

**FINAL REPORT OF *THE PROFESSIONAL ARCHAEOLOGISTS, AVOCATIONAL ARCHAEOLOGISTS,*  
*AND RESPONSIBLE ARTIFACT COLLECTORS TASK FORCE***

Submitted to the Society for American Archaeology Board of Directors

September 12, 2016

Report Authors

***Task Force Chair:*** Bonnie L. Pitblado

***Task Force Members:*** Scott Brosowske, Virginia L. Butler, Jim Cox, Chris Espenshade, Angela J. Neller, Giovanna Peebles, Peter Pilles, Guadalupe Sánchez, Richard Shipley, Michael Shott, Rafael Suárez, and Suzie Thomas

In November 2015, the Society for American Archaeology (SAA) Board of Directors passed Motion 136-54.4, reading as follows:

The Board establishes the *Professional Archaeologists, Avocational Archaeologists, and Responsible Artifact Collectors Relationships Task Force*. The task force will define appropriate relationships among professional archaeologists, avocational archaeologists, and responsible artifact collectors in light of the SAA Principles of Archaeological Ethics and legal statutes and will produce a statement that can be disseminated. The task force will also develop a statement of action steps derived from the document. The task force will consult with the SAA's Council of Affiliated Societies (CoAS), which offers existing infrastructure to reach out to responsible collectors with whom the task force might work. The task force will broadly disseminate the November issue of *The SAA Archaeological Record*, aided by the SAA Manager, Communications. The task force will submit the statement and action items to the Board by September 8, 2016.

On January 4, 2016, the Board formally asked Dr. Bonnie L. Pitblado to serve as task force (TF) chair, which she agreed to do. Dr. Pitblado in turn asked Dr. Michael Shott to assist as an informal co-chair and formal TF member, which he likewise agreed to do. This final report first and foremost conveys to the Board the requested "statement that can be disseminated" and "statement of action items," but it also explains how we recruited TF members, researched pertinent issues, discussed issues within the TF, drafted an initial statement draft, recruited stakeholders to provide feedback on the initial draft, and incorporated that feedback into the final version of the Statement presented herein.

#### *Task Force Member Selection*

The TF chair and co-chair (hereafter "the chairs") aimed to recruit a task force that maximized diversity in terms of the following:

- Archaeological sector/stakeholder type
- Focal geographic region
- Gender and ethnicity
- Experience collaborating (here, the chairs sought extensive experience across the board)

As the task force biographies (Appendix A) attest, this yielded a 13-member group comprising university, museum, CRM and government-sector archaeologists and two highly respected avocational archaeologists who collect artifacts. Focal geographic areas of TF members include the U.S. Northeast, Northwest, Southwest, Intermountain West, Midwest, Mid-Atlantic, Southeast and Southern Plains. The chairs also recruited TF members from Mexico, Uruguay and Finland to expand coverage of the Americas and to obtain perspectives on the issue from a region of the world (Europe) that has often navigated the professional-collector relationship productively. The group included six women and seven men, two Latino archaeologists, and Native Hawaiian Angela Neller, curator for the Wanapum Heritage Center in Washington State. Neller has a long-standing interest in the relationship of material culture and history to the identity of native people and the role museums can play in preserving and perpetuating indigenous community values.

## *Methods*

After recruiting the task force and circulating biographies as a form of introductions, the chairs asked members to suggest literature that they thought would be beneficial for all to read. Shott compiled and annotated all the materials (Appendix B) and created two Dropbox folders, one with what the chairs designated “core” TF reading, and the other with supplemental reading. All TF members completed the core readings, so that discussion could build on a common foundation that complemented members’ unique collaborative experiences. The TF spent about six weeks reading and preparing for discussion.

From mid-March through late-July, the TF discussed issues raised in the readings and through personal experience. This was a transformative time for all task members, with the diversity of the mix forcing sometimes difficult but always compelling conversations. The latter part of the discussion period included considering first what the group could agree were inarguable premises—foundational points that would support recommendations for “appropriate collaborations” ultimately developed. The recommendations themselves, as to “what makes a collector ‘responsible’ or not,” next came under scrutiny. Finally, the TF tried to articulate what they had come to see as keys to successful collaborations among archaeologists, avocationalists, and collectors. The structure of that discussion appeared to all to be an effective way to structure a draft “statement for dissemination” as well. The TF chair logged all discussion, which totaled 140 single-spaced pages of text.

In early August, members of the TF crafted a draft statement intended for wide circulation to archaeological stakeholders who could provide fresh feedback. Thirteen voices contribute a high degree of diversity of thought, but to present SAA with a statement as representative as possible of its target audience, the TF wanted to reach out to as many of those people as possible. From the outset, SAA Executive Director Tobi Brimsek had wisely counseled the TF not to engage in formal surveys that can be off-putting to audiences and logistically tricky to administer. Instead, she suggested that the TF rely on informal outlets (for example, social media) to gather necessary feedback. Accordingly, the TF developed the following call for input on the draft statement, with the embedded link leading to the statement itself and instructions for evaluating it (Appendix C):

**Calling everyone with a passion for archaeology**—professionals, avocationalists, artifact collectors, and others with an interest! The Society for American Archaeology (SAA) has appointed a task force to develop a statement specifying how various groups (like those mentioned in the first sentence) can best work together. After much discussion, the 13-member task force has developed a draft statement that we would like YOU to review. It should only take 15 minutes or so, and whatever your position in archaeology, your ideas will help the task force finalize its work for SAA. Click here for more information and to read and review the statement: <https://taskforcearchaeologistsandcollectors.wordpress.com/>. Questions or trouble accessing the statement? Please e-mail [bonnie.pitblado@ou.edu](mailto:bonnie.pitblado@ou.edu). Thank you!! **All comments received by August 26 will be considered.**

Members of the task force collaborated to devise a list of target recipients who could disseminate the request for feedback to members of their societies or groups, again with the goal of getting the

statement into as many stakeholder hands as possible. Those successfully enlisted to help distribute the request for feedback include (but were not limited to), the following:

