico experienced an agricultural crisis (Rubio-Cisneros 2019: 12). The aim was to exploit fisheries to generate income, an activity that intensified over the course of the late 20th and early 21st century in Quintana Roo as continuing government policies and subsidies supported fishing and promoted tourism development (Rubio-Cisneros 2019: 13). This mixture of traditional and non-traditional descent communities presents challenges in making direct cultural connections with the past and does not guarantee that archaeology is seen as relevant (Glover et al. 2012: 515).

According to Don Villo and others from the community, the town of Chiquilá is made up of three colonias (groups): the natives, the Yucatecos, and the migrants. The native group consists of people like Don Villo and his family, whose families have lived in Chiquilá and the surrounding area for generations (pers. comm. Don Villo, March 2019). This is different from the Yucatecos which is comprised of indigenous Maya who have lived in the Yucatan and moved to Chiquilá, although the time range for this is unclear (pers. comm. Don Villo, March 2019). The migrant group is made up of the people that moved to Chiquilá from the 1980’s up until now and continues to grow with the development of tourism. According to the Instituto Nacional de Estadística Geografía e Informática (National Institute of Statistics Geography and Information; INEGI), the population of Chiquilá in 2010 was 1,466 (INEGI 2010). During a recent visit, the Mayor has estimated Chiquilá’s population to be about 6,000 people (pers. comm. Valerio, March 2019), though this may be an exaggeration.

Chiquilá is the gateway to Holbox Island and in recent years has seen an increase of tourists passing through to the island (Glover et al. 2012: 515). Alongside Holbox Island, the town of
Chiquilá has gone through major infrastructural development along the main road. Recent changes can be seen in Figures 3 and 4, which display the difference in town construction from the summer of 2017 to 2018 respectively. These changes have been prompted by the need to keep up with the growing presence of tourists passing through and their demands. It is the dynamic history and record of change in Chiquilá and in the Yalahau region that should be presented, not only for the thousands of tourists that pass through annually, but also for the community.

Figure 3 Chiquilá town center and roundabout (glorieta) taken summer of 2017 (photo by Mikaela Razo)
Figure 4 Chiquilá town center and roundabout (glorieta) summer 2019 (photo by Mikaela Razo)
4 METHODS

This project began with the conceptualization and construction of three buildings in the center of Chiquilá. Work for this thesis began in March of 2018 when the Chiquilá Tourist Parador Project was concluded. The Chiquilá Community Museum Project (CCMP) was initiated during a trip taken in May of 2018 and is marked by the creation and dissemination of Proposal 1. In between this first trip and another trip made in December of 2018, steps were taken by me in preparation for the demands of the project.

Proposal 2 was completed in February of 2019 to be circulated for two trips, one in February and another in March. Following this March trip, came a 3-day trip made in April to attend the inauguration ceremony of Chiquilá’s Tourist Parador. This chapter documents the steps I’ve taken to prepare for the demands of the CCMP, the identification and differentiation between each of the stakeholders, the methods used during each of the aforementioned trips, and the collaboration with the University of Florida to establish and continue the CCMP. At present the CCMP is spearheaded by graduate students Nathania Martinez and myself, along with Glover, Rissolo, and Murtha.

The CCMP has three main goals: empower the local population through collaboration, serve the community as a reliable source of information, and provide an adaptable and manageable platform for sustainable development. These goals can be accomplished through collaboration with various stakeholders and other means of engagement. It should be noted that while these methods are meant to engage, the option to participate remains with the community and that not every person or member is willing to contribute to CCMP.
4.1 Steps Taken in Preparation

When it was confirmed that my thesis would commence in March of 2018, I altered my course schedule for fall semester at Georgia State University (GSU). While I had experience working in museums, specifically with collections management, I needed to have a better understanding and working knowledge of the process of creating an exhibit. I enrolled in the graduate level Exhibit Production and Planning course offered by the History Department at GSU. Over the course of one semester, the class was tasked with cataloguing and researching exhibit artifacts, creating artifact and topic related content, and designing an exhibit layout and design for maximum audience engagement. The course offered insight into the creative process and techniques that can be used in the CCMP.

These methodologies include: establishing a “big idea” to focus the exhibit for the team, creating themes to provide coherency among content, identifying content topics, gathering research on specified topics, refining and editing content for audience viewing, generating an exhibit aesthetic, creating panels with content, and assembling the exhibit in designated spaces. Since the project is still in the initial stages of creation, the practices used and discussed in this thesis are restricted to the project’s current position.

4.2 Collaborative Work

This project is collaborative in nature and will likely develop into a co-creative endeavor, working on the established relationship between the Chiquilá community and PCE members. Collaboration is done in tandem with various stakeholders through personal communications, proposals, and meetings. Involving locals in this process and encouraging participation will increase interest in stewardship of the archaeological resources, allow for opportunities to design projects, and positively impact communities. In focusing on the nurturing of existing partnerships,
this project is designed to decenter archaeology and broaden the methods used in assigning value to sites and material remains by taking into consideration the voices of community members.

I have also been working with Glover and Rissolo and other members of the PCE project throughout this process. With the advancement of the museum project, the first proposal was updated, completed, and presented in February of 2019. It was then disseminated during the brief February trip made by Glover and colleagues, as well as the March trip discussed in more detail below.

4.2.1 Collaboration with University of Florida

The Chiquilá museum project is being developed in tandem with Tim Murtha and one of his graduate students from the University of Florida (UF). Murtha holds a joint appointment in the Center for Latin American Studies, the Department of Anthropology, and the College of Design, Construction and Planning. He is a landscape archaeologist, anthropologist, and design educator. Murtha has over twenty years of experience studying landscape history and settlement patterns in Belize, Guatemala, Mexico, and Scotland. Collaboration began with Murtha in 2014 when he was the director of the Hammer Center for Community Design at Pennsylvania State University (PSU). PSU granted Murtha funds to collaborate with PCE on the CCMP, funds that transferred with Murtha when he took up his current position at UF. From there, Murtha was able to create a studio design class in which he held a design charrette focused on Chiquilá. Glover guest-lectured in November of 2017, along with his two children (Alec then age 8 and Rhys then age 5), to present their experiences about living and working in the community.

Nathania Martinez is a graduate student in the College of Design, Construction, and Planning at the University of Florida. Her graduate research aims to map community experiences by combining aerial historic imagery with recorded mixed media stories across locally-defined
public spaces in Chiquilá. It is a spatial and temporal study based on Chiquilá’s change over the past 50 years according to community members. Her focus will be on the design, planning, and construction of engagement tools with the intent to provide visions of landscape-based opportunities and help build the capacity of locals in generating alternative income producing strategies to empower the community through cultural and environmental authenticity.

Nathania has been my partner on this project and between the two of us, we have worked on updating the proposals, engaging community members (physically and digitally), disseminating proposals and information about the project, and have to date recruited three members to join the community museum committee. Nathania has taken the lead on the design of the proposals and poster (Appendix A.2 and A.3). We have also created a community museum email (museo.chiquila@gmail.com) to establish three things: (1) a single point of contact between those of us involved in the project, (2) to begin recording any and all communications, (3) to pass on the email, its content history, and any associated social media platforms to the museum committee in the future. This same email will be used to create a Facebook page to promote transparency, to provide a more public platform to disseminate information about the CCMP, and to function as another means of dispelling chisme (gossip).

By collaborating with Nathania and Murtha, we are able to propose ways to optimize the various uses of each space. Their addition to the CCMP enhances our understanding and conceptualization of the constructed spaces as they interact with the community, the natural environment, and the region’s history.

4.3 Identifying Stakeholders

A stakeholder is someone with an interest or concern in a particular thing, or in this case, a museum project. I anticipate nine major groupings of stakeholders, adopting the groups identified
by Glover and colleagues (2012), with the establishment of the Chiquilá museum: the first being INAH with authority over the material remains from the archaeological site; the second is the municipal governance located in Kantunilkin that has been a major contributor to the implementation of the museum project; the third being the Secretaría de Turismo (SEDETUR) that provided the proposal and funding for Chiquilá’s Tourist Parador Project (CTPP); the fourth is National Commission of Protected Natural Areas (CONANP) which manages the Yum Balam protected area; the fifth group would consist of any future artesanos or vendors who wish to sell their goods and services; the sixth being the members of the various sub-groups of the Chiquilá community where this museum will reside and whose constituents will be most affected by it; the seventh stakeholder is made up of the ejido members of Chiquilá and the neighboring town of San Angel who donated some of the land the tourist parador constructions were built on; the eighth is tourists as a transitory and heterogenous group of people that pass through Chiquilá and whose preferences are a determining factor in how the constructions are used: and the ninth is the members of the PCE who have built relationships with the other groups, have worked in the area for more than a decade, and wish to continue working in the local area. Due to the close connections between towns, the people of Solferino (a separate ejido from Chiquilá) could be considered another stakeholder group depending on their interest and involvement in the project whether as a community participant or as artisanal vendors.

4.3.1 Government Organizations

The disparity between social groups has become especially obvious with the adoption of a neoliberal agenda that has dominated Mexico’s social, political and economic policies over the past thirty plus years (Laurell 2015: 250). This disparity deeply affects the degree of representation among groups of people in positions lacking in authority, resources, and funding. In Mexico, this
process has contributed to rising inequality and poverty, polarized income distributions, the privatization of profits, and the socialization of losses (Laurell 2015). The privatization of profits and the socialization of losses refers to the practice of treating earnings as the rightful property of their shareholders while treating losses as a responsibility society must assume (Laurell 2015: 253). This makes it very easy for people or groups in positions of power to propose a project and fully fund it without first consulting the community in which it will be established. This top-down process alters how said groups react to, perceive, and interact with the forced changes (Ervin 2015: 7). For this thesis, the four major governmental organizations or groups are discussed below from the one with what I perceive to be the most jurisdiction over the Chiquilá Tourist Parador project to the least.

The construction of the building where the Chiquilá museum will hopefully be located was funded and initiated by the federal Secretaría de Turismo (SECTUR) through Quintana Roo’s State office, the Secretaría de Turismo de Quintana Roo (SEDETUR). SECTUR is a federal government organization that oversees the design and implementation of public projects for the development of tourism in Mexico. SEDETUR is the state level office that oversees Quintana Roo’s tourism activities. SEDETUR allocated over 11 million pesos (c. $500,000 USD) to the construction of Chiquilá’s tourist parador (Appendix B.1). When initially proposed, the parador was designed to exclusively provide tourist information and to give priority to tourists through alternating local tourist service providers and artesanos. While we do not know what discussions were had nor the scope of people involved, the community at large was neither actively involved nor completely or purposefully sidestepped during this process.

As stated at the beginning of this section the municipality of Lázaro Cárdenas, located in Kantunilkin, is the overseer of Chiquilá’s tourist parador. The municipality is the third level of
governance, following the federal and state government, and has monitored the development of the project on behalf of SEDETUR. While SEDETUR may have drafted and funded the Tourist Parador project, the Municipal President has stated that he governs the affairs of the new spaces post-construction. The municipal government worked alongside officials from SEDETUR to employ outside laborers for the construction and maintenance of the buildings (pers. comm. Chicho, May 2018). Although the President may be able to control the museum, authority over the use of archaeological remains (i.e. pottery) lies outside of municipal jurisdiction.

The National Institute of Anthropology and History (INAH) is a federal government agency of Mexico that was established in 1939 and “investigates, preserves and disseminates the archeological, anthropological, historical and paleontological heritage of the nation in order to strengthen the identity and memory of the society that owns it” (INAH 2015). At the forefront of the protection and conservation of tangible and intangible cultural heritage, INAH has full regulatory authority over academic work and research, provides educational services and outreach activities, and holds the largest collection of publications and artifacts related to Mexico’s national patrimony (INAH 2015).

INAH’s creation has been essential in preserving Mexican heritage, significantly impacting social contexts as a key voice in the conservation and knowledge of national memory and heritage (INAH 2015). INAH catalogs monuments, buildings, material remains, and sites regarded as cultural patrimony with the intent to preserve them. All work that PCE conducts must be approved via INAH’s Council of Archaeology (Consejo) and the reports written at the end of each research season are submitted for approval to the Consejo. INAH decides whether the museum is able to display authentic artifacts, or if the environment hinders proper conservation and management,
then pictures and replicas will be used in place of their original counterpart(s). In the case of this museum, INAH has been explicit in expressing concern about the use of actual artifacts.

It is significant to note that there are tensions between INAH and the Chiquilá community. PCE members had reported a carved serpent head at Vista Alegre to INAH following the 2005 field season. In 2012, based on fears that the serpent head might be stolen, INAH officials removed it for preservation purposes. The local community was livid that INAH had come in and essentially took the serpent head, although the removal was approved by the ejido commissioner at the time (pers. comm. Glover April 2019). Since members of PCE work closely with INAH, the locals partially put PCE at fault for the confiscation of the serpent head. Glover has since commissioned a replica to be made by an artist in Muna, Yucatan that he is planning on returning to the community this summer (2019). This shows how top down governmental processes creates tensions between the community and governmental representatives that then impact other stakeholders. The serpent head incident has put PCE in difficult position because we have to continue work with both INAH and the community and do so in a way that doesn’t offend either party. The serpent head is a hot topic within Chiquilá and is mentioned every time a member of PCE is working down there.

While INAH handles the cultural patrimony, The National Commission of Protected Natural Areas (CONANP) manages and works to conserve the natural patrimony. CONANP has worked to conserve the natural patrimony and ecological processes of Protected Natural Areas (ANP) in Mexico (CONANP 2018). The ecological processes refer to the chemical, physical, and biological actions or events that connect live organisms to their environment (Green facts 2019). CONANP has initiated programs to strengthen and promote the conservation and sustainable management of Mexico’s biodiversity and environment (CONANP 2018). CONANP’s main task
is to build an institutional framework and create long-term strategies and goals that will guide and strengthen their work and responsibility for the betterment of Mexico (CONANP 2018).

Among many of CONANP’s environmental responsibilities, the Yum Balam Protected Area (Figure 5) is situated on the northern coast of Quintana Roo. Established in 1994, it includes the archaeological sites of Vista Alegre and Conil, the Yalahau Lagoon, and the modern towns of Chiquilá and Holbox. It is Ramsar designated, which means Yum Balam has been recognized as containing wetlands of international importance. According to CONANP there are seven different types of vegetation, with six representative wildlife and 19 animal species present at Yum Balam (CONANP 2018).
Figure 5 Yum Balam Natural Protected Area (CONANP)
The Mexican President in 2014, Enrique Peña Nieto, issued a decree expanding the boundaries of Yum Balam. This expansion included a stretch of land the *ejido* members had been trying to sell for years. The President’s decree triggered turmoil between the community and CONANP by encompassing this particular land and thus thwarting the *ejido*’s plans. When Glover and colleagues arrived in 2016 for a field season at Vista Alegre, CONANP’s office in Kantunilkin was boarded up and graffitied (pers. comm. Glover, April 2019). The office has now been reoccupied. Much like the situation with the removal of the serpent head by INAH, the expansion of Yum Balam’s designated territory contributed to community dissatisfaction with governmental organizations and a weariness associated with government operations.

CONANP has recently published a new management plan for Yum Balam with six main objectives: 1) to protect and conserve the biological diversity through the establishment of policies; 2) to establish policies to determine initiatives and programs aimed at conservation, restoration, protection, training, and education; 3) to recover and restore the ecological conditions prior to human interference; 4) to generate, rescue, and disseminate knowledge and practices that allow for sustainability; 5) to disseminate the conservation actions to raise awareness for conservation of regional biodiversity; and 6) to establish the ways Yum Balam will be administered and the participation mechanisms used by the three levels of government, the community, and people, groups, or organizations who are interested.

It is the first management plan published in the 25 years since Yum Balam’s designation as a protected area. Right before it was released, Rubio-Cisneros and colleagues (2019: 17) called on CONANP to create a management plan based on discussions with fishers from Holbox. Fishers had lobbied to reduce fishing pressures and illegal fishing but grew frustrated when their petitions were largely ignored by the government’s mild or null enforcement (Rubio-Cisneros et al. 2019:...
17). These tensions are significant to consider as this project progresses as CONANP is considered a content expert for some of the environmental topics and have shown an interest in contributing resources.

4.3.2 Community stakeholder(s)

The town of Chiquilá is the leading community stakeholder in the CCMP. This is due to the fact that the Chiquilá Tourist Parador, and associated buildings, were constructed in the center of town. Once the buildings were inaugurated (11 April 2019), the responsibility for the building(s) was given to the Municipality as was stated within the Chiquilá Tourist Parador agreement. What this means is that although the parador is in Chiquilá, the town does not have sole authority over how the spaces are utilized and administered. The structuring of authority over these buildings will become clearer as the project progresses through dialogues between government stakeholders and the community.

The officials from SEDETUR and the municipality refer to the tourist parador as a regional center that provides tourism services and artisanal goods from the area. This means Chiquilá is not the only community stakeholder in the CCMP. The neighboring towns of San Angel and Solferino can be considered additional community stakeholders as they are the closest towns. The towns of Kantunikin and Holbox have an implicit stake in the tourist parador, as the former is the center of the Municipality while the latter is home to the Municipal President and the major tourism draw.

Chiquilá is made up of many different groups of people. Understanding the various sub-communities is significant in identifying the type of narrative that can be presented in the museum. These groups include: the lanchero co-operatives who provide tourist services (i.e. whale shark and classic tours) via boats; the schools which provide education for children and young adults from the ages of six through 18; the native group of people whose families have lived in the town
for generations; the migrant groups who have moved to Chiquilá from other states or places in Mexico; the Yucatecos, the descendent group of the indigenous Maya; Chiquilá’s mayoral cabinet; and many others that will be identified as this project advances.

Besides the local towns, other stakeholders include the companies of tourism services, although it has yet to be determined whether these will be local or outside businesses. The other type of service expected to have a place within the tourist parador, is the regional women’s artisanal group led by the coordinator Maribel Valerio. It is uncertain whether other artisanal groups will offer services within the tourist parador, but the project proposal (Appendix B.1) does state that these small businesses should work on an alternating basis. The roles and level of participation by each of the aforementioned towns and services has yet to be fully determined but should nonetheless be considered as the project moves forward.

The tourists are a quasi-community stakeholder because their interests are acknowledged and function as the prime purpose for the construction and continued use of Chiquilá’s tourist parador. They are a heterogenous group that is transitory in nature but remains a key component in the development of goods and services. Since tourist participation is a key incentive for decisions and final products, the major funding stakeholders may not be engaged to their fullest potential as their choices depend on a diverse group of participants.

4.3.3 Proyecto Costa Escondida

The Proyecto Costa Escondida (PCE) is an interdisciplinary research project that investigates the relationship between humans and the environment along the north coast of Mexico’s Yucatán Peninsula. Since 2006, Glover and Rissolo have partnered with members of the Chiquilá community to investigate how social and environmental factors influenced human coastal adaptation in the Yalahau region over the past 3,000 years (Table 1). PCE has attempted to
facilitate in the funding and conservation of archaeological sites in collaboration with local community members. While not every attempt has been successful, it illustrates an interest and perseverance in assisting the Chiquilá community.

Meetings were held in both 2016 to discuss the idea of a Chiquilá museum and in 2017, meetings were once again convened to explore the possibility of using the space to the east of the glorieta (where the current children’s park is located). When the opportunity arose in May of 2018 to propose a community museum in Chiquilá, members of PCE have since created multiple proposals and associated presentational posters to continuously advance the project. Although PCE is by no means the deciding factor in CCMP, they are still considered a stakeholder due to their vested interest in collaborating with the community to produce a successful project. We can also provide a variety of skillsets and knowledge to facilitate the process and engage the local community in ways that other stakeholders are unable. This leads to my positionality within this project and my own position as a sub-stakeholder of PCE.

4.3.4 Personal Position as a Stakeholder

In regard to my project, my positionality can be questioned as a person who appears to be of Caucasian descent. Although I identify as a Mexican woman, I understand that my upbringing has been Americanized and altered to a certain extent in order to conform to the white-washed rituals of society. My Spanish has therefore not been developed to its fullest extent and can become an issue when holding and partaking in conversations. I take careful steps to combat my linguistic discrepancies by taking notes in discussions and meetings with locals and having my content go through rigorous edits. Although I do not anticipate it being nor has it been a substantial problem, there is also the possibility that my authority may be undermined or dismissed based on the fact
that I am a young woman. When put together, I am a woman who looks extremely white with proficient Spanish, is 22 years old, and still lays claim to her family’s Mexican heritage.

I understand that entering this space as a non-local, despite my Latin heritage, may impress a neocolonial ideology upon the people I work with. I actively work to employ decolonizing methodologies by acknowledging my positionality and fostering a co-creative and collaborative environment. If I do not explicitly state or work with community members to publicize my project, its goals, and purpose, they may perceive my methodologies as sustaining neocolonial practices. Not only can this negatively impact the nature of my project, but also the work of PCE and others interested in the area for the long term, hindering the process of cultural heritage management, stewardship, and community involvement.

As I enter this community space, I recognize the innate power hierarchy that exists in the academic realm between the researcher and the researched. In this case, the researched will be the archaeological sites, material remains, and histories of the local area. To combat this hierarchy, it is thus imperative that I include local voices to provide accurate representations of the sites, the history, and the community. Due to the inherent hierarchy that exists from the top, the national and state governments, down to the individual citizen, it is important to understand the difficult position I am in as an intermediary stakeholder.

Although difficult, there are instances in which my previously stated disadvantages have and may continue to allow me access to people and places not easily accessed. Working in a patriarchal community as a young woman has allowed me to interact with the younger generation. I have also been able to form connections with the wives and daughters of the men we maintain relationships with and hope to make more in the future. Being a young woman has enabled me to
enter spaces my male counterparts may not necessarily have access to and allows me to provide a
different perspective for my thesis and the community museum project.

This position of privilege allows me to work as an academic in a foreign country. Recognizing this, my goal throughout the project is to generate transparent methodologies by including and informing community members throughout this process. The process of this will by no means be a quick one. It should be a slow process that takes the time to ensure the museum originates from the interest and passion of Chiquilá’s community members. This project will surpass the time constraints of my enrollment at Georgia State University, but I will contribute to it for as long as I am able.

4.4 Engagement and Community Collaboration

Working with the community is a key component of this project and to the PCE overall. This project is intended to be inclusive, encourage interest, and promote accurate information about the history and scientific investigations that are being done in the area. These investigations include archaeological excavations and survey, geological expeditions, marine studies, ecological investigations, and many more. While we want and intend to help the museum succeed, it must be driven by the community in order to achieve long-term sustainability.

Public outreach activities must adopt an applied approach, tailoring interactions to the Chiquilá community and sub-community groups and used to discuss the ways in which archaeologists can partner with locals. Engagement efforts include attending festival and feast days, public talks, community contributions through local shopping, and maintaining positive relationships with local members. Some of these activities have already been performed over the past two summers of my participation on PCE and include assisting young girls with their English lessons, attending tourism lectures at the public university in Kantunilkin and participating in class
activities, and organizing local school field trips to the archaeological excavation sites. A drone
demonstration was also performed at the Primaria school (ages 6-12), as part of an outreach
initiative to the Directors of each school in Chiquilá. These discussions are initial attempts at
involving the local schools in the creative process to tailor museum exhibit content to the
educational curriculum. While interactions with community members are done in more casual
settings, this changes when we interact with government officials.

With officials like the Municipal President of Lazaro Cardenas or the State Secretary of
Tourism, we are required to assume a more formal persona and attire. During meetings and
discussion, we are very explicit about our own capabilities. Whenever a representative or
community member from Chiquilá is not present, we do not attempt to fully negotiate on their
behalf. We simply note that a discussion would be better had with people from Chiquilá about the
topic at hand. However, in cases where an agreement must be made by the end of the meeting,
then we make proposals to gain, or use in this case, as much as we can so that we have sufficient
space to work with alongside the community.

4.5 Meetings

Due to the nature of the PCE, Glover and Rissolo have been in contact with each Municipal
President, the Chiquilá Mayor(s), ejido members and the comisario of the ejido, INAH and
CONANP officials, and members of the Chiquilá community since the beginning of the project.
Ideas pertaining to the creation and establishment of a community museum have been present in
dialogues between Glover and Rissolo and the local community for years. While there are various
reasons as to why one has yet to be established, it by no means implies that the community has
given up on the idea. The opportunity did not fully take shape until a year after I joined PCE.
I began work on PCE in May of 2017 after being accepted into the MA program at Georgia State University. This initial work laid the foundation for my understanding of the region’s history, archaeology, and community engagement. I decided to focus my thesis on a community museum project in Chiquilá following the construction for the Chiquilá Tourist Parador Project, which had been completed in March of 2018.

A very early meeting occurred during May of 2017 that included: Glover and Murtha from PCE; municipal President, Emilio Jímenez Ancona; Allen Ortega and Nicholas Guevara Labastida, two officials from INAH; and Andres Cohou Martinez, the alcalde of Chiquilá at the time. They discussed the prospect of a Chiquilá community museum for the first time and were given the go-ahead by the Municipal President. The community museum was thus proposed to be located where the current park now resides, just east of the center of town (Figure 7).

Work on the museum project gained traction during a trip to Kantunilkin at the end of May 2018, attended by Murtha, Glover, Carlos Cisneros (Georgia State graduate student), and me. Three weeks were spent meeting officials and people, scheduling meetings, and gaining a better understanding of the project. We met with Francisco Cab Ku, the CONANP representative for the Yum Balam region. This was an introductory meeting where we discussed the Chiquilá museum as a space for interpretations and the incorporation of and collaboration with CONANP. We also met with the municipal President at the time, Emilio Jímenez Ancona; the Sub-secretary of Tourism of the Quintana Roo State, Luis de Potestad Clements; the Councilor of Tourism of the Lázaro Cardenas Municipality, Marta Loya; the Coordinator of Tourism of the Lázaro Cardenas Municipality, Jesús Gabriel Tah Moc; and the Director of Urban Planning and Tourism of the Quintana Roo State, Sergio Vásquez. A formal email was sent to the Secretary of Tourism of the
Quintana Roo State, Marisol Venegas Pérez, detailing the current desire to see the advancement of the museum project and attached with a copy of the proposal that we developed (Appendix A.1).

A brief trip was made in December of 2018 to meet with the new Municipal President, Nivardo Mena Villanueva, and the three candidates for the upcoming Mayor election in Chiquilá. This allowed us to reaffirm the proposal with new officials and reflect our interest in collaborating on this project. Once the proposal was updated in February (Appendix A.2), Glover circulated it to officials and key figures within the Chiquilá community. This trip was then followed by another in March by me and Nathania and Carlos. We spent 6 days working in Chiquilá to distribute proposals and disseminate information about the CCMP to anyone who would listen. We specifically targeted the Directors of the schools in Chiquilá to begin including them in conversations about content that might be useful to their prospective curricula. We explicitly stated that the content of each proposal was only meant to present possibilities and that nothing was set in stone. This is because we are interested in having feedback from the community and as we are only facilitators in this process, we truly want this project to stem from community interest and involvement.
The inauguration ceremony on April 11, 2019 led to a brief visit to attend the event and reaffirm PCE’s presence in the CCMP process. I attended the event to pass out proposals and business cards with the project’s email. I was introduced to Marisol Venegas, the Secretary of tourism for the State of Quintana Roo. The invitation and itinerary for the event (Appendix B.2 and B.3) outlined the attendees and outlined the proceedings. Five officials were present to preside over the event and inaugurate the building (Figure 6; from left to right): Omar Govea (Director of Projects and Tourist Infrastructure, SEDETUR), Sub-Secretary of Tourism, Nivardo Villanueva (Municipal President), Marisol Venegas (Secretary of Tourism for the State of Quintana Roo), and Valerio Mayoral (Mayor of Chiquilá).