- **Maureen Malloy, SAA Public Education Manager** (facilitated posting to SAA's Facebook page and Twitter feed)
- **Cheryl Ardovini, SAA Membership and Marketing Manager** (distributed to all SAA Council of Affiliated Societies (CoAS) members (see list of current CoAS members at <https://ecommerce.saa.org/saa/staticcontent/staticpages/adminDir/affiliates.cfm>)
- **Meredith Langlitz, American Institute of Archaeology (AIA) Senior Programs Coordinator** (distributed to AIA members and posted on SAA's Public Archaeology Interest Group FB page)
- **Terry Klein, President of the Register of Professional Archaeologists (RPA)** (distributed to all RPA members)
- **Bambi Krauss, President of the National Association of Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (NATHPO)** (distributed to all member THPOs)
- The **National Association of State Archaeologists (NASA)** (distributed to NASA members by TF member Peebles, retired Vermont State Archaeologist still active in the organization)
- The **Canadian Archaeological Association (CAA)** (distributed to all members)
- The **European Association of Archaeologists (EAA) Committee on Illicit Trade in Antiquities**
- **Director of the Registro Público de Monumentos y Zonas Arqueológicas del INAH** (Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia)
- **All US state archaeological societies with a Facebook presence** (about 30 total societies), and the **Sociedad Mexicana de Antropología**
- **Artifact collectors** who have attended the Perryton, TX and/or Loveland, CO "Stone Age Fairs" (both of which have "no-selling" policies)
- **Department heads (or personal contacts) at universities with large Anthropology programs** for distribution to all faculty and graduate students (e.g., University of Arizona, Arizona State University, University of New Mexico, University of Michigan, University of Oklahoma, and University of Florida)
- **Museum archaeologists** targeted by TF members Neller and Pitblado, who are active and former members of the museum community, respectively
- **Blog site: SAA Task Force on Professional Archaeologists, Avocational Archaeologists, & Artifact Collectors** (<https://taskforcearchaeologistsandcollectors.wordpress.com/blog/>), which drew comments

### *Results of Request for Feedback*

Over the course of the two-week period provided for external comments, the TF received 249 replies. The chairs created a coding guide (Appendix D) to facilitate processing the responses (when cut and pasted into a master "response log," the raw responses comprised 260 single-spaced pages of input). The TF chair read all responses, so that one set of TF eyes had reviewed everything received. In addition, members of the TF read, coded and searched for patterns in the feedback of particular subsets

of respondents. For example, two task force members performed these tasks for respondents who identified as cultural resource management professionals; others academic archaeologists; and so on.

Appendix E shows the coded data from all 249 respondents, 170 of them men, 68 women, and 11 who did not mention their gender. The following bullets list the stakeholders as coded by the TF, together with the number of respondents in each group.

- **A:** Avocational (n = 39)
- **C:** Collector (n = 38)
- **M:** Museum archaeologist (n = 10)
- **P-Ac:** Professional Archaeologist, Academic (n = 47)
- **P-CRM:** Professional Archaeologist, CRM (n = 45)
- **P-G:** Professional Archaeologist or Heritage Resource Manager working for a government of any sort and at any level (federal, state, local, tribal, etc.) (n = 38)
- **P-O:** Professional Archaeologist working for private or non-profit corporations or in other positions not clearly aligned with the museum, academic, CRM or government sectors. (n = 13)
- **S:** Graduate Student (n = 11)
- **O:** Other Stakeholder (n = 8)

TF members did indeed observe patterns in the comments made by sub-populations of archaeological stakeholders, although many of them cross-cut multiple stakeholder groups. The vast majority of respondents, all but 4, supported the statement fully (n = 132), with minor modifications to wording (n = 46), or with one or two substantive changes (n = 56). Three people had mixed feelings and had to be coded as at once accepting the document for being as good as it could be, but not being very comfortable with the collaborative principle. The TF plumbed the “substantial changes” data set particularly carefully, searching for suggestions repeated frequently, and particularly for those mentioned by multiple groups of stakeholders.

In the final analysis, the following themes for improving the statement emerged as those shared by enough respondents (and members of the TF) that they should be incorporated into the final draft of the statement. Numbers indicate the number of times unique respondents articulated a sentiment. Stakeholder groups that mentioned (or did not mention) a particular point are noted.

- **Archaeologists must stop being rude, elitist, and dismissive of RRS (n = 29;** mentioned by all groups but museum professionals and students; most frequently mentioned by avocational archaeologists)
- **More fully articulate the TF’s position on “commercialization” (n = 23;** mentioned by all groups but students and “other professionals.” Collectors and academic archaeologists most frequently raised this issue.
- **More explicitly recognize descendant communities as stakeholders within the context of artifact collecting (n = 14;** mentioned by all groups but collectors and students; most commonly mentioned by archaeologists working in government positions, including THPOs).

- **Emphasize even more than the statement already does the importance of public education and outreach and broaden populations targeted** for E & O to include students and professionals not already experienced in these activities (**n = 12**; mentioned by all groups but collectors and “other stakeholders,” and most often by students)
- **More forcefully state that all stakeholders must comply with all cultural resource laws** (**n = 12**; not mentioned by avocational, collectors, or museum professionals; mentioned by 6 academic archaeologists and 2 each of CRM, government, and “other sector” archaeologists).
- **Clearly define terms such as “professional archaeologist” and “avocational archaeologist” and (or) simplify them to better reflect stakeholder identities** (**n=10**; mentioned by all groups but museum professionals, students and government archaeologists; most commonly mentioned by archaeologists working in the CRM sector)
- **Work to dispel the common public perception that archaeologists or law enforcement officers may seize lawfully obtained artifacts or control of sites** located on private land (**n = 9**); mentioned by all groups but students and “other professionals.”
- **Do not so strongly condemn all excavation on private land by RRS** (**n = 6**, half of those mentioning this issue identify as collectors)
- **Expand regions of the world and professions to which archaeology may look for examples of functional collaborative models** (**n = 5**; three of those suggestions made by students)
- **Encourage if not require archaeologists to share the results of their work with the public** that funds it and to do so accessibly (**n = 4**, mentioned by members of the avocational, government and CRM communities; NOT mentioned by any student or academic archaeologist).
- **Clarify that not all archaeologists are trained as anthropologists** (**n = 3**) (observed by two academic archaeologists and one avocational).