Valerio provided the introduction to the event and was then followed by the Sub-Secretary of Tourism who gave a succinct speech about the Chiquilá Tourist Parador Project. The accordance
(Appendix B.1) was then signed by all present at the table. The signing was then followed by short speeches from Villanueva and Venegas (respectively), both discussed the potential of the spaces and their hopes for the future. The formal portion of the event concluded with Venegas’ speech, after which Govea took over to walk Villanueva and Venegas through the posters. These posters were basic in nature and included information about the cost of the CTPP and what each space was designated to be used for. One poster had a small mention of the museum and its placement within the parador and the educational nature of the panels. Govea and I performed a walk-through of the tourist parador reaffirming the space(s) we originally negotiated and further discussed their potential uses and realities.

4.6 Proposal(s)

4.6.1 Proposal 1

The first formal proposal for the museum was disseminated to key stakeholders in the summer of 2018 (Appendix A.1). It became obvious to me based on conversations with various people involved that the employees of SEDETUR envisioned a different function for the spaces than what the local community actually wanted. The federal employees insisted the spaces be used for tourism advertising and commerce whereas the community expected a cafeteria and more public services. Since the museum space had not been definitively allocated, the proposal was designed to be ambitious so that as the project progressed, the utility of each space could be renegotiated.

Election season in Mexico (national elections are held in early July) put a halt to the project, and we were forced to wait while things settled down and transitions were made. Obviously, the changing of officials in positions of authority affects how we went about proposing the museum and the nature of the content and it may very well have implications on how it gets implemented.
When a group from PCE traveled down to Kantunilkin in December 2018, we were able to briefly meet with the new municipal President, Nivardo Mena Villanueva. He is a native of Holbox Island and his wife owns the prominent ice cream business that sells its products in Chiquilá and Holbox Island. President Villanueva was receptive to the idea of the community museum in Chiquilá, as were the candidates for the mayoral election in Chiquilá. The proposal was updated shortly after this trip was made.

4.6.2 Proposal 2

After sending a series of emails to Omar Govea, the Director of Projects in SEDETUR, to set up a meeting, he reached out to Glover in early January. The meeting was to discuss the development of the project, our involvement, and to create a timeline. After this video call with Omar and in preparation for a brief PCE related research trip (made by Glover, Rissolo, Goodman, and a few others), the proposal was updated in February of 2019 (Appendix A.2). It was then disseminated to relevant officials and key figures within the Chiquilá community. We were able to be more specific with the second proposal as new developments had focused the potential of the spaces, outlined the types of things the community should think about as we progress, and slightly altered the conceptualization of content and related materials. By explicitly stating the types of things the community should be thinking about, we are trying to emphasize the amount of work that needs to be done and encourage the community to create a committee to manage these space(s) and tasks. Although the idea of a community committee came about independently, it is also part of the parador turístico de Chiquilá proposal (Appendix B.1) created by SEDETUR. The formation of a museum committee or council is entirely dependent on the locals and their level of interest in managing the newly constructed spaces.
Proposal 2 was also presented in a poster form, shortened to fit a standardized board (Appendix A.3), as part of a formal ceremony expected to take place on 5 March 2019. This ceremony did not take place and was rescheduled for April 11, 2019. These posters were a condensed version of the current proposal, highlighting key components and illustrating the potential of the spaces. These posters were not used during the ceremony as they contained too many words, according to Govea. The ceremony is the official transfer of authority and management of the space to the Municipality of Lazaro Cardenas and Chiquilá. The community has shown resistance to the ceremony because once the management of the new public spaces is transferred, SEDETUR will no longer be in charge of any maintenance or future development. This resistance is founded on the fact that the government funded these buildings with tourism in mind but chose to neglect the deteriorating roads and public infrastructure. The invitations and knowledge about the inauguration event were disseminated only a few days in advance to not only PCE but also to Chiquilá’s mayor. However, having a discussion with Govea after the event assisted in reaffirming the proposals and our role in the CCMP process.

4.7 An Organized Museum

The upper and lower level of the proposed museum, while connected, will employ different methods of engaging the audience. Utilizing a big idea, content categories, and content themes, will contribute to the consistency of information presented. Thought has been placed into creating content topics that are associated with the cultural and natural resources of the region. The content has been thematically organized by two main themes with seven sub-topics for the upper level of the tourist parador. These sub-topics include: Conil, Holbox Island, San Eusebio, Vista Alegre, the Community, History of the Colonia, Milpas, Fishermen, Yum Balam, Mangroves and Sabanas, Ojo de Agua / Aquifers, Laguna Yalahau, Jaguars, Whale sharks, and Regional birds. In order to
maintain coherency among the content, three themes have been identified and should be present: (1) background information, (2) significance, and (3) any “fun facts” if applicable. There have been discussions pertaining to the utilization of the kid’s park and part of the alcaldía, however ideas about how to maximize these spaces will be explored further with Govea, Martinez, Murtha, Glover, and myself. The content of the museum is further discussed in the following chapter.
5 THE CHIQUILÁ MUSEUM PROJECT

As mentioned above, discussions surrounding a community museum occurred in 2016 during PCE’s six-month long field season at Vista Alegre. Glover, along with his family, lived in Chiquilá full-time for the duration of this season (January – June 2016). From there the project has slowly progressed from a simple verbal concept to a physical construction to where we are now – a project in its very initial stages.

The Chiquilá Community Museum Project (CCMP) was established in May of 2018 and is an ongoing project. This chapter explores the changes in infrastructural development in Chiquilá over the past couple of years. The two most recent trips, in March and April 2019, have been significant to the advancement of this project. The sections below discuss our (Nathania, Carlos, and my) chance encounters and the ways we chose to engage the community.

The museum as a concept consists of multiple parts: a purpose statement, a big idea, content for each of the buildings, and the design and implementation for the exhibit(s). While our main focus has been on the spaces within the tourist parador, we are still interested in the potential of the park and the alcaldia. With collaboration and an inconsistent presence in the community comes a few challenges. No matter the capacity or final location the museum resides, so long as there is community interest and involvement in this project, it is sure to succeed.

5.1 A Change in Chiquilá

Under SEDETUR’s direction, construction in Chiquilá began at the end of 2017. With a budget of 11 million pesos, three new buildings were completed by spring of 2018. They doors of the center building, glorieta (roundabout) or palapa as it is more commonly called (Figure 4), have yet to open to the public. According to a few people we talked to, the interior is incomplete. Carlos Loria, nicknamed Bolillo, told us that the inside was missing lightbulbs and had tiles falling from
the ceiling. He went on to tell us that it would be less expensive for SEDE TUR to tear down and rebuild the center building than it would be to remodel it, but that might be an exaggeration that illustrates the community’s frustration with how the governmental funds were used in the community.

The other two spaces are located to the east and south of the parador. The location of the current park was the original site that initial discussions thought would be a good place for the museum. It is now a small park with three palapas, creating a shady open space (Figure 7). The other building, which was originally marked for artisanal displays and vendors, now houses the alcalde’s office beside a room regularly used to hold meetings (Figure 8). This building, with the alcalde’s office, was built over the community’s basketball court and audience stands (Figure 9).

Figure 7 Newly constructed park circled to the East of the parador (photo by Nathania Martinez)
Figure 8 Current alcalde's office circled (photo by Nathania Martinez)
Drastic changes like these have been a common occurrence since I started the project in the summer of 2017. The number of parking services, hotels, and other businesses competing for tourist money has dramatically increased in the past two years. What used to be empty lots or shallow mangroves, are now in the process of construction. When I arrived in Chiquilá in 2017, the plot of land across from our hotel was empty (Figure 10). The land is currently home to a three-story structure (Figure 11).
While these changes might seem like a normal part of everyday life, it tells a lot about how tourism affects the development of infrastructure. In just two years, Chiquilá is harder to recognize – the demand set by tourism on the people and land has transformed the town. This is significant
to document as this project moves forward because the identity of Chiquilá and its inhabitants changes every day. It is these modifications that have the ability to alter the content of the museum depending on the desires of individuals or groups. These groups vary from lancheros and migrants to the native populations, each needs to be taken into careful consideration from our initial stages of collaboration to the generation of content.

5.2 March 2019 Trip

In March of 2019, a week-long trip was made by Nathania Martinez, Carlos Cisneros, and me. After a long video call between Nathania and myself, we presented a tentative itinerary and list of goals to Glover and Murtha. Our goals can be condensed into two items: to begin discussions with the recently elected alcalde (mayor) of Chiquilá about the museum and the establishment of a museum committee; and to disseminate information about the museum and existing proposals (see below) to the people of Chiquilá and relevant parties. Prior to our arrival we had also set a date to meet with Francisco Cab Ku from CONANP, notified the alcalde of our visit, and made plans to visit successful projects in the region we wanted to learn from. Although we had originally planned to visit two examples, Punta Laguna’s Monkey Preserve and Tahcabo’s community museum, due to time constraints we were only able to visit Punta Laguna.

5.2.1 Punta Laguna Monkey Preserve

After a brief visit to Vista Alegre on our third day, we invited Valerio Dominguez Mayoral (current alcalde of Chiquilá) to join us on an afternoon trip to Punta Laguna. Punta Laguna is part of a nature reserve, called Otoch Ma’ax Yetel Kooh (OMYK), that is home to a Monkey and Jaguar Preserve (Figures 12-14). Taking advantage of the tourist traffic to the nearby Cobá archaeological site, OMYK decided to preserve a part of their jungle and open trails for ecotourism (García-Frapolli et al. 2007: 138). From its outset thirty years ago, OMYK has been managed by
community members who have organized themselves into a cooperative (García-Frapolli et al. 2007: 138).

The purpose of this excursion was to see how the Preserve and the community around it worked with federal and state government agencies to achieve a grassroots business managed by those same community members. Organizations include: Mexico’s Republic Government; the Secretaría de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales (the Secretary of Environment and Natural Resources; SEMARNAT), Procuraduría Federal de Protección al Ambiente (Federal Agency of Environmental Protection; PROFEPA); National Institute of Anthropology and History (INAH); Global Environment Facility (GEF); and has been recognized as a Ramsar site, which means it has been designated as a wetland of international importance (Figure 15).
Figure 12 Cement road sign for Punta Laguna's Monkey Reserve (photo by Mikaela Razo)
Figure 13 CONANP designated signs for the protected area Otoch Ma’ax Yetel Kooh in which Punta Laguna’s Monkey Reserve resides (photo by Mikaela Razo)
Figure 14 The Monkey Preserve’s museum sign for the protected region (photo by Mikaela Razo)
Francisco, our guide, explained that Punta Laguna was founded and named by Ignacio, Marcos, and Domingo Canul who worked as chicleros (chicle harvesters) in the early 1900’s. The descendants of the Canul brothers learned the chicle trade and continued the legacy of protecting the jungle (Appendix C.1). The initiative to conserve and protect the area was spearheaded by Punta Laguna’s founding families (C.1). The Monkey preserve was established in 2002 and offers...
a myriad of outdoor activities alongside a small museum (Figure 16). The museum, with information displayed in both Spanish and English, discusses the animals in the area (Figure 17), the nearby archaeological ruins (Appendix C.1 and Figure 18), information about cenotes, the active Maya community (Appendix C.1), among other topics. When asked about the development of the museum, our guide stated that it was built up over time (pers. comm. Francisco, March 2019).
Figure 16 Outdoor activities offered at Punta Laguna (photo by Mikaela Razo)
Figure 17 Protected animals in Punta Laguna (photo by Mikaela Razo)
We invited Valerio to see how the community around *Punta Laguna* was able to collaborate with various organizations to be in charge of managing the preserve, selling artisanal wares, and being responsible for the knowledge generated through the preserve. We made the purpose of our visit explicit to Valerio before we entered the preserve, stating why we were interested in *Punta Laguna* and how a similar initiative could be made with the archaeological sites and protected areas surrounding Chiquilá. It became very clear that Valerio did not have the same objectives as we did in coming to *Punta Laguna*. His lack of interest and noncommittal responses was a frequent occurrence in a majority of our discussions with him throughout this trip.

When engaging Valerio to specifically discuss the community museum project, he tended to react as if he was overwhelmed with how serious we were about it and how often we tried to
mention the project. We understand and interpret his responses to mean that the project is not very high on his immediate list of things he wants to accomplish in office. Valerio was and is currently dealing with more pressing issues as a newly elected mayor. He has been involved with getting an ambulance in Chiquilá alongside seeking better electrical and water services. While I recognize these important issues and applaud him for taking them on, I also attribute some of his attitude to the fact that Nathania and I are women and we were the ones pushing the discussion of the museum. Although this behavior is not unexpected, it does present its own set of challenges as a woman working on this project especially as the project progresses and the number of interactions with politicians and other government officials increases.

5.2.2 Chance Encounters

Besides our interactions with the alcalde, we chose to allocate a significant portion of our time to just being present in Chiquilá. Our consistent presence led to chance meetings which boiled down to us simply being in the right place at the right time. We chose specific people because the project needs a museum committee, established by and with the community, in order to proceed. In targeting different people from different groups, we hope to have respective representatives present and active on the committee. This would ensure no one person or group could monopolize the functions or purpose the community museum could potentially serve. An ideal committee would comprise of a person from various social factions or organizations within Chiquilá to manage the museum and serve the community at large.

The first chance encounter occurred on Monday (18 March) where Nathania did a series of test flights with her drone to capture images. These photos will then be used to create a more current map of Chiquilá and comprises a large portion of Nathania’s MA thesis. We did this along the waterfront and to the left of the ferry and port (Figure 19). This position allowed any person to
stop and watch the flight or ask us questions. When a group of *triciclo* drivers were watching us, Carlos took the initiative to strike up a conversation about the drone and handed out copies of the current museum proposal.