Responding to the above feedback, but also incorporating many other more minor but useful suggestions from external reviewers, the TF produced the following document for the SAA board and ultimately for broad dissemination among the archaeological community and other stakeholders.

## **TASK FORCE STATEMENT (FINAL)**

People have collected artifacts throughout time, across space, and for myriad reasons. Professionally trained archaeologists collect artifacts to demystify and preserve material evidence of the past. Many non-archaeologists, including members of descendant communities, informally trained (“avocational” or “amateur”) archaeologists, and other members of the public captivated by the past sometimes collect artifacts. Their reasons for collecting may or may not tidily coincide with those of archaeologists, but they can be both legitimate and legal. On the other hand, some individuals collect artifacts because they view them as commodities from which they may financially profit, or because destroying the material expression of another’s past brings them a sense of power or perverse pleasure. Such collecting is often conducted illegally and whether legal or not, it violates archaeological ethics.

These are the realities archaeologists working in the United States, Canada, and many other world regions must navigate. Rejecting outright all collaboration with the many communities of people who share archaeologists' passion for the past, if not their level of training, is detrimental to our collective understanding of the human record. It is also unnecessarily divisive at a time that the archaeological discipline requires public support to thrive. The Society for American Archaeology (SAA) recognizes the importance of collaboration beyond disciplinary borders, and in November 2015, established the *Professional Archaeologists, Avocational Archaeologists, and Responsible Artifact Collectors Relationships Task Force*. SAA asked the task force to “define appropriate relationships among professional archaeologists, avocational archaeologists, and responsible artifact collectors in light of the SAA Principles of Archaeological Ethics and legal statutes.”

After extensive review of literature related to the subject of collecting, months of discussion of salient issues, and vetting of a draft statement by about 250 stakeholders, the 13-member task force offers members of SAA and other interested parties the following **premises, recommendations for identifying appropriate partners outside the profession, and keys to maximizing the success of collaborative relationships**.

Premises:

- All archaeological collecting, whether conducted by archaeologists or citizens, impacts the archaeological record and its interpretation. Avoiding collection unless an archaeological site is in jeopardy, and reducing the impact of collecting when it occurs, are always ideals.
- The terms “professional archaeologist,” “avocational archaeologist,” and “artifact collector,” invoked in SAA’s creation of the task force are defined differently by different people. For this reason, this statement downplays labels, distinguishing principally among formally trained archaeologists (archaeologists); responsible and responsive stewards of the past (RRS)<sup>i</sup>; and those whose practices violate archaeological ethics, cultural resource laws, or both.
- Many RRS, including some artifact collectors, have long and productively partnered with archaeologists. Archaeological knowledge worldwide has advanced as the direct result of information RRS have shared with professionals or published themselves. Archaeologists should increase their efforts to collaborate with the RRS communities for the benefit of all involved and the archaeological record.
- Many of the world’s most respected museum and research collections originated as private gifts, and some RRS today continue the tradition by donating private collections to ensure researcher and public access to them. Other RRS have returned collections to descendant communities, also a desirable outcome.
- Some who acquire artifacts violate laws and (or) principles of archaeological ethics in so doing. Archaeologists and RRS know “looting”—illegal or flagrantly disrespectful collecting—when they see or hear of it. Looters and those who collect artifacts expressly to sell them for a financial profit are not viable collaborators for archaeologists or RRS.

- The precise nature of the relationship among archaeologists and other stakeholders varies across the Americas and the world. To successfully collaborate, all parties must be mindful of local traditions, the concerns of descendant communities, and laws governing heritage.
- By virtue of their membership in SAA, the Canadian Archaeological Association and many other archaeological societies, archaeologists have accepted ethical obligations<sup>ii</sup> to actively engage with RRS, who are by definition stakeholders in the archaeological enterprise. Failing to do so violates standards of behavior archaeologists have pledged to uphold.
- Archaeologists have in the past sometimes failed to productively engage with RRS, occasionally alienating individuals and even entire communities. These failures have diluted knowledge of the archaeological record to an unknown but likely significant degree.
- When archaeologists have (a) engaged the RRS community as unique, knowledgeable individuals who can advance archaeological pursuits, and (b) reciprocated by sharing their findings with the RRS community through public education and outreach, they have achieved the sort of collaboration the task force advocates.

Building on these premises, the task force strongly recommends that archaeologists fulfill their ethical obligations to actively engage the RRS community in project-appropriate ways. With respect to collecting artifacts, the task force concludes that archaeologists should engage RRS who comply with *or are willing to comply with* the following collecting protocols:

- Adhere to all applicable cultural resource laws, particularly those prohibiting artifact collection on virtually all public and some private land and those regulating the antiquities trade
- Obtain landowner permission to collect artifacts on private property as allowed by law
- Restrict collecting to the ground surface or plowzone and collaborate with a formally trained archaeologist when contemplating excavation
- Record and share at least basic provenience information<sup>iii</sup> as well as collections themselves with archaeologists and other stakeholders
- Do not sell artifacts for financial profit
- Serve as strong stewards for their collections during and beyond their lifetime

The task force emphasizes the following points as keys to successful collaboration among stakeholders:

- Collaboration can only succeed in an atmosphere of respect. Archaeologists must respect RRS for their unique knowledge and experiences, and vice versa. Both archaeologists and RRS must also respect members of descendant communities by actively trying to understand their unique perspectives as the descendants of those who created the record.
- The more open *all* stakeholders are to understanding and respecting divergent ideas about the past and its material expressions, the more likely they are to find common ground that can be shared to maximize benefit to the archaeological record.



- Collaboration is a broad term that can and should take many different forms, depending on the archaeologist, members of RRS communities, and the nature of an archaeological undertaking. As a general rule, “giving a talk” on archaeological findings, while encouraged, only scratches the surface of the sorts of meaningful, dynamic, two-way interactions the task force advocates.
- Archaeologists’ formal training should include learning how to cultivate and nurture positive relationships with RRS, with a focus on what sorts of collaborations are appropriate under given circumstances. Like any other archaeological skill, effective collaboration takes practice.
- Collaboration must not lead professionals to breach the principles they have pledged to uphold as members of SAA or other archaeological organizations. However, professionals have an obligation to know, understand, and apply all those principles in their practice of archaeology, rather than adhering only to those that align neatly with their personal moral codes.
- Professionals can neither force nor should they expect RRS to follow the ethical principles to which professionals subscribe, although many RRS already do so. However, by treating members of RRS communities with respect, and by explaining the reasons why archaeologists follow the ethical precepts they do, they may convince other RRS to adhere to them as well.
- Archaeologists and RRS must recognize that people are capable of profound changes in attitudes and behaviors. Archaeologists should not dismiss prospective collaborators because they at some point violated what we define today as best collecting practices. Likewise, RRS should understand that with this statement, the SAA community commits to improving relationships with RRS that its members have sometimes neglected and even harmed. All will benefit by granting each other new opportunities to share the journey to understanding the past.

<sup>i</sup>The task force conceives of “responsible and responsive stewards of the past” as including avocational or amateur archaeologists who have received informal training in archaeology, as well as those with a fundamental interest in and respect for the past and its material evidence. Some RRS collect artifacts; many do not.

<sup>ii</sup>For example, SAA Ethical Principle 1 includes the statement that “... (Archaeologists) should use the specialized knowledge they gain *to promote public understanding and support its long-term preservation.*” Principle 2 notes that “Responsible archaeological research requires...*a commitment to make every reasonable effort to consult actively with affected group(s) with the goal of establishing a working relationship that can be beneficial to all parties.*” Principle 7 stipulates that “Archaeologists...should encourage colleagues, students, *and others to make responsible use of collections, records, and reports in their research as one means of preserving the in situ archaeological record.*” Similarly, the preamble to the Canadian Archaeological Association’s “Principles of Ethical Conduct” states that “...Canadian archaeologists (should) conduct their activities according to the principles of scholarly practice and *recognize the interests of groups affected by their research.*” Italics those of the task force.

<sup>iii</sup>Recording “basic provenience information” entails placing find locations on maps (and recording find locations with a GPS unit, if available), and permanently marking all artifacts from a site or artifact concentration with a provenience indicators linked to their map locations.

## Action Items

In addition to the statement on responsible relationships, the SAA board also asked the task force to develop action items derived from the statement. To do this, seven TF members developed individual lists of actions they saw as most likely to further the collaborative ideals reflected in the statement (see Appendix F for verbatim recommendations of each contributor). The co-chair compiled all individual contributions and mined them for common themes, much as the TF did for stakeholder feedback. The following actions emerged as those the TF as a whole concludes will most effectively translate the statement suggestions into mechanisms for enhancing collaboration among archaeologists, RRS and other archaeological stakeholders, including members of descendant communities.

## RECOMMENDED ACTIONS DERIVED FROM THE STATEMENT

1. More outreach and public education in general, but also more education of archaeologists and RRS
  - a. Education of or outreach to RRS should include explanation of often-complex cultural resource legislation (emphasizing particularly that laws do not permit seizure of lawfully acquired artifacts or sites located on private property); advice on the value of documenting private collections; and explanations of why archaeologists do not spend as much time in the field as they might like and museums do not exhibit all artifacts they manage and care for. Archaeologists, perhaps through the vehicle of an SAA Task Force, should more thoroughly develop minimum standards and establish “best practices” for private collectors to document artifacts and sites they locate. Finally, SAA and all archaeologists should consider ways to engage RRS by offering opportunities to work with professionals on research projects of all sorts.
  - b. Education of professionals and students should underscore the information potential of private collections and the significance of its loss when RRS are ignored. Professionals and aspiring professionals must also be taught to respect RRS and to collaborate with them in ways that do not exploit their labor or sensibilities.
  - c. Outreach should include more efforts to share both with RRS and the general public the results of CRM and federally sponsored academic research, in ways that are consistent with the need to protect sites from uncontrolled access.
2. Clarifying or Revising SAA’s Statement of Ethics. Although TF members already have argued that SAA’s current Statement of Ethics not only permits but requires consideration of the considerable corpus of information found in private collections (e.g. *American Antiquity* 79:386-391, (2014) and *SAA Archaeological Record* 15(5):12, 2015), it could be revised to more explicitly recognize the need for collaboration. SAA should work with partners like the CAA, SHA, and RPA in this effort.
3. Document Private Collections for Preservation and Research. The professional community should systematically document private collections, starting with carefully designed pilot projects. Documentation could include comprehensive 2D digital imagery of all minimally provenienced artifacts and records (field logs, catalogs, lists of sites, maps, etc.), and 3D

documentation of selected artifacts. This documentation will enhance CRM and other preservation and research by complementing professionally acquired site data.

- a. A longer-term goal should be a nationwide database of documented collections, with appropriate security to protect sites from uncontrolled access and collection.
  - b. SAA should encourage professionals and students, both graduate and undergraduate, to conduct research on databases as they accumulate.
4. *Consider Use of other Models for Collaboration.* SAA should evaluate already-established models for collaboration. Programs like Britain’s Portable Antiquities Scheme and similar efforts being developed elsewhere in Europe may provide useful models, practices, and precedents. As well, SAA should look to other disciplines, such as art history, for ideas for productive collaboration with RRS. Of course, differences in law, relevant archaeological records, and traditions of research and collaboration must be recognized and respected in this process.
  5. *Improve our Knowledge of and Understanding of Collection as a Basis for Better Collaboration.* Archaeologists and allied social scientists should work with the RRS community to gather as much information as possible about collectors, their areas of collection, collection methods, patterns of documentation (or not), perspectives on archaeology and history, views of artifacts, and what happens to their collections when they pass on.
  6. *Collections Curation.* Private archaeological collections often are dispersed, sold, or discarded upon a collector’s death. Although documentation of collections prior to this (Point 4 above) would reduce the loss of information, SAA should also consider encouraging collectors to donate their collections for proper indefinite curation. This is a bold proposal to make amidst the curation crisis that besets archaeology, and the TF does not make it lightly. Despite our best efforts, many collections never will be donated, but some will. If efforts at more constructive collaboration are productive, some collectors may provide monies for long-term care and management of their collections (as some already have).
  7. *An SAA Interest Group.* As part of its outreach/education efforts, SAA should support members in creating an interest group focused on archaeologist-RRS collaboration. It could also create new awards (e.g. for “best documentation of a private collection”), to complement, not replace, existing recognition like the Crabtree Award, and dedicate sessions at its annual meeting to the products of collaboration.