![Figure 19 Our location (circled in red) in relation to the waterfront and ferry zone (photo by Nathania Martinez)](image)

After running out of proposal copies, we made a stop at Bolillo’s *papelería*. Bolillo is a longtime friend of Glover’s and is an active and well-respected member of the community. While printing a set of proposals, a woman saw its digital version on the screen and engaged us in conversation. She introduced herself as Elmy and invited us to the *Bachillerato* school (ages 15-18) to meet with the Director. This timely invitation came after a lengthy conversation with Bolillo’s wife, Lupita, about how we could get into contact with the Directors of Chiquilá’s
schools. Elmy then introduced us to Director Reyna Vega Chuc. Following our impromptu meeting with Director Reyna, we met with the Subdirector Miguel Zapata Salazar of the *Primaria* school (ages 6-12). In order to really make an impression with our visit and get the young kids excited about our work, we performed a drone demonstration. It quickly proved successful, although slightly chaotic, as the children asked questions about the drone, why we’re flying it, what purpose did it serve, and they even asked questions about and wanted to read the proposal (Figure 20). Glover did this in 2014 with a similar reaction from the school children. We visited the *Secundaria* (ages 12-15) the next day (20 March) and met with Director Raúl Maghah Yan.

![Figure 20 Photo of drone demonstration at the Primaria in Chiquilá (photo by Carlos Cisneros)](image)

In each discussion we focused on a few items. The first was who we were and why we were interested in seeing the Director, or Subdirector, of each school. The next point explained the community museum project and was usually accompanied by the exchanging of proposals. We wanted to be explicit about how the potential museum could benefit and contribute to the school(s) curriculum. From our conversations, the project seems to be supported by the (sub)Directors of
each school in Chiquilá. We exchanged contact information and plan on reaching out via email to share digital versions of the proposals and stay in contact.

Another chance encounter occurred when Manuel, local launcher, a birding guide, and good friend, introduced us to David Kokom. David is a significant person within the lanchero community because he is the current president of the 10 lanchero co-operative. The lanchero cooperative provides tourist services for the Lagoon and ocean including whale shark tours, trips to Ojo de Agua (freshwater spring), and to Vista Alegre. Much like our other conversations, we briefly explained ourselves and the project. We were able to exchange information and gain another interested person who was willing to work with us in the future. We were interested in talking and potentially collaborating with him because the lanchero occupation encompasses an important portion of the Chiquilá community (Figure 21).

Figure 21 Lancheros (tourist boats) lined up on pier and along waterfront in Chiquilá (photo by Mikaela Razo)

We were introduced to Augusto who is a teacher at the Primaria in Solferino and moonlights as the alcalde’s assistant. Augusto was one of the first people we were able to meet
and talk to. Despite the fact that he works closely with the current *alcalde* and is an active member of the Chiquilá community – he knew nothing about the museum project. We then had a long discussion about the project, its long process, and our hope for community collaboration. Augusto seems to me to be a very reliable person who made it clear that he has a passionate interest in the museum project and the potential benefits for the schools in neighboring towns (like Solferino).

We also made a point to talk with some of the older members of the Chiquilá community, like Don Navo and Don Delfino, both of whom are familiar with PCE and are respected members of the ejido. Whenever we visit Don Villo and his wife Dona Maria (Figure 22 and 23 respectively), they always regale us with stories about their youth and the changes in the region over the past 60 to 80 years. Don Villo is an animated speaker who grew up on Holbox and then moved to Chiquilá in his late teens along with Dona Maria. He has shared stories about what the two towns (Holbox and Chiquilá) looked like before large-scale infrastructural development, the marine biodiversity in the 20th century, the incoming migrant groups, and many other topics. It is stories like these, that we hope to include and incorporate into the museum to share the history and knowledge with the various audiences, both local and non-local.
Figure 22 Picture of Don Villo telling a story about Chiquilá (photo by Mikaela Razo)
By making these connections with people from the local Chiquilá community, we hope that word of our work and the museum project is shared with their friends and so on. We shared both physical and digital copies of the current proposal (Appendix A.2) so that people can share and review them at their convenience. We do not wish to create a hierarchy of knowledge by withholding the proposals or work we are creating and / or doing with the various stakeholders. Our ultimate goal is to make this a community-based participatory project founded on the interest of and collaboration with the Chiquilá community.
5.3 The Inauguration Ceremony

The inauguration ceremony for the tourist parador and associated buildings was held on April 11, 2019. Nathania Martinez was notified of the event the Friday (5 April) before and confirmed the time and place on Monday (8 April). An invitation was sent along with an itinerary that Tuesday (Appendix B.2 and B.3), a plane ticket was purchased for me to attend. Although the event was confirmed with us via the office of Govea from SEDETUR, when we questioned members of the community, they knew nothing of the event. We were uncertain whether I would actually need to make the trip because the ceremony had been cancelled and rescheduled a number of times before. When the alcalde verified the event, I confirmed by my plane ticket and arrived in Mexico Wednesday (10 April) evening.

There is speculation among community members, that the event was kept a secret until the last minute so that the people of Chiquilá would not have time to boycott the event and thus force another rescheduling (but I recognize this could simply be chisme). The ceremony happened very quickly, and the officials were quick to leave the premises. While only a handful of the community attended, there was a large number of photographers and reporters. I was able to have a lengthy discussion with Govea who undertook a walk-through of the tourist parador with me. We discussed the potential of the spaces we had previously negotiated and thought up new ideas. He was quick to note that we should try to have the museum completed in three months since the state will undergo a round of elections. Govea’s timeline is ambitious but given the fact that a change in authority could mean a change in plans, his assertion is not without reason. That being said, Govea wants to flesh out content and set a definitive timeline to be printing panels and begin the process of executing our plans.
5.4 The Museum as a Concept

While this thesis documents the initial stages of facilitating the establishment of a museum and associated exhibits, we have been able to begin the production of an exhibit brief. An exhibit brief is the assemblage all of the information gathered to define the content and purpose of the exhibition (Lord and Piacente 2014: 244). They can be used to describe an exhibition project to stakeholders, potential funders, and the public. An exhibit brief includes four components: a purpose statement to define the fundamental relevance of the project; a core idea or concept (i.e. the big idea) to guide the exhibit team; a schedule to form the basis for future detailed time frames and a budget to ultimately determine the kind of exhibition that can be produced; and a resource plan to identify the categories of people and resources required to complete the project (Lord and Piacente 2014: 250).

5.4.1 Purpose Statement

The purpose of the museum is three fold: to first and foremost, operate as a co-creative project used to empower the local population through the control of their own representation and help build capacity for research and stewardship; to serve the community through authentic information as a reliable source of history for both locals and tourists; and provide an adaptable and manageable platform for a sustainable tourist economy without drastically altering the realities of Chiquilá’s identity and history. Since the demands of tourism are constantly changing, focusing the objectives of this project on the community and their wants encourages a more sustainable outcome that adheres to a consistent agenda with the potential for change. These initial goals are stated from my position and what I hope to accomplish with this project however, they are subject to change as we progress.
5.4.2 The “Big Idea” and Thematic Correlation

A big idea is a statement or sentence of what the exhibition is about (Serrell 2015: 7). It is a complete, active sentence that “identifies a subject, an action, and a consequence … provides an unambiguous focus for the exhibit team throughout the exhibit development process by clearly stating … the scope and purpose of an exhibition” (Serrell 2015: 7). While the purpose statement outlines our goals for the museum overall, the big idea is specifically geared towards the content and is meant to be used by the exhibit and content creators. It helps in defining the content’s boundaries by identifying a theme that unites each individual topic. For the Chiquilá museum, the big idea is:

The rich natural and cultural history of the north coast of Mexico’s Yucatan Peninsula has been shaped by the dynamic relationships between peoples (past and present) and their landscape, which are revealed through scientific investigations and local knowledge.

The current big idea was created in tandem with Glover and Nathania in February of 2019. This is only a tentative statement to focus the content once during the formation process. I hope it will be altered as we gain more collaborators among the local community and there is an increase in vested interest.

In order to create cohesion among the content categories (section 5.3), it is thus prudent to establish a set of sub-themes that work on a different level than the big idea. Where the big idea will help establish relevant content topics, the sub-themes would create a consistency about the type of information presented on the content topics. These sub-themes include: background information, significance (past / present), fun facts (if applicable), and relevant pictures. In combining the big idea and the sub-themes, we are able to establish the basis for collecting content and organizing information for presentation.
5.5 Tentative Content Categories

Museums and object interpretation and representation have had a contentious past defined by colonial practices and authoritative hierarchies (Barker 2010: 298). By engaging locals and encouraging active involvement, the museum can present a counter discussion to the hegemonic and idealized manifestation of indigenous identity. In performing the research on the local history and archaeology, the museum can address various historical perspectives and present the realities of the local community.

Now that we are in the early stages of collaborating and having discussions with the local community, we hope these topics displayed in the proposals will develop to reflect the desires of the locals and reflect the identity of Chiquilá and the Yalahau region. Ideally, the management and authority over these spaces would remain with the community through the community museum committee. It would be this committee, acting as a representative to the Chiquilá community at large, that would be able to execute decisions concerning the museum's content, its implementations, its role within the community, as well as its future.

As of right now there is one location for the museum – the center building (Figure 4). This is according to our conversations with the alcalde and the municipal President. I have slated these as tentative content topics because they were initially created for proposal 1 (Appendix A.1), with an understanding that their substance could change based on conversations with the community and other stakeholders. Within the parador, the museum would be further split into two parts, the upstairs and the downstairs. Since we are unsure about how the two other constructions could or will be utilized, we have only discussed potential ideas for them. The following sections discusses the possible content topics and use of spaces in the central palapa in more detail.
5.6 The Palapa Upstairs

Once the proposals were created, this area was quickly proposed to have the most ambitious amount of information. The space has been approximately measured out to 336.8 m². We envisioned the panels being placed around the observation deck to coincide with direction of each topic (Figure 24). The initial topics have been changed due to some inconsistencies and has been revised into two major themes: cultural and natural (Table 2). Sub-topics would then be divided accordingly. These topics are subject to change based on the preferences of the Chiquilá community and what they wish to present to their audience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural</th>
<th>Natural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conil</td>
<td>Yum Balam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista Alegre</td>
<td>Mangroves and Sabanas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Eusebio</td>
<td>Ojo de Agua / Aquifers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holbox Island</td>
<td>Laguna Yalahau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Chiquilá Colonia</td>
<td>Jaguars and terrestrial fauna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milpas</td>
<td>Regional birds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishermen</td>
<td>Whale sharks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2 Proposed organization of topics for upper level of tourist parador*
Figure 24 Panel layout for viewing observatory (upstairs parador), placed in the direction the resources they are describing are located
5.6.1 Aligning Content with Experts

Each of the following tables lists the content experts that have been contact via email or that should be contacted as this project proceeds. For the sake of presenting information with ease, I will be using the two categories established in Table 2. While the following lists include many people, they are by no means static and may change over time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural</th>
<th>Have Been Contacted</th>
<th>Should be Contacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Eusebio</td>
<td>Jennifer Mathews</td>
<td>Scott Fedick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Gust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holbox Island</td>
<td>Derek Smith</td>
<td>Elders from the Chiquilá community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nadia Rubio-Cisneros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista Alegre and Conil</td>
<td>Dominique Rissolo</td>
<td>Chiquilá community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeffrey Glover</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patricia Beddows</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beverly Goodman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Community, History of the Colony, Milpas</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chiquilá community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishermen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nadia Rubios-Cisneros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chiquilá community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 Cultural topic with associated content experts contacted and those that should be contacted

The above category (Table 3) is defined by local cultural resources. For these topics, we would like to incorporate the oral histories supplemented by scientific investigations. In order to generate more well-rounded content in collaboration with community members, the information included should present things like: where the site, group, or thing is located in relation to the tourist parador (and subsequently Chiquilá); a general timeline of said topic in relation to the timeline of the region; the type of inhabitation that was occurring at a site whether domestic or occupational (if applicable); and discuss the changes over time to include the environmental and
cultural aspects. While also addressing the sub-themes of significance, background, and fun facts (if applicable).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural</th>
<th>Have Been Contacted</th>
<th>Should be Contacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yum Balam, Jaguars, Whale sharks</td>
<td>Francisco Cab Ku (CONANP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Birds</td>
<td>Francisco Cab Ku (CONANP)</td>
<td>Manuel Joya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangroves, Sabanas</td>
<td>Francisco Cab Ku (CONANP)</td>
<td>Daniel Leonard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scott Fedick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Yalahau, Ojo de Agua / Aquifers</td>
<td>Patricia Beddows</td>
<td>Dominique Rissolo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beverly Goodman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 Natural topic with associated content experts contacted and those that should be contacted

This category (Table 4) focuses on the natural resources in the area. The type of information included could be: average sizes, where the animals or resources can be found, types of food they eat (if applicable), detailed descriptions, significance to the environment (if applicable), and how have they changed through time (if applicable). These categories could be integrated into or be displayed alongside some of the cultural topics due to their close relations. Like how Vista Alegre resides within the mangroves, the content for these topics could be placed together or in close range of the other.

5.7 The Palapa Downstairs

The downstairs portion of the center building has two parts: the vestibule area (Figure 25) and a portion of the side room (Figure 26). The vestibule area would be an ideal area to welcome visitors to Chiquilá and the museum; to introduce the audience to the general purpose of the
museum exhibit(s) and where to find them. This could be accomplished with a simple sign or two at each entrance around the exterior of the central staircase.

The second space is a portion of an enclosed room on the first floor. This would be an ideal place to specifically discuss the archaeological and associated scientific investigations in the area. This enclosed room has a great detail of potential for showcasing artifacts, or replicas if artifacts are unavailable, since it is the one space with the most controllable atmosphere that we could work with. Options we have discussed before include mounting a TV to display videos of oral histories or educational material, displaying artifacts or other material remains, or videos of the archaeological process and showcasing panels with history, pictures, or archaeological research. We are also interested in displaying a replica of a serpent head found at Vista Alegre within this room. Depending on what is or becomes available to us, along with discussions with the community, will alter how we envision and develop this space.
Figure 25 Location of introduction panels on the first floor of the Parador
Figure 26 Outlined exhibit space within the enclosed side room
5.8 Potential of the Other Spaces

The other two spaces that were constructed alongside the tourist parador is the small park and the building on top of the previous basketball court (Figures 7 and 8). The former space was built in two parts: a jungle gym and three distinct shaded areas (Figure 27); while the latter was built with two rooms: the current alcalde’s office and an empty room that is serving as his meeting room. The park has a lot of potential to serve as an additional educational space if the upper floor of the parador is taken or busy. Although I do not know how eager kids will be about playing on a jungle gym that is been sitting under the sun all morning, we have seen young children occupy the space in the afternoon and evening. With a few tables and chairs, this park could function as a reprieve from the sun during the day and a relaxing area to congregate during the evenings and nights.