## Conclusions

The task force is grateful to have had the opportunity to study how archaeologists and RRS interact and to offer suggestions for improving relationships among them. Members of the TF view the statement and action items presented in this document as a starting point, with the hard work of improving archaeological practice through collaboration ahead of us. All members of the TF—together with more than a few archaeologists and RRS who provided feedback on the initial draft of the statement on collaboration—stand ready to begin working through the action items above and other ideas that arise through the collaborative process.

We note in closing that one member of this task force, Giovanna Peebles, also chaired SAA’s 2014 *Task Force on Metal Detecting of Archaeological Sites in Reality TV* (Metal Detecting Task Force). Although

the goals of the Metal Detecting Task Force and this one were different, they share two elements. First, many metal detectorists are part of the RRS community targeted by this Task Force, and many responded to our call for statement feedback. Second, and most important, both task forces arrived at precisely the same conclusion: to improve problems ranging from the inaccurate and damaging portrayal of archaeology in the media to the poor relationships between archaeologists and RRS, ***SAA and all archaeologists must significantly expand their efforts to engage the public in what they do.***

Archaeology today faces threats on many fronts. Yet the discipline has traditionally enjoyed widespread support from the public because what we do produces information that resonates with nearly everyone. Archaeologists, however, have damaged their own brand by allowing others to co-opt their public portrayal and by undermining their relationships with members of the interested public by treating collectors, not to mention many highly skilled avocational archaeologists who do not collect artifacts, with disdain.

This must stop, and not only must it stop, but archaeologists must pivot such that the default for every project is a commitment to a dynamic, inclusive, interactive, and collaborative approach—and to sharing results widely with all stakeholders. Doing this will require recalibration of our thinking, project design, and even funding models, but that is a challenge we must accept.

**APPENDIX A: Member Biographical Sketches: *Professional Archaeologists, Avocational Archaeologists, and Responsible Artifact Collectors Relationship Task Force***

**BROSOWSKE, SCOTT** ([SBrosowske@pphm.wtamu.edu](mailto:SBrosowske@pphm.wtamu.edu)). Courson Archaeological Research/Panhandle-Plains Historical Museum, Perryton, Texas. 806-435-0619.



I received a B.A. in Archaeological Studies from the University of Texas at Austin and an M.A. and Ph.D. in Anthropology from the University of Oklahoma. I have been the executive director of Courson Archaeological Research (CAR) since 2005, and I also hold an adjunct curator position with the Panhandle-Plains Historical Museum at West Texas A&M University. CAR is a non-profit research entity that studies the full range of prehistoric and historic period societies that inhabited the Southern Plains and adjoining regions prior to Euro-American settlement. With this broad range of interests, which spans early Holocene foragers to Anglo buffalo hunters of the late 1870's, we are interested in understanding the variability and continuity underlying adaptations to the region. Our research is multidisciplinary in scope and involves archaeological fieldwork, laboratory analysis, historic archival work, and experimental studies. CAR is unique in that we are privately funded and our research staff consists of both professionally trained employees and enthusiastic avocational volunteers. Together we work cooperatively to advance our knowledge of the peoples who lived here before us.

I began my pre-college career as a surface artifact collector and have continued to work closely with avocational archaeologists/collectors to conduct research and fieldwork. CAR has hosted two Texas Archaeological Society field schools, a Flint Hills Conference, and until recently, has provided summer archaeological field schools for traditional and non-traditional students from around the world. Each spring we host the Perryton Stone Age Fair, a non-commercial Indian artifact show. This event provides an opportunity for collectors and professional archaeologists to interact, share information, and build relationships in an informal setting. I am currently a member of the Plains Anthropological Society, the Society for American Archaeology, the Texas Archaeological Society, and current president of the Panhandle Archaeological Society.

**BUTLER, VIRGINIA L.** ([virginia@pdx.edu](mailto:virginia@pdx.edu)). Professor, Department of Anthropology, Portland State University, Portland, OR. 97207 ; mobile, 503.381.8601; work, 503.725.3303

On the faculty at Portland State University since 1994, my primary research interest has been zooarchaeology—especially related to fisheries—and understanding long-term relationships between humans and animals. BA Anthropology, University of Georgia. PhD University of Washington. Geographic focus in western North America. Example publications in *American Antiquity*, *Antiquity*, *Journal of Archaeological Science*, *Journal of World Prehistory*, *Quaternary Research*, and *Ecology and Society*.

In the past decade, I've become increasingly interested in engaging the broader public about archaeology (for scientific literacy, conservation biology, stewardship), which directly leads to my interest in joining the SAA Task Force. Three projects illustrate what I bring to the Task Force.

a) I was part of project which researched *municipal government policies* throughout the U.S. regarding cultural heritage stewardship, which fell outside the bounds of federal and state site protection. Our goal was to find policies and practices that could be instituted in Portland. A manuscript summarizing this work is in press in a special issue on Historic Preservation in *Journal of the American Planning Association*.



b) To fire up Portland citizens about local heritage and stewardship, I have taken the lead in creating an annual event, the “Archaeology Roadshow”, a 5-hour celebration of archaeology that brings together PSU faculty and students, tribes, federal and state agencies, private companies and avocational organizations to create exhibits and hands on-activities that showcase our local heritage (<https://www.pdx.edu/anthropology/archaeology-roadshow>). We attracted over 800 visitors at our June 2015 event. One important goal is to establish personal connections between archaeologists and artifact collectors to highlight the problems with artifact collecting and site looting in a non-judgmental way. Visitors bring their objects and experts (in archaeology, geology) provide as much information as possible (age, possible function) about the items to visitors.

c) As part of a commemoration on the 50 yr anniversary of construction of The Dalles Dam on the Columbia River, I researched and wrote an article (2007, *Oregon Historical Quarterly*) about the extraordinary scale of site looting that took place in the vicinity of my dissertation research—and the extent professional archaeologists worked with local collectors in this effort. I was dumbfounded at the scale of collaboration—and that professional archaeologists (working for universities and federal agencies) were almost condoning collecting and private ownership of artifacts on public lands in the 1950s. The historical perspective gave me much to consider about current relationships between professionals and collectors and the need to find balance. Moreover, the views of Native Americans were scarcely considered a half century ago and their place in this conversation is of course critical now.