When we discussed the use of the second building with officials from the municipality over the summer of 2018, the space was originally designated for the showcasing and selling of artisanal goods. Speeches made by officials at the inauguration ceremony about the uses of this second building has contradicted our conversations with them. After some discussions with Maribel Valerio, who owns a hotel and is coordinator of regional women’s local artisanal groups, she has stated that these groups will be present on the bottom floor of the tourist parador. As previously stated, the alcalde has moved his office into this building and uses the other space as his meeting room. These open spaces have a variety of possible uses that will depend on the interests of the stakeholders and the community.
Figure 27 Design plan for new children's park and three shaded areas
5.9 Implementation

The upstairs portion of the tourist parador has an open floor plan with plenty of space and a thatched roof. Whereas the downstairs environment can be controlled with doors and a A.C. system, the upstairs can be affected by the weather since it lacks windows or proper walls. For this reason, whatever goes upstairs must be durable to withstand turbulent weather and sustainable to endure long term. Plastic (or some type of synthetic material) plaques are the most logical options considering the circumstances upstairs, but durable materials should be considered for all of the panels. The same should be considered for the small park and the associated shaded areas. Since we are still in the initial stages of this project, discussions pertaining to the types of materials for the museum panels has been had, but not decided. These discussions should be had with the museum committee as this project advances and must take into account budgetary constraints.

We have a few examples to use as reference for the aesthetic design and layout of the panels. These panels don’t have to be overly complicated, they can have a simple design that displays the information succinctly (Figure 28 and 29). We can replicate the design of PCE’s previous attempts, in which history is aligned with a timeline (Figure 30). Another possibility is to reproduce panels similar to those created by CONANP (Figure 31) because their long-term sustainability is self-evident. Besides the content, we are also interested in including pictures to facilitate the audience in better understanding the information. The content will be displayed in both Spanish and English, and we hope to include indigenous Yucatec Mayan language. Much like the way it is displayed in Figure 31, the languages will be presented side by side.
Figure 28 Example of introduction panel for parador entrances (by Nathania Martinez)
Figure 29 Example of panel design (by Nathania Martinez)
Figure 30 Prior attempts at posters for community (courtesy of PCE)
Figure 31 Yum Balam outdoor panels created by CONANP (by Carlos Cisneros)
5.10 Challenges

One of the challenges the PCE faces in this region is the development of tourism in Mexico and their usage of heritage for profit. This places constraints on what each stakeholder believes can be accomplished with the proposed space(s), and it drives what each one believes the museum should look like. Since many locals presume that tourism is the end all be all for the community’s economic success and future prosperity, there is little consideration of the negative impacts tourism may bring and how they may affect the community in the long run. In this instance, part of our job is to serve as facilitators during this process – a source they can use to address these topics and collaborate with to create more sustainable initiatives for the community.

As a community that is made up of indigenous, native, and migrant groups, another possible challenge to consider is the accumulation of local heritage as diverse groups of tourists come into contact with the community. This is to say that because the Chiquilá community is comprised of various sub-communities, there may not be a single cohesive narrative of local heritage. As such, different groups may find different aspects of the history more or less significant. This presents its own challenge when thinking about content for the museum and how to go about accurately presenting and disseminating this more complex narrative of heritage and history to the audience.

Over the course of two years (summer 2017 to March 2019), drastic changes in development have occurred. New hotels are being built, the town center and connecting spaces have been completely redone, and there has been a substantial increase in transportation services. The security of local identity is in danger of being overridden by consumerism, overcrowding, pollution, environmental mismanagement or destruction, and the commodification of a stereotyped homogenous ancient heritage that doesn’t entirely reflect the various sub-communities within
Chiquilá. For this reason, encouraging stewardship of the local heritage and sites among all levels of the community through the establishment of a committee and museum is important.

I am aware and acknowledge the ethical dilemmas that are raised with projects like this one. These issues do not just arise after sites have been discovered and materials interpreted, they begin before archaeologists start their work in an area. There are local political tensions to consider and how archaeological work might impact the locals, the physical environment, government presence, and the community identity. These tensions are deeply connected with the top-down hierarchical system that currently exists between the various stakeholders and their sense of ownership. They progress as the archaeological project does and concern local involvement throughout the process, whether members are even interested in or able to be engaged.

Alongside the conglomeration of multiple historical narratives is the commodification of heritage as we see it most profoundly in Cancun and other major cities, towns, and archaeological sites in the Yucatan Peninsula. It is a growing concern as we notice pre-colonial history being homogenized, glorified, appropriated, and idealized to attract more capital (Barker 2010: 297). Despite the common misconceptions that having tourism attractions immediately brings in money, the cash benefits do not always positively or directly impact indigenous and small communities (Díaz-Andreu 2013: 230). The very people large businesses outwardly argue to represent are intentionally overlooked and disregarded in favor of the romanticized identity they descend from, almost completely detracting them from the economic equation. If they choose to partake in the economic equation, they are encouraged by these businesses to commercialize the very heritage and culture they were forced to abandon and forget by the Spanish (Walker 2009: 48). Engaging the Yucatecos in the Chiquilá community without perpetuating the same practices as the commercialized tourist businesses always presents its own set of obstacles.
Another challenge is ensuring that we are engaging people at every level in the community. This is true of any community project. When town meetings are held, not every individual from the community is present and summary of the discussions are usually spread by word of mouth. If we engage in discussions about what the locals want, only the voices of those who showed up will be considered. Even then, not everyone is willing to share their opinion about the infrastructural development or what gets put in them. It’s hard to determine the accuracy of local representation when the current male-dominated structure of daily life determines a majority of domestic and civic engagements. Women are not the only ones at risk of being unintentionally excluded, there are also children and people who work outside of their community. These biases will differ based on each stakeholder and community.

This is hard to combat and is an issue in working with communities that adhere to androcentric norms. But these biases are not limited to gender, there are members of the community who are illiterate or have vision issues. Alternative initiatives can be taken in the form of engaging school children who then go home and tell their parents. Another way to go about this is by indiscriminately engaging any person we come across, whether this be on the street or someone is just interested in a drone flight. While there is a low probability that we will be able to be unbiased, we can still try to best of our abilities and engage people through visual and auditory means. This can be facilitated with local leadership, either individually or through the community museum committee. While this is idealistic in nature, in truth not every member of Chiquilá is going to have input into the project or want to contribute. This is not necessarily a negative thing, it is the reality of the situation and an aspect of community-based participatory research. The key point being that community members have the option and that they can choose when and where they want to get involved, if at all.
5.11 Current and Future Work

Nathania and I are currently working on revising the proposal based on our discussions and experiences during the March trip. We have since this trip, sent out emails to the Directors and Sub-director of the schools in Chiquilá and plan on reaching out to the people we received phone numbers for. Our main goal is to remain in contact with the people we met and to keep them updated on the project development as we move forward.

One thing we wanted to establish was a point of contact for the museum project and once the museum is established, for the committee. We created a Google email (museo.chiquila@gmail.com) that we want to use to create a Facebook page. The Facebook page will serve as a public platform for the community museum in order to be transparent throughout this process and to keep followers updated. The main description would provide a succinct summary for the project as well as the organizations or people currently involved. Our first post would publicize the proposals and poster we have made so far as well as a small synopsis of the events that brought us to their creation. The following post would then be made about our March trip, accompanied by photos. Each subsequent post would be about any and all upcoming trips or updates, that we know of, concerning the museum project.

We also have the idea to have brief “who are we?” posts about PCE, Glover, Nathania and I, and other key people within this project. This could come in the form of posts or videos, depending on people’s preferences. Since Facebook is really popular in Chiquilá and surrounding towns, we hope the page will be used as a platform for people to learn more about the project. The main point of having the email and Facebook page is to have a single point of contact that can track our interactions with people and the project’s progress. We also wanted to establish an email account that is more consistent than people’s personal or school emails. In this way, we can keep
everything in one place and when the museum committee assumes ownership over the email, they’ll have all of this information already within their possession.

Based on our various conversations during the March trip, Nathania and I have also created a list of things we would like to edit in the proposal. We wanted to first and foremost make a note that we are only facilitators in this process and that final decisions are not made by us. We don’t want people to assume that we have taken ownership of this project or that we have jurisdiction over the project. Not many people seem to like seeing a picture of the parador on the front page, so we are interested in changing it out for a picture or figure that might better represent Chiquilá. We want to revise the content topics and make a note that they are only suggestions. That they can and probably should be adjusted based on the interests of the community to better reflect the realities of Chiquilá and to better coordinate with school curriculum.

A “process page” would be included to list things that should be considered as the museum develops. We also wanted to reevaluate the types of content the new alcaldia (mayor’s) building can be fitted with. Another page or section would be added to search for or to gain interest and support from the people of the town and region. This would also include organizations to fund the project and any future programs or activities that might occur there. There’s a lot that still needs to be done and this will not be the last revision we make to the proposal. Hopefully, people from the committee or community will be able to join us in this editing process. Until then, we will continue to make revisions based on project updates and conversations with locals.
6 CONCLUSIONS

The northern coast of the Yucatan Peninsula has rich cultural and environmental resources, both in the past and the present. It is this history that we hope will be displayed in the Chiquilá community museum using local knowledge gained through oral histories supplemented by the scientific research from the area. Engaging all levels of the Chiquilá community and including them, along with the other stakeholders, throughout this creative process is thus imperative to the success of the Chiquilá Community Museum Project. This process is not something that can be completed over a couple of weeks. It is a process built up over time and founded on the interest of the Chiquilá community and their contributions to the project.

Our hope is to continue collaborations with the University of Florida and local community members to create a museum that builds capacity for research and stewardship, to provide a platform to present the realities of Chiquilá’s identity and history, and to serve as a reliable source of information for all visitors. With the growing demands and development of tourism in Chiquilá and surrounding towns, it is important to encourage sustainable plans with the potential for change. The tourist parador constructions have great potential to positively impact the community and visiting tourists. I remain hopeful of the outcome based on the initial interest and enthusiasm shown by the people we have interacted with. Bringing these possibilities to fruition will continue in the coming months, and maybe even years.
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CHIQUILA
distrito del patrimonio cultural y natural
museo comunitario

Como parte del centro turístico recientemente desarrollado, proponemos el uso de múltiples espacios para involucrar a la comunidad de Chiquila y visitantes de la región. Aprovechando los ricos recursos culturales y naturales de la costa norte de Quintana Roo, el desarrollo de estos espacios no solo enriquecerá la experiencia de los turistas que viajan a Holbox, sino que también brindará una oportunidad para la exploración de recursos locales y regionales.

Los siguientes cinco espacios son fundamentales para el desarrollo a fin de exhibir y comprometer plenamente los ricos recursos culturales de la región:

1. Lobby del Centro de Turismo

2. Espacio de exposición (Primer piso)

3. Plataforma de observación (Segundo piso)

4. Museo Interactivo de Recursos Culturales y Naturales

5. Exhibición Artesanal

Propuesta preliminar del 22 de mayo de 2018, presentada por el Proyecto Costa Escondida con contribuciones de Jeffrey Glover, PhD (Georgia State University), Dominique Rossol, PhD (University of California, San Diego), Nathanael Martinez (Universidad de Florida), Miguel Razo (Universidad Estatal de Georgia), Carlos Caceres (Universidad Estatal de Georgia) y Timothy Murtha, PhD (Universidad de Florida). ¿Preguntas? Envíe un correo electrónico a jglover@gru.edu o tmurtha@ufl.edu.
1. Lobby del Centro de Turismo

En el lobby del centro de turismo, proponemos la instalación de dos paneles cerca de las entradas del sur y del norte. Los paneles idénticos proporcionarán una historia general de la región centrada en la descripción de los recursos culturales y naturales importantes que se encuentran a lo largo de la costa norte.

Cada panel tendrá 2 metros X 1 metro, incluidas las traducciones al español y al inglés.
2. Espacio de exposición (Primer piso)

En un espacio seguro del primer piso, 20-25 m² de espacio de exhibición permanente proporcionarán información sobre la historia cultural de la región, comenzando con los antiguos mayas y la historia más reciente de la región. Se exhibirán artefactos (dependiendo del permiso del INAH) o reproducciones importantes junto con paneles de información en español e inglés. Un monitor con videos de actividades de investigación en curso ofrecerá a los visitantes y a la comunidad investigar recursos culturales importantes y la historia regional.
3. Plataforma de observación (Segundo piso)

En el segundo piso, se instalarán paneles de observación sobre la línea de vista en la base del techo para permitir que los visitantes y miembros de la comunidad aprendan más sobre los recursos culturales y naturales críticos visibles en esa dirección. Los jeroglíficos para las direcciones cardinales de Maya serán pintados en los pilares. Los paneles estarán en español e inglés.

En el centro de la sala adyacente a las escaleras se imprimirá e instalará un modelo tridimensional del sitio arqueológico de Vista Alegre. Se incluirá un pequeño panel de información.
4. Museo Interactivo de Recursos Culturales y Naturales

Junto al nuevo área del parque, al Este del centro de turismo, se desarrollarán tres museos interactivos para exhibir los recursos culturales y naturales clave de la región. En las exhibiciones de recursos naturales, se describirá y discutirá la ecología local. En las exhibiciones de recursos culturales, oportunidades interactivas para explorar la historia de Chiquila y la región. En el área central, cerca del patio de recreo, se explorará un espacio de exhibición abierto diseñado para integrar recursos culturales y naturales.
5. Exhibición Artesanal

Acompañando a la exposición artesanal anticipada será una exposición rotativa de la producción tradicional de artefactos, que se basa en los artefactos y reproducciones de las excavaciones de los sitios arqueológicos de Vista Alegre y Conil. Cerámica, concha y piedra estarán en exhibición junto con información sobre técnicas de producción anteriores en español e inglés.

Debido a la ubicación estratégica de Vista Alegre a lo largo de la costa, se han recuperado artefactos de toda Mesoamérica. Estos artefactos estarán en exhibición para discutir también el importante papel del comercio y el intercambio en la sociedad maya. La exhibición también celebrará la posición única de la región a lo largo de la historia cultural maya.

Placa grabada hecho de concha del Clásico Terminal (dC 900 - 1100)

Estampador / sello hecho de cerámica para estampar ropa o papel

Pesa de red hecho de un tiesto de cerámica

Malacate hecho de cerámica asociado con la producción de algodón
Este documento es una versión actualizada de la propuesta preliminar hecha el 22 de Mayo del 2018, donde se describió una serie de ideas sobre el desarrollo de un museo comunitario asociado con el parador turístico y espacios adyacentes recientemente construidas en Chiquilá. Se propuso el uso de múltiples áreas de estos espacios para reflejar los intereses de la comunidad de Chiquilá y sus comunidades vecinas, y servir para cautivar la atención de visitantes a la región. Al celebrar y aprovechar de los ricos recursos culturales y naturales de la costa norte del estado de Quintana Roo, el desarrollo de estos espacios no sólo enriquecerá la experiencia de los turistas que viajan rumbo a las playas de Isla Holbox, sino que también brindará una oportunidad para expandir las exploraciones del turista a incluir recursos costales locales y regionales en tierra firme.

Los siguientes cinco espacios fueron identificados como apto para el desarrollo del museo a fin de exhibir y describir plenamente los recursos de la región: el vestíbulo del parador turístico y un espacio de exposición seguro en la planta baja, láminas rodeando la planta alta del parador, parque infantil interactivo, y en el interior del edificio adyacente a la plaza estampada. Las propuestas para cada uno de estos espacios se describen en las siguientes secciones. Están sujetos a evolucionar con el desarrollo del museo comunitario durante un proceso iterativo donde los artículos serán construidos en fases a medida que se adquieran fondos.

... 

Una lámina de esta propuesta se presentará durante el convenio público programado para el 5 de Marzo del 2019 en Chiquilá, donde se le entregará el funcionamiento del parador turístico al municipio.
Comité del museo comunitario

La creación de un museo comunitario que representa la comunidad y inspira a visitantes de la región es un proyecto emocionante, pero también requerirá planificación para que prospere. Se sugiere que se establezca lo más pronto posible un comité del museo comunitario compuesto de miembros de la comunidad que servirán como asesores para el desarrollo del museo, representantes de intereses de la comunidad, defensores del mantenimiento continuo del museo comunitario, y un punto de contacto para todo tema que se refiera al museo. Con el establecimiento de un comité se podrá proceder con discusiones organizadas sobre elementos que son críticos para el desarrollo del museo. Su establecimiento queda a la discreción de representantes de la comunidad, pero se propone que se componga de diversas voces miembros y miembros de la comunidad que dispongan de interés y energías para influir el desarrollo del proyecto.

En las siguientes páginas se presenta con más detalle las propuestas del contenido que se han hecho para localizar en cada área discutido en la propuesta previa. Incluyendo unos temáticos educativos para desarrollar como contenido de los paneles con el propósito de crear coherencia temática en el museo.

Discusiones a tener en cuenta durante este proceso incluyen pero no se limitan a:

- El desarrollo del contenido de los paneles educativos;
- Presentación, diseño, y materiales de los paneles;
- Maneras de incluir a la comunidad en los procedimientos;
- La creación de una marca formal que identificara al museo;
- La administración y mantenimiento del museo después de su construcción;
- La protección de los bienes del museo comunitario;
- y la potencial para crear programas escolares y educativas.
Vestíbulo del parador turístico

En el vestíbulo del parador turístico, proponemos la instalación de dos paneles idénticos enfrente de las dos entradas principales. Los paneles servirán para llamar la atención: saludarán a los visitantes, les dará una historia general de la región, y los dirige al contenido asociado con el museo y los servicios del parador.

Cada panel medirá aproximadamente 1 metro x 2 metros y se propone que apropiadamente incluyan letra en español, inglés, y en maya para comunicarse con una audiencia diversa. Las dimensiones exactas se determinarán basado en el tamaño apropiado para el espacio.

Plan de la planta baja del parador turístico
Dibujo adaptado de planos provistos por Secretaría de Turismo del Estado de Quintana Roo.
Espacio de exposición (planta baja)

En un área seguro de la planta baja del parador turístico, dentro de 20-25 m² de espacio de exhibición permanente, se propone incluir información sobre las investigaciones científicas que han sido ejecutados en la región. Especificamente esas relacionadas con los artefactos arqueológicos prehispánicos que se han excavado en el área. Contingente al permiso del Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia (INAH), se podrá exhibir una selección de artefactos originales, reproducciones, o fotos junto con paneles de información con letra en español, inglés, y maya. En esta selección de artefactos se incluye exhibir una reproducción comisionada de la Cabeza de Serpiente del sitio arqueológico Vista Alegre. Se propone también en este espacio la inversión de un monitor que continúe reproduce videos creativas y educativas. Por ejemplo, testimonios de miembros de la comunidad, videos de los sitios arqueológicos Conil y Vista Alegre, y de lugares de interés cultural y ecológicas en la región.
Plataforma de observación con paneles educativas (planta alta)

Desde la planta alta del parador turístico se disfruta de una vista espectacular de la laguna y de la vida cotidiana de Chiquilá. Aquí se propone instalar paneles educativos rodeando la planta montadas sobre la línea de vista que dirigen al observador hacia la dirección cardinal en que se encuentra el sujeto o tema que se describa en cada panel. Igualmente se propone considerar distintas formas de presentar la información. También se propone la exhibición potencial de una maqueta del sitio arqueológico de Vista Alegre. Este espacio se presta para múltiples usos asociados con programas dirigidos por el museo comunitario, que podrían incluir programas escolares y exhibiciones de obras de arte local.

Como en las propuestas para la planta baja del parador, se propone que incluyan los paneles apropiadamente y donde se permite letra en español, inglés, y en maya. La cantidad y las dimensiones exactas de los paneles se determinarán basado en el tamaño apropiado para el espacio y módulo de presentación.

Abajo se muestra una tabla de grupos temáticos que se han contemplado para el desarrollo enfocado del contenido de los paneles y materiales educativos del museo comunitario. Se propone que cada tema tenga su propio panel con imágenes y información pertinente, como su histórico, conocimientos, importancia, y hechos interesantes. Hay varias maneras para mostrar la información. Estas formas determinarán la cantidad de paneles y los materiales.

### Temas

#### Lugares
- Conil
- Isla Holbox
- Vist Alegre
- San Eusebio

#### Fauna
- Tiburón ballena
- Jaguar
- Aves regionales

#### Ambiente
- Yum Balam
- La Laguna Conil
- Manglares y sabanas
- Lagos de agua y el acuífero

#### Cultura
- Comunidad
- Historia de la colonia
- Pescadores
- Milpa

---

**Plan de acción:**
- Revisar temas propuestos
- Desarrollar contenido de paneles con el apoyo de especialistas que puedan informar sobre cada tema
- Formalizar decisiones sobre la presentación, diseño, y materiales de los paneles
- Ubicar fotos y materiales que se puedan usar para los paneles

**Plan de la planta alta del parador turístico**
concepto de paneles ubicados correspondientes a la dirección en la que se encuentra el objeto o tema
Parque infantil con componentes interactivos

Este espacio presenta oportunidades para incluir varias actividades dirigidas para la juventud que sean interactivas y que involucren a la comunidad, dado a que está al aire libre. Se propone explorar opciones para incluir una exhibición interactiva que destaca los recursos culturales y naturales de la región en maneras que sean apreciables para una población infantil. También se propone considerar el uso de este área como salón de clase exterior asociado con el museo comunitario para uso por grupos escolares.

Plan de acción:
- desarrollar ideas para conceptualizar actividades interactivas
  ejemplos:
  - instalación de paneles educativos sobre la ecología y expresiones culturales de la región
  - área para de artesanías para niños
  - murales pintadas por la comunidad

Plan del parque infantil
Dibujado/adaptado de planos provistos por Secretaría de Turismo del Estado de Quintana Roo.
Exhibición Artesanal

Dado a la potencial representación de artesanías de la región en esta localidad se da la oportunidad de crear un espacio que celebra los procesos creativos y expresivos. Acompañando a la exposición artesanal anticipada se propone una exposición de la producción tradicional de artefactos, que se basa en los originales y reproducciones de las excavaciones de los sitios arqueológicos de Vista Alegre y Conil. Incluyen materiales hechas de cerámica, concha, y piedra. Se podrían exhibir junto con información sobre técnicas de producción antiguos.

 Debido a la ubicación estratégica de Vista Alegre a lo largo de la costa, se han recuperado artefactos de varios lugares de Mesoamérica. Estos artefactos, con el permiso del INAH, o sus réplicas se podrían exhibir para destacar estos procesos creativos y también el importante papel del comercio y intercambio que tuvo la sociedad Maya durante siglos. La exhibición también celebraría la posición única de la región a lo largo de la historia cultura Maya.

Ejemplos de artesanías antiguas. Desde arriba: placa grabada hecho de concha del Clásico Terminal (DC 900-1100). Estampilla o sello hecho de cerámica para marcar ropa o papel.

Ejemplos de artesanías de hoy como el uso de textiles para bordar y hacer hamacas.
Conclusiones

Hasta ahora se ha conversado sobre la planificación de los avances de la propuesta para el museo comunitario en Chiquitá. Las propuestas han sido estrategicamente sugeridas como tal, dado a la oportunidad que se presentó cuando se construyó el parador turístico en la glorieta de Chiquitá y espacios adyacentes. Una oportunidad para localizar y realizar un sueño que se ha ido fomentando en la mente de varios comunitarios para crear un museo comunitario que preserva y valora el patrimonio local de la región costera noreste de la Península Yucatán. Un área repleta de historia que contar, características geológicas, y de flora y fauna únicas que proteger, y de muchos cuentos y costumbres que preservar y compartir con generaciones por venir. Las áreas que se han considerado en esta propuesta se han imaginado como una serie de espacios públicos vinculados para crear una experiencia integral del muelle—al que se describió en el título de la propuesta como un distrito del patrimonio cultural y natural. Pero esta propuesta hace falta de los aportes y apoyo de la comunidad. Con su ayuda el museo comunitario representará sus valores y su región.
Chiquilá
un distrito del patrimonio cultural y natural
museo comunitario

Hasta ahora se ha conversado sobre la planificación de los avances de la propuesta para el museo comunitario en Chiquilá, dado a la oportunidad que se presentó cuando se construyó el parador turístico en la glorieta y espacios adyacentes. Una oportunidad para localizar y realizar un sueño que se ha ido fomentando en la mente de varios comunitarios para crear un museo comunitario que preserva y valora el patrimonio local de la región costera noreste de la Península Yucatán. Un área repleta de historia que contar, características geológicas, y de flora y fauna únicas que proteger, y de muchos cuentos y costumbres que preservar y compartir con generaciones por venir. Con su ayuda el museo comunitario representará sus valores y su región.

Los siguientes cinco espacios fueron identificados como apto para el desarrollo del museo a fin de exhibir y describir plenamente los recursos de la región: el vestíbulo del parador turístico y un espacio de exposición seguro en la planta baja, fórmicas rodeando la planta alta del parador, parque infantil interactivo, y en el interior del edificio adyacente a la glorieta.

Las propuestas para cada uno de estos espacios están sujetos a evolucionar con el desarrollo del museo comunitario durante un proceso iterativo donde los artículos serán construidos en fases a medida que se adquieran fondos.
ejemplos:

Espacio de exposición (planta baja)

En un área segura de la planta baja del parador turístico, dentro de 30-35 m² de espacio de exhibición permanente, se propone incluir información sobre las investigaciones científicas que han sido ejecutadas en la región. Específicamente, hay que relacionar las actividades arqueológicas prehispánicas que se han ejecutado en el área. Contingente a este fin, se propone incluir un espacio con artefactos originales, reproducciones, o fotos junto con paneles de información con letra en español, inglés, y maya. Es importante considerar que el uso de réplicas no requeriría las mismas protecciones que requieren los artefactos originales. El uso de réplicas también ofrece contacto más directo con los visitantes que podrían aumentar oportunidades de aprendizaje. En este sentido, se propone incluir una reproducción del artefacto que se exhibirá en el sitio arqueológico el sitio arqueológico Vista Alegre. Se propone también en este espacio la inversión de un monitor que continuamente reproduce videos creativos y educativos. Por ejemplo, testimonios de miembros de la comunidad, videos de los sitios arqueológicos Caral y Vista Alegre, y de lugares de interés cultural y ecológicos en la región.

Plataforma de observación con paneles educativos (planta alta)

Desde la planta alta del parador turístico se distingue una visión panorámica de la laguna y de la vida cotidiana de Chiquila. Aquí se propone instalar paneles educativos indicando la planta montadas sobre la línea de vista que dirigen al observador hacia la dirección cardinal en que se encuentra el sujeto o tema que se describe en cada panel. Igualmente se propone considerar diferentes formas de presentar la información. También se propone la incorporación de una maqueta del sitio arqueológico de Vista Alegre. Este espacio se presta para múltiples usos asociados con programas dirigidos por el museo comunitario, que podrían incluir programas escolares y exhibiciones de obras de arte local.