**COX, JIM** ([jcdds1@cox.net](mailto:jcdds1@cox.net))

I am a practicing dentist of 33 years, devoted to both my professional career, and my avocational interest in archaeology. During the last 49 years of collecting artifacts and studying archaeology here in the state of Oklahoma, I have amassed arguably the largest, most well-documented collection from my home state in private hands. My collection has been well-published in a number of mediums and used as a dataset for several archaeological students working on their master’s thesis and doctorate dissertations.



I became interested in archaeology at a very early age, discovering my first broken artifact in Oklahoma at the age of 12 in 1967. This interest grew through my association with the Oklahoma Anthropological Society and my friendship and mentoring with Dr. Don Wyckoff, Dr. Robert Bell, David Lopez, and Jack Hofman, then a high school student like myself. Eventually, I was hired by the then State Highway Archaeological Survey to assist every summer in fieldwork and publications through high school and college and even into dental school. This experience in a professional environment, I feel, gave me special insights into this hobby of avocational archaeology and collaboration in professional archaeological endeavors.

I eventually went on to be for a time on the Board of Directors of the Oklahoma Anthropological Society (OAS), was a founding member of the Archaeological Society of Oklahoma serving as president for one term, a member of the Plains Anthropological Conference, Society for the Study of the First Americans, and the SAA. I have given scientific presentations at the Plains Conference, OAS, and Paleoamerican Odyssey. I have authored and co-authored a number of papers in archaeology, with emphasis on Paleo-Indian studies and the Spiro Mound site here in Oklahoma.

**ESPENSHADE, CHRIS** ([Cespenshade@skellyloy.com](mailto:Cespenshade@skellyloy.com)).

I am an archaeologist/cultural resource specialist in the Pittsburgh office of Skelly and Loy, Inc. I have 30 years of supervisory experience in CRM and am a Registered Professional Archaeologist. I hold an MA in anthropology from the University of Florida and a BA in anthropology from Wake Forest University. I have worked in the Southeast, Mid Atlantic, Northeast, Midwest, and Caribbean regions.

I began life as an arrowhead hunter, and was directed into archaeological studies by a local university professor. Over the past 20 years or so, I have been advocating about the need for professional archaeologists to interact with the avocational metal detecting community. I am a co-founder and instructor for the RPA-certified class, *Advanced Metal Detecting for the Archaeologist*, which includes a discussion on how best for professional archaeologists to access the skills and knowledge of the local detecting community. I was also involved in creating the prototype of a class, *Archaeological Partnership Program*, to prepare avocational detectorists to work with professional archaeologists. On a recent project at Bennington Battlefield, I stretched what could be done for the limited grant budget by involving local detectorists. More than 55 person-days of labor were provided by volunteers over four weekend days, and the work of the avocational detectorists greatly broadened our understanding of the First and Second Battles of Bennington.



I can be reached at [cespenshade@skellyloy.com](mailto:cespenshade@skellyloy.com) or via phone at 412-477-6602. Various papers I have presented on this subject are available at <https://skellyloy.academia.edu/ChrisEspenshade>.

**NELLER, ANGELA J.** ([Anelle1@gcpud.org](mailto:Anelle1@gcpud.org)). Curator, Wanapum Heritage Center. 509-766-3468 Office; 509-899-6004 Cell.



I have an M.A. in Anthropology from the University of Illinois and over 25 years of experience in the preservation and management of archaeological collections. I am currently Curator for the Wanapum Heritage Center, Grant County Public Utility District, in Washington State, where I manage the ethnographic, archaeological, and archival collections. Additionally, I provide technical expertise to the Wanapum Band on NAGPRA, the NMAI Act, and Washington State's Burial Law, working closely with the tribes and bands of the Columbia Plateau. My previous positions were with the Illinois Transportation Archaeological Research Program at the University of Illinois and the Bishop Museum in Honolulu. As a Native Hawaiian, I am particularly interested in the relationship of material culture and history to the identity of native people and the role of the museum in preservation and perpetuation of indigenous communities.

My experience with artifact collectors has been limited to working with descendants on curating family collections that have come from the Columbia Plateau. Additionally, I have used collector field notes and photographs in my repatriation work to help with cultural affiliation and understanding the history of the Columbia Plateau.

**PEEBLES, GIOVANNA** ([giovanna.peebles@gmail.com](mailto:giovanna.peebles@gmail.com)). Montpelier, VT. Retired Vermont State Archaeologist. Cell: 802-249-2794.

On July 1, 2014, I retired after 38 years as Vermont State Archaeologist (Vermont's first and only till my replacement was hired a few weeks after my departure). From my first week on the job in 1976, collectors were one of my core constituencies. That first week at work, a University of Vermont entomologist handed off to me the Vermont Archaeological Inventory (VAI), about 400 archaeological sites, all pre-Contact, that he and other collectors had recorded. I took responsibility for the VAI, as required by our new state law, from that point forward. In 1977, I hired Stephen Loring, now with the Smithsonian's Arctic Studies Program, along with a research assistant, for one full year to conduct the Vermont Collections Survey. The team interviewed all the well-known, old-time Vermonters who had collected artifacts for decades, catching some of them just before they died. The team intensively documented the thousands of artifacts and recorded hundreds of site locations, adding these sites to the VAI. In the intervening years, I continued to work with and collaborate with dozens of





collectors. It was not always an easy experience but it was a fascinating journey for many reasons. I hope to share some of these experiences with The Force.

**PILLES, PETER** ([ppilles@fs.fed.us](mailto:ppilles@fs.fed.us))



After graduating from high school in Phoenix, Arizona, Peter Pilles studied anthropology and archaeology at Arizona State University in Tempe. As with many young archaeologists, he spent several years doing short-term projects--for the Pueblo Grande Museum, Arizona State University, and the Arizona State Museum--before joining the staff of the Museum of Northern Arizona in 1967. In 1975, he became the first full-time forest archaeologist in the southwest region when he accepted a position with the Coconino National Forest. However, he maintained close ties with the

museum and currently serves on its board of trustees.