Temas propuestos para contenido

- Caral
- La Laguna Caal
- San Esteban
- Tíbor (color)
- Mangue y sabana
- Zona de agua y arácnidos
- Cultura:
  - Población de la cola
  - Acuáticos
  - Pescadores
  - Sala

Plan de la planta alta del parador turístico

- Montaje de los paneles
- Opción 1: Montaje del sitio del sitio de la Cruz
- Opción 2: Montaje de la viga de cemento
- Opción 3: Montaje de las casas
Se propone crear un comité del museo comunitario

La creación de un museo comunitario que representa la comunidad y inspira a visitantes de la región es un proyecto emocionante, pero también requerirá planificación para que prospere. Se sugiere que se establezca lo más pronto posible un comité del museo comunitario compuesto de miembros de la comunidad que servirán como asesores para el desarrollo del museo, representantes de diversos intereses de la comunidad, defensores del mantenimiento continuo del museo comunitario, y un punto de contacto para todo tema que se refiera al museo. Con el establecimiento de un comité se podrá proceder con discusiones organizadas sobre elementos que son críticos para el desarrollo del museo. Su establecimiento queda a la discreción de representantes de la comunidad, pero se propone que se componga de diversas voces de miembros y miembros de la comunidad que dispongan de interés y energías para influir el desarrollo del proyecto.

Discusiones a tener en cuenta durante este proceso incluyen pero no se limitan a:

- El desarrollo del contenido de los paneles educativos;
- Presentación, diseño, y materiales de los paneles;
- Maneras de incluir a la comunidad en los procedimientos;
- La creación de una marca formal que identificara al museo;
- La administración y mantenimiento del museo después de su construcción;
- La protección de los bienes del museo comunitario;
- y la potencial para crear programas escolares y educativas.
Appendix B

Appendix B.1 Parador Turístico de Chiquilá (Chiquilá’s Tourist Parador) Proposal

ACUERDO PARA LA ENTREGA Y OPERACIÓN DE LA OBRA DENOMINADA “PARADOR TURÍSTICO DE CHIQUILÁ”, QUE CELEBREN POR UNA PARTE LA SECRETARÍA DE TURISMO DEL ESTADO DE QUINTANA ROO, REPRESENTADO POR SU TITULAR LA LCDA. MARISOL VANEAGAS PÉREZ, ASISTIDO EN ESTE ACTO POR EL LIC. LUIS DE POTESTAD CLEMENS, SUBSECRETARIO DE PLANEACIÓN Y DESARROLLO TURÍSTICO DE LA SECRETARÍA DE TURISMO, Y POR LA OTRA PARTE EL H. AYUNTAMIENTO DE LÁZARO CárDENAS, REPRESENTADO POR SU PRESIDENTE MUNICIPAL EL C. JOSÉ NIVARDO MENA VILLANUEVA, ASISTIDO EN ESTE ACTO POR EL C. SALVADOR VARGAS ROSAS, SECRETARIO GENERAL DEL H. AYUNTAMIENTO, DE ACUERDO A LOS SIGUIENTES ANTECEDENTES Y ACUERDOS.

ANTECEDENTES:

1.- QUE EL ARTÍCULO 2º DE LA LEY DE TURISMO DEL ESTADO DE QUINTANA ROO, ESTABLECE LA COORDINACIÓN Y PARTICIPACIÓN DE LAS AUTORIDADES FEDERALES, ESTATALES, MUNICIPALES Y ORGANISMOS DEL SECTOR PARA EL DESARROLLO TURÍSTICO DE LA ENTIDAD.

2.- QUE DE CONFORMIDAD A LO ESTIPULADO EN EL ARTÍCULO 42, FRACCIÓN XIV DE LA LEY ORGÁNICA DE LA ADMINISTRACIÓN PÚBLICA DEL ESTADO DE QUINTANA ROO, SE ESTABLECE QUE LA SECRETARÍA DE TURISMO PROPORCIONARÁ INFORMACIÓN Y ATENCIÓN AL TURISTA, CUBRIENDO LOS CENTROS DE MAYOR Afluencia, Carreteras y Terminales de transporte aéreo, terrestre y marítimo según se requiera, así como instalar, coordinar y dirigir MÓDULOS DE INFORMACIÓN TURÍSTICA.

3.- QUE MEDIANTE EL CONVENIO DE COORDINACIÓN PARA EL OTORGAMIENTO DE UN SUBSIDIO, EN EL MARCO DEL PROGRAMA DE DESARROLLO REGIONAL TURÍSTICO SUSTENTABLE Y PUEBLOS MÁGICOS CELEBRADO POR UNA PARTE EL EJECUTIVO FEDERAL, POR CONDUCTO DE LA SECRETARÍA DE TURISMO “SECTUR”, SE TRANSFIRIO AL GOBIERNO DEL ESTADO RECURSOS POR LA CANTIDAD DE $5,536,438.00, APORTANDO EL ESTADO $8,335,945.06 POR UN TOTAL DE $11,872,383.06, DESTINADOS A LA CONSTRUCCIÓN AL PROYECTO DEL PARADOR TURÍSTICO DE CHIQUILÁ, MUNICIPIO DE LÁZARO CárDENAS, QUINTANA ROO.

4.- QUE DANDO RESPUESTA A LA PETICIÓN QUE HICIERA EL H. AYUNTAMIENTO A LA SECRETARÍA DE TURISMO PARA EL EFECTO DE ENTREGAR EL PARADOR TURÍSTICO DE CHIQUILÁ, ES EL MOTIVO Y EL OBJETO PARA FORMALIZAR EL PRESENTE ACUERDO.

5.- QUE, PARA EL SEGUIMIENTO DE LAS ACCIONES Y CONDICIONES PREVISTAS EN EL PRESENTE ACUERDO, LA SECRETARIA DE TURISMO, DESIGNA EN ESTE ACTO AL TITULAR DE LA SUBSECRETARÍA DE DESARROLLO TURÍSTICO CON
RESIDENCIA EN LA CIUDAD DE CHETUMAL, QUINTANA ROO, DE MANERA CONJUNTA E INDISTINTA DE SU TITULAR.

EXPUESTO LO ANTERIOR Y CON FUNDAMENTO EN LO DISPUESTO EN LOS NUMERALES 3°, 19 FRACCIÓN XII, 42 DE LA LEY ORGÁNICA DE LA ADMINISTRACIÓN PÚBLICA, 1°, 2° DE LA LEY ESTATAL DE TURISMO; 1°, 2° Y 3°, DE LA LEY ORGÁNICA MUNICIPAL, TODAS LAS LEYES DEL ESTADO DE QUINTANA ROO EN VIGOR; LA SECRETARÍA DE TURISMO EN ADELANTE “SEDETUR” Y EL H. AYUNTAMIENTO DE LAZARO CÁRDENAS EN ADELANTE “EL AYUNTAMIENTO” CONVIEENEN EN CELEBRAR EL PRESENTE.

ACUERDO

PRIMERO.- LA “SEDETUR” ENTREGA EN ESTE ACTO AL “AYUNTAMIENTO” LA OBRA CONSISTENTE EN EL PARADOR TURÍSTICO DE CHIQUILÁ, QUE EN FORMA CONJUNTA CON EL GOBIERNO FEDERAL SE LLEVO A CABO, Y QUE SERÁ UTILIZADO EN FORMA EXCLUSIVA PARA DAR INFORMACIÓN TURÍSTICA Y ATENCIÓN AL TURISTA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUPERFICIES EN PARADOR TURÍSTICO “CHIQUILÁ”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDIFICACIÓN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALAPA PRINCIPAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÁREA DE SERVICIOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURÍSTICOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRO DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERPRETACIÓN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA TOTAL: 2078.73 M²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SEGUNDO.- EN VIRTUD DE QUE “LA SEDEUT” HA HECHO ENTREGA DE LA INFRAESTRUCTURA TURÍSTICA DESCRITA EN ARTÍCULO PRECEDENTE, LAS PARTES ACUERdan REALIZAR UNA ACTA DE ENTREGA RECEPCIÓN ESPECIFICANDO LAS CARACTERÍSTICAS DE LOS MISMOS QUE “EL AYUNTAMIENTO” RECIBE Y QUE ESTARÁN BAJO SU RESPONSABILIDAD.

TERCERO.- EN ESTE ACTO “EL AYUNTAMIENTO” RECIBE LA OBRA CORRESPONDIENTE SEÑALADA EN EL ACUERDO PRIMERO DE ESTE INSTRUMENTO COMPROMETIÉNDOSE A LA CONSERVACIÓN, CON EL OBJETO DE ALCANZAR UNA IMAGEN TURÍSTICA QUE CONLLEVE A LA Afluencia DE VISITANTES EN ESTE MUNICIPIO.

CUARTO.- “EL AYUNTAMIENTO” EN USO DE LAS FACULTADES Y ATRIBUCIONES QUE LE CONFERE LA LEY ORGÁNICA MUNICIPAL DEL ESTADO DE QUINTANA ROO Y SU REGLAMENTO INTERIOR, SERÁ EL ENCARGADO EN TODO MOMENTO DE REALIZAR LAS ACCIONES PARA EL MANTENIMIENTO Y CONSERVACIÓN DE LAS OBRAS REFERIDAS MATERIA DEL PRESENTE ACUERDO Y QUE EN ESTE ACTO LE ES ENTREGADA POR CONDUCTO DE “LA SEDEUT”.

QUINTO.-“EL AYUNTAMIENTO” SERÁ EL ENCARGADO DE DESIGNAR AL PERSONAL QUE SE REQUIERA PARA LA OPERACIÓN DEL MÓDULO, QUIENES DEBERÁN REUNIR LOS REQUISITOS Y PERÍCUL PARA DESEMPEÑAR EL PUESTO, POR LO QUE EN NINGÚN MOMENTO “LA SEDEUT” TENDRÁ RELACIÓN LABORAL ALGUNA ENTRE DICHO PERSONAL.

SEXTO.- LAS PARTES ACUERdan QUE LAS PERSONAS DESIGNADAS POR “EL AYUNTAMIENTO” PARA LA OPERACIÓN DE EL PARADOR TURÍSTICO DE CHIQUILÁ, DEBERÁN CONTAR CON LA CAPACITACIÓN NECESARIA PARA LA ATENCIÓN E INFORMACIÓN A LOS TURISTAS, PARA LO CUAL LA SEDEUT PODRÁ APOYAR A PETICIÓN DEL MUNICIPIO.

SÉPTIMO.- LAS PARTES ACUERdan QUE EL PARADOR TURÍSTICO, NO PODRÁ SER DESTINADO PARA OFICINAS DISTINTAS PARA LO CUAL FUE CREADA Y DEFINIDA EN EL ACUERDO PRIMERO DE ESTE INSTRUMENTO.

OCTAVO.- “EL AYUNTAMIENTO” SE COMPROMETE A QUE EL MANTENIMIENTO DEL INMUEBLE Y DEL EQUIPAMIENTO SERÁN SU RESPONSABILIDAD, ASÍ COMO EL PAGO DE SERVICIOS QUE SE DERIVEN POR LA OPERACIÓN DEL MÓDULO.

DÉCIMO.- CON EL OBJETO DE ASEGURAR LA APLICACIÓN Y EFECTIVIDAD DEL PRESENTE ACUERDO, LAS PARTES CONVIENEN EN HACER UNA REVISIÓN PERIÓDICA Y SISTEMÁTICA DE SU CONTENIDO E INSTRUMENTACIÓN.

DÉCIMO PRIMERA: “CONSIDERACIONES PARA LA OPERACIÓN DE INFRAESTRUCTURA TURÍSTICA DEL ESTADO DE QUINTANA ROO”.
SE GENERA LA FIGURA DE UN COMITÉ DE OPERACIÓN EL CUAL ESTARÁ INTEGRADO POR:

- **PRESIDENTE** SERÁ EL ESTADO A TRAVÉS DEL TITULAR DE SECRETARÍA DE TURISMO Y EN SU CASO A TRAVÉS DEL SUPLENTE QUE ÉSTA DETERMINE.
- **SECRETARIO EJECUTIVO** SERÁ EL AYUNTAMIENTO A TRAVÉS DE SU PRESIDENTE MUNICIPAL DEL H. AYUNTAMIENTO DE LÁZARO CÁRDENAS Y EN SU CASO A TRAVÉS DEL SUPLENTE EL TITULAR DE LA DIRECCIÓN DE TURISMO.
- **REPRESENTANTE DE LA COMUNIDAD, VOCAL** - EL CUAL SERÁ DESIGNADO POR EL AYUNTAMIENTO.
- **REPRESENTANTE DE LOS PRESTADORES TURÍSTICOS, VOCAL** - POR DEFINIR.
- **REPRESENTANTE AMBIENTAL, VOCAL** - POR DEFINIR.

LOS CUÁLES TENDRÁN VOZ Y VOTO. EL COMITÉ PODRÁ INVITAR A MIEMBROS SEGÚN LOS TEMAS QUE SE TRATEN CON DERECHO A VOZ ÚNICAMENTE.

EL COMITÉ DEBERÁ INSTALARSE AL MOMENTO DE LA ENTREGA-RECEPCIÓN DE LA INFRAESTRUCTURA EN CUESTIÓN Y CONTARÁ CON UN MÁXIMO DE 30 DÍAS PARA REALIZAR SU PRIMERA SESIÓN DE DONDE ESTABLECERÁ:

- **PLAN DE TRABAJO ANUAL**
- **DETERMINACIÓN DEL PRESUPUESTO PARA EL MANTENIMIENTO Y OPERACIÓN DEL INMUEBLE**.
- **PROGRAMA FÍSICO FINANCIERO**.
- **PROPUESTAS DE CONCESIONES DE LOS ESPACIOS QUE ASÍ CORRESPONDAN**.
- **PROGRAMA DE ROTACIÓN PARA EL USO DE LOS ESPACIOS CUANDO ASÍ CORRESPONDA**.

EL COMITÉ SESIONARA ANUALMENTE HASTA EN 3 OCASIONES DE MANERA ORDINARIA, ADICIONAL A LAS EXTRAORDINARIAS QUE SEAN REQUERIDAS.