Pilles has worked primarily in northern, central, and southern Arizona. His recent excavations in the Coconino National Forest include Sinagua and Yavapai sites in the Verde Valley (though he also recently was part of a team excavating a shell mound in Brazil). His focus is on rock art, ceramics, cultural resource management (once known as rescue or salvage archaeology), and public involvement in archaeology.

Beyond excavating or surveying, Pilles has spent considerable time recording rock-art sites and removing modern graffiti from them. He's also supervised the stabilization of standing ruins at a number of sites. As a teacher, Pilles has instructed members of law-enforcement agencies about archaeology and the legal framework that protects our sites (see *Cultural Resource Magazine*, vol. 17, no. 6, and vol. 19, no. 7, at [crm.cr.nps.gov](http://crm.cr.nps.gov) for more on federal archaeology laws). Also in the teaching field, Pilles has given numerous courses on the conservation and management of rock-art sites.

Over his career, Pilles has been recognized for numerous efforts by the Hopi Tribe (for contribution to the enhancement of Hopi culture), the Northern Arizona Archaeological Society (for 20 years at Elden Pueblo), the American Rock Art Research Association (for management and protection of sites in Coconino), and from Coconino National Forest (for, among other things, assistance in investigating vandalism at Kinnickinick Ruin). In 2002, he received the Grand Award, Arizona Heritage Preservation Honor Award, from the Arizona Preservation Foundation/State Historic Preservation Office in recognition of years of outstanding service in historic preservation in the state.

Source: <http://interactive.archaeology.org/arizona/bio.html>

**PITBLADO, BONNIE** ([bonnie.pitblado@ou.edu](mailto:bonnie.pitblado@ou.edu)). Robert E. and Virginia Bell Professor of Anthropological Archaeology, University of Oklahoma, Norman.

Since 2012, I have been an anthropology professor at the University of Oklahoma. For the decade prior to that, I called Utah State University (Logan, UT) home, serving both as an anthropology professor and director of the USU Museum of Anthropology. I specialize in the earliest occupations of the Rocky Mountains, which take us back very nearly as far as the earliest occupations of North America more generally. From the time that I completed my dissertation on that subject at the University of Arizona, I have worked side-by-side with avocational archaeologists, some of whom collect artifacts and some of whom do not. I learned very quickly that I would be a fool *not* to partner with people who know their landscapes better than I do and who in so many cases are both “book-” and “street-” smart about the archaeology of their areas—regardless of what initials they may or may not have after their names. Not only have my collaborations with private people been intellectually rewarding for all involved, but they have also led to some of my most rewarding and long-lasting friendships.



When I am not climbing around the mountains of Colorado or Idaho, I can be found either underwater, scuba diving in tropical waters, or—more often—at some baseball diamond or another in or near Oklahoma, watching my 12 year-old son play ball.

**SÁNCHEZ, GUADALUPE** ([guadalupe\\_sanchez\\_miranda@hotmail.com](mailto:guadalupe_sanchez_miranda@hotmail.com))



I received my B.A. in archaeology at the Escuela Nacional de Antropología e Historia in Mexico City, and my M.A. and Ph. D. degrees in the School of Anthropology at the University of Arizona. Over the past 20 years, my investigations have concentrated on Northern Mexico, with varied topics encompassing Pleistocene-Holocene hunter-gatherers, the introduction of early maize and agriculture, human adaptations, paleoethnobotany, paleoecology, geoarchaeology and lithic technological

organization. I am currently a research associate at Estación del Noroeste, UNAM, and I am the former director of the Subdirección de Laboratorios y Apoyo Académico, and the Museo Regional de Sonora for the Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia in México. My work has appeared in the *Proceedings of*

*the National Academy of Sciences (PNAS), Quaternary International, Kiva: The Journal of Southwestern Anthropology and History, Arqueología Mexicana, and Archaeology Southwest.*

For the last 20 years I have worked with artifact collectors in Hermosillo, Sonora, because they have the majority of Clovis points and Archaic points found in Sonora. Many of the sites that my team and I have investigated were found by collectors, and we have been able to work with their collections. However, our relationship with the collectors is somewhat tenuous. It will be very productive to learn the experiences of the task force members and to try to implement some actions with the collectors in Hermosillo. I also look forward to sharing the Mexican experience with the group.

**SHIPLEY, RICHARD** ([richardshiple6@outlook.com](mailto:richardshiple6@outlook.com))

I am a native of Southeastern Idaho and now share time between the Salt Lake City area and a cabin close to where I grew up. I received degrees from Utah State University, including an honorary Ph.D. this past year. I was the owner/founder of Shipley Associates, an international communications consulting firm. Now retired, I have served in recent years as Chair of the Utah State University Board of Trustees and as Special Assistant to Governor Leavitt of Utah.

I have been a "collector" of Native American artifacts since finding an arrowhead on a scouting trip in the late 1950's. As a college student, my friends and I tracked the excavations of Julian Stewart in northern Utah. Having worked with a number of archaeologists, I was impressed with the innovative programs involving the collecting community under Bonnie Pitblado's direction.



My wife and I provided the endowment necessary to operate USU's anthropology museum, and we sponsored USU's Southeastern Idaho and Northern Utah Paleoindian Research Program. We have also provided funding to protect archaeological sites in Utah (including Danger Cave) and Idaho. As a resident of a state that is 70% Federal land, I have experienced the unique balancing of interface and cooperation of the collecting community and university/government scholars and administrators. I look forward to working again with Dr. Pitblado and THE FORCE.

**SHOTT, MICHAEL** ([shott@akron.edu](mailto:shott@akron.edu))

I have practiced archaeology in the Midwest, the Great Basin, and elsewhere for over 35 years [Yikes!], in capacities that range from contractor to government bureaucrat to academic researcher (I am currently an anthropology professor at the University of Akron). I'm particularly proud of co-founding a local chapter of a state archaeological society while in grad school. My earliest experience took me to



an obscure corner of Michigan where I encountered literally dozens of collectors willing, often eager, to open their collections to professionals. Resulting data were both typical of private collections—variable in quality and detail of documentation that ranged from low and little to high professional standards—and instrumental in gauging the broad parameters of prehistoric occupational patterns there. From Paleoindian sites in Michigan to Late Woodland villages in the Ohio Valley to obsidian quarries in Nevada, every major site I have excavated or sampled was discovered by collectors and reported to professionals.