**OBJETIVO:**

GARANTIZAR LA ADECUADA OPERACIÓN DE LA INFRAESTRUCTURA ASÍ COMO SU MANTENIMIENTO, ESTABLECIENDO LOS CRITERIOS PARA EL USO DE LAS INSTALACIONES, SIEMPRE BUSCANDO EL BENEFICIO DE LOS TURISTAS CON BASE AL APOYO DE LOS PRESTADORES DE SERVICIOS LOCALES.
OPERACIÓN:

LAS ÁREAS COMERCIALES SE CONCESIONARÁN A PRESTADORES DE SERVICIOS TURÍSTICOS LOCALES, CONSIDERANDO ROTACIÓN, SE DEBERÁ CUBRIR UNA CUOTA DE RECUPERACIÓN, LA CUAL ESTABLECERÁ EL COMITÉ Y LA CUAL SERÁ LA UTILIZADA PARA EL MANTENIMIENTO Y PAGO DE SERVICIOS QUE REQUIERA LA INFRAESTRUCTURA EN CUESTIÓN.

EN NINGÚN CASO LA INFRAESTRUCTURA PÚBLICA PODRÁ SER UTILIZADA EN EL BENEFICIO PERSONAL DE UN GRUPO O PARTICULAR, NI UTILIZANDO PARA FINES DISTINTOS A LOS ESTABLECIDOS.

LOS PERIODOS DE CONCESIÓN SERÁN DE 3 A 12 MESES SEGÚN CORRESPONDA.

AL FINALIZAR LOS PERIODOS DE CONCESIÓN Y CON BASE AL CUMPLIMIENTO SE PODRÁ RENOVAR O REVOCAR, ESTABLECIÉNDOSE NUEVAS CONDICIONES SI ASÍ SE CONSIDERA.

EL CUMPLIMIENTO DE LOS COMPROMISOS ESTABLECIDOS EN LA OPERACIÓN DE LA INFRAESTRUCTURA SERÁ MOTIVO A CONSIDERARSE PARA LA IMPLEMENTACIÓN DE MEJORAS O NUEVAS OBRAS DE INFRAESTRUCTURA EN LA COMUNIDAD O DESTINO.

LEÍDO QUE FUE EL PRESENTE ACUERDO Y ENTERADAS LAS PARTES DE SU CONTENIDO Y ALCANCE LEGAL, LO FIRMAN Y RATIFICAN EN EL MUNICIPIO DE LÁZARO CÁRDENAS, QUINTANA ROO, A LOS 05 DÍAS DEL MES DE FEBRERO DEL AÑO DOS MIL DIECINUEVE.

POR “LA SEDETUR”

LCDA. MARISOL VANEGAS PEREZ
SECRETARIA DE TURISMO

POR “EL AYUNTAMIENTO”

SECRETARIO EJECUTIVO.
SECRETARIO GENERAL

SEZE MUNICIPAL DE LÁZARO CÁRDENAS

LIC. LUIS DE POTESTAD CLEMENS
SUBSECRETARIO DE DESARROLLO TURÍSTICO

SALVADOR VARGAS ROSAS
SECRETARIO GENERAL
Appendix B.2 Invitation for the Chiquilá Tourist Parador Inauguration Ceremony (April 11, 2019)

P. Aq. Omor Danna Hernández
Director de Proyectos de Infraestructura Turística

SEDETUR

Oficio No. SEDETUR/SEPOT/DPT/D00/04/2019
Asunto: Invitación Parador Turístico Chiquilá
Chetumal, Quintana Roo, a 9 de abril de 2019
"2019, año por una edificación inclusiva"

C. JEFFREY B. GLOVER, PH.D.
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY
PRESENTE.

Por medio de la presente me permito hacerle una amena y cordial invitación para que nos acompañe a la entrega y operación del “Parador Turístico de Chiquilá”, en el Municipio de Lázaro Cárdenas, el cual se llevará a cabo el día 11 de abril del presente año a las 11:00 a.m. (Se anuda ficha técnica).

Agradecemos confirmar su asistencia al teléfono 835 08 60 Ext. 41289 o el correo sedetur.chetumal@hotmail.com

Sin más por el momento y agradeciendo de antemano la atenciones a la presente, le envío un cordial saludo.

ATENTAMENTE

[Signature]

[Note: The name and title of the sender are mentioned, but not legible due to image resolution.]
ALCANCES DEL PROYECTO: Con el desarrollo de la obra “Parador Turístico de Yum Balam (Chiquilá)”, se pretende dar apoyo a las actividades turísticas y en el desarrollo e imagen urbana integral en los destinos turísticos y comunidades que integran los circuitos turísticos. Edificación de un parador turístico mediante la construcción de un área de interpretación, Información Turística, Área Artesanías, Área de Prestadores de servicios.

INVERSIÓN: $11,872,383.06 FEDERAL $5,536,438.00 ESTATAL $6,335,945.06

CONCEPTOS EJECUTADOS: Área de palapa en acceso principal, centro de interpretación, parador fotográfico, área de servicios turísticos.
**FICHA “PARADOR TURÍSTICO CHIQUILÁ”**
*11 DE ABRIL 2019 11AM*

**SEDETEUR**
*SECRETARÍA DE TURISMO*

---

**PROGRAMA DE INAUGURACIÓN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVIDAD</th>
<th>PARTICIPANTE</th>
<th>TIEMPO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PALABRAS DE BIENVENIDA</td>
<td>ALCALDE DE CHIQUILA</td>
<td>5 MIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPLICACIÓN TÉCNICA, ALCANCES, USOS, PROYECTO MUSEO</td>
<td>SUBSECRETARIO DE PLANEACION Y DESARROLLO</td>
<td>5 MIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRMA DE CONVENIO</td>
<td>AUTORIDADES</td>
<td>5 MIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALABRAS DEL PRESIDENTE MUNICIPAL</td>
<td>PRESIDENTE MUNICIPAL</td>
<td>10 MIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENSAJE DE LA SECRETARÍA DE TURISMO</td>
<td>SECRETARÍA DE TURISMO</td>
<td>10 MIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECORRIDO PARADOR</td>
<td>AUTORIDADES</td>
<td>10 MIN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PRESÍDIUM**

1. SECRETARÍA DE TURISMO
2. PRESIDENTE MUNICIPAL
3. SUBSECRETARIO DE TURISMO
4. SECRETARIO GENERAL
5. ALCALDE
6. DIRECTOR DE INFRAESTRUCTURA SEDETEUR
7. DIRECTOR MUNICIPAL DE TURISMO
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Appendix C.1 Punta Laguna Museum panels

Information about the reserve and its location (by Mikaela Razo)
Cenote Las Calaveras
Punta Lagunars, Q. Roo.

El cenote Las Calaveras es parte del sitio arqueológico de Punta Lagunars, ubicado en el área natural propiedela Casa de las Máscaras del Pumac, (Casa de los Monos y del Puma). El asentamiento prehispánico está conformado por 36 estructuras, y sus orígenes se relacionan al periodo Precerámico tardío (300 a.C.-250 d.C.).

En el interior del cenote Las Calaveras se registraron los restos óseos de por lo menos 123 individuos. Es muy probable que en él se llevaran a cabo ceremonias funerarias, depositando de forma directa o arrojando los cuerpos al interior del cenote donde comenzaban su recorrido hacia el mundo de los muertos.

El cenote tiene forma de botella al cual se desciende, donde una gruta en la superficie. Tiene entre 25 a 30 m de diámetro, el nivel del agua se encuentra a los 12,40 m y tiene una profundidad de 15m. A unos metros de la entrada del cenote existe un pequeño altar rectangular con tres cruces de piedra caliza que los mayas locales masan con huleas a las que ofrecían comida en ceremonias religiosas.

Ubicación de cámaras
Cerco de la planta

La caña de azúcar es una planta de invasión en el área, y es utilizada para la producción de azúcar. Los productos de esta planta son muy valiosos para la economía local.

Disfruta de estos sitios y por favor ayúdanos a protegerlos como parte de esta gratitud en la comunidad.

Information about the Cenote las Calaveras (by Mikaela Razo)
Hace 50 años, los hermanos Ignacio, Marcos y Domingo Canul Tun, de oficio chicheros, salieron de Chemax, Yucatan, en busca de nuevos sitios de trabajo. Después de tres días de camino se encontraron con una gran laguna rodeada de un frondoso y selvático bosque de zopote, lo que suponía una oportunidad de establecerse; ya que además del chicle que podían vender en Chemax al señor Cruz Centeno, por 7c el Kg. de chicle, tenían un sitio seguro, cercano a una laguna de agua dulce. A este lugar le pusieron por Punta Laguna.

Los hermanos Canul aprendieron y continuaron con el oficio de extracción de chicle. Una vez que conocieron las plantas y animales de la selva decidieron comenzar a usarlos de manera diferente: comenzaron a defender su lugar, ya que con los Huracanes llegan los incendios, como el ocurrido durante 1967, después del paso del Huracán Buela en el que las familias Canul combatteron el incendio y protegieron la selva alrededor de la laguna, que hasta la fecha se conserva como selva madura en buen estado de conservación.

Con el paso de los años han habido llegada de personas interesadas por el sitio, a partir de 1986 llegan los primeros investigadores a Punta Laguna, los pobladores se dan cuenta de que conocer y conservar a los seres humanos, sus costumbres, sus preocupaciones en varios. Por el momento 4 jóvenes de la comunidad se han convertido en asistentes de los investigadores, y cada vez más jóvenes se interesan por conocer las animales de la misma selva.

Actualmente Punta Laguna ha modificado su forma de usar los recursos naturales. Ahora conservan el sitio para que los visitantes lo conozcan y lo disfruten.

50 years ago, three brothers called Ignacio, Marcos and Domingo Canul Tun left Chemax, Yucatan looking for new places to work. They who were professional chicheros, which means they extracted the chicle latex resin from the zopote (sapodilla or naseberry) tree that was used from making chewing gum. After traveling for 3 days they found an enormous jungle with a big lagoon surrounded by huge Zopote trees. This would become their opportunity to settle down since could extract gum to sell to Cruz Centeno in Chemax for 7 cents each kilogram, and it was a safe place near a beautiful lagoon. They called it Punta Laguna (Lagoon Point) and this name is still used today.

Some years later, the sons of the Canul brothers learned and continued working with the extraction of gum. The conservation of the area began as they learned about the plants and the animals of the jungle and decided to begin a new way of using them. The jungle is susceptible to damage caused by strong hurricanes and subsequent fire, like in 1967 after hurricane Buela. The Canul family fought the fire and protected the jungle surrounding the lagoon, which continues to have mature and well-conserved vegetation.

As time went by, people gained interest in Punta Laguna and by 1986 the first investigators arrived. People from Punta Laguna noticed that conserving and learning more about spider monkeys, pheasants, ocellated turkeys, deer and other elements of their environment attracted more visitors. There are currently 4 young men from the community that have become assistant investigators, and little by little more persons become interested in learning about the animals and the jungle that surrounds them. Gradually, Punta Laguna has modified their way of using their natural resources. Now they conserve them so that visitors may come and enjoy their town.
The Archaeological Site of Punta Laguna

The ancient Maya were diverse groups of people who lived in the Yucatan Peninsula, Guatemala, Belize, and parts of Honduras and El Salvador from approximately 2000 BC to AD 1500. Archaeologists divide ancient Maya history into three periods: the Formative (2000 BC to AD 250), the Classic (250 AD to 900), and the Postclassic (AD 900-1500). The arrival of the Spanish around 1500 marks the transition between ancient and modern Maya history.

Preliminary research suggests Punta Laguna was occupied at the beginning of the Classic period, depopulated, and then reoccupied and reached its zenith during the Postclassic period. The site includes a series of caves; several stelae; a cenote with an ancient Maya mortuary deposit of over 120 individuals; and over 150 structures. Some of these structures – the tallest of which rise over six meters in height – are solid platforms that would have supported buildings made from perishable materials that have since decomposed. These buildings may have been houses, administrative centers, or places of worship.

Punta Laguna is located approximately 20 km from Cobá, one of the largest ancient Maya cities ever constructed. Cobá was occupied during the Classic period, and the Maya built the majority of the large structures at the site between approximately AD 730 and 1000. The Maya then abandoned Cobá, but briefly reoccupied the site between about AD 1300 and 1500. At present the relationship between Punta Laguna and Cobá remains unclear.

Information about the archaeological site of Punta Laguna (by Mikaela Razo)
La Historia de...

Campamento Hidalgo

Todo comenzó hace 25 años, cuando se construyó una vía de acceso de Cobá a Tulum. La compañía Hidalgo y Cortez instaló un campamento de trabajadores de la construcción ya que muy cerca de ahí se encontraba un banco de sasabe, material que se utilizaba para los caminos. Los trabajadores construyeron casas de cartón en las que vivieron por meses. Al terminar se llevaron todo el equipo que habían utilizado para su obra dejando abandonadas muchas casas de cartón. Al verlas construidas y abandonadas, los habitantes de los núcleos de poblaciones cercanas decidieron venir a habitártelas. Dado que los nuevos pobladores son de origen maya, poco a poco comenzaron a cambiar el estilo y la arquitectura a la de su origen. A partir de aquí comienza la historia de la población conocida como Campamento Hidalgo o Hidalgo y Cortez.

Muchos cambios ha sufrido esta comunidad, pero el origen no se pierde, la lengua es la maya, actualmente son 31 familias que realizan actividades como la milpa, la producción de carbón vegetal, la apicultura, el tallado de madera y la producción de instrumentos musicales.

It all began 25 years ago when the road that leads to Coba and Tulum was built by the Hidalgo and Cortes Company. They installed a camp for the construction workers near a quarry used to extract lime gravel for the road. The workers built cardboard huts in which they lived for months. When the road was finished, they took all of their equipment and abandoned the huts. People from near by towns noticed the abandoned huts and decided to inhabit them. They gradually transformed the camp to make it more like the kind of Mayan towns they were used to. From this moment, the town known as Campamento Hidalgo (Hidalgo Camp) or Hidalgo and Cortes was born.

The community has gone through several changes, but their Mayan origins are still present in their culture and their language. Presently, 31 families live there dedicated to agricultural activities, vegetable and charcoal production, apiculture, wood carving and the production of musical instruments.

The history of Campamento Hidalgo (by Mikaela Razo)