**SUÁREZ, RAFAEL** ([suarezrafael23@gmail.com](mailto:suarezrafael23@gmail.com)), Associate Professor, Department of Archaeology, University of the Republic, Uruguay.

In 2010, I obtained my PhD. Anthropology / Archaeology focusing my research on the early prehistory of the Americas. I am currently a Professor at the University of the Republic in Montevideo. My areas of interest and expertise include South American Paleoindian Archaeology, hunter-gatherer lifeways, geoarchaeology and paleoenvironmental reconstructions, lithic technology, analysis of biface/projectile point manufacturing sequences, raw material acquisition, and hunter-gather organization of technology.



Since the late 1990's I have worked with private and museum collections in Uruguay, South America. My academic interest in relation to the early peopling of South America has allowed me to bond with many private artifact collectors in Uruguay, because in the Uruguayan plains there is a high concentration of projectile points (thousands!) on surface sites, including Fishtail points (ca. 12,800-12,200 cal BP), one of the earliest point types in South America. More than 15 years ago I began conducting intensive, systematic surveys of private collections to document the full range of types of artifacts of early hunter-gatherers in this part of the continent. As a result of that work, my research partners and I have identified—in intact stratigraphic context and with strong chronologic control—two *new* types of Paleoamerican projectile points: Tigre points (ca. 12.000 to 11.300 cal BP) and Pay Paso points (ca. 11.080 to 10.250 cal BP). This would not have been possible without the involvement of private citizens in our research.

THOMAS, SUZIE, FSA ([suzie.e.thomas@helsinki.fi](mailto:suzie.e.thomas@helsinki.fi))



I am University Lecturer in Museology at the University of Helsinki, Finland. I completed my PhD at Newcastle University, UK, on the relationships between archaeologists and metal detectorists in England and Wales, in 2009. I am a founding editor of the *Journal of Community Archaeology and Heritage* and am currently a member of the Lapland's Dark Heritage research project team funded by the Academy of Finland (<http://blogs.helsinki.fi/lapland-dark-heritage/>).

My recent publications include:

Thomas, S, A. Wessman, J. Siltainsuu, and W. Perttola (2016) Understanding Metal Detecting and Archaeology in Finland, *Cuadernos de Prehistoria y Arqueología de la Universidad de Granada* 25: 185-197

Thomas, S. (2015) Collaborate, Condemn, or Ignore? Responding to Non-Archaeological Approaches to Archaeological Heritage, *European Journal of Archaeology* 18(2): 312-328

Thomas, S. (2013) Brian Hope-Taylor, the Council for British Archaeology and 'The Need for Adequate Archaeological Propaganda', *Public Archaeology* 12(2): 101-16

Thomas, S. (2012) Searching for Answers: a study of metal-detector users in the UK, *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 18(1): 49-64

## Appendix B: Task Force Readings, Annotated by Michael Shott (or with Abstracts)

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (CORE)

2016 The National Historic Preservation Program at 50: Challenges and Opportunities.

*Laments the general lack of widespread public support for preservation. The TF might suggest one, admittedly small, way to broaden support is more effective, constructive engagement with responsible collectors. Also calls for a broadened definition of historic resources, which we could argue should embrace private artifact collections as valuable, informative resources that we otherwise neglect. Finally, advocates revising procedures and criteria for recognizing and protecting resources. Again, private collections are historic resources, so revised criteria should encourage, maybe even require, us to consider them.*

Baxter, Jane E.

2013 Investigating Absence: Assessing the Cumulative Effects of Casual Collecting at a 19<sup>th</sup> Century Bahamian Plantation. *Journal of Field Archaeology* 38:174-184.

*Documents significant bias by selective private collection*

Bland, Roger (CORE)

2005 A pragmatic approach to the problem of portable antiquities: the experience of England and Wales. *Antiquity* 79:440-447.

*Abstract: Thousands of artefacts are found every year by the public the world over, and many are sold or destroyed. How are we to ensure that these discoveries can take their place in archaeological research)? For some, legislation, state control and strong penalties are the best or only option. Here, the co-ordinator of the English Portable Antiquities Scheme makes the case for a voluntary code, led by co-operation, education and reward.*

Charles, Tommy

1983 Thoughts and Records from the Survey of Private Collections of Prehistoric Artifacts throughout South Carolina: A Second Report. *South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology Notebook* 15:1-37.

*Charles's personal account of his involvement in and then direction of a survey of SC private collections that promoted site reporting, and collections documentation and curation. An example of what should be done in every US state.*

Dobat, Andres S. (CORE)

2013 Between Rescue and Research: An Evaluation after 30 Years of Liberal Metal Detecting in Archaeological Research and Heritage Practice in Denmark. *European Journal of Archaeology* 16:704-725.

*Here, "liberal" means a collaborative versus confrontational relationship between professionals and collectors/detectorists. This source is relevant not strictly for its focus upon metal detection but more broadly for how the roles of and relationships b/w professionals and responsible collectors can be productive, for the role that collectors and their collections play in both preservation (by documenting*

*many sites that professionals lack the opportunity to find and document) and research (by greatly increasing some—not all—relevant bodies of data). For comparison to the US, there are three salient differences. First, metal-detecting is of relatively recent origin—about the past 30 years—and lacks the generations of tradition here in the US. Second, this concerns metal-detecting rather than artifact collection in general. Metal-detecting is governed by a national law that claims treasure troves as national patrimony but partially compensates finders, partly in proportion to “the care taken by the finder during the recovery of the find...” Doesn’t directly address the possibility that monetary awards stimulate detection, but states that “compensations rarely outweigh the investment of man hours..” (No word in this paper on Danish law’s view of, say, Mesolithic chert blades or Neolithic pottery.) Third, much wider compliance with relevant law is based on cultural and social values very different from those that prevail here. Compared to Denmark, it puts it mildly to note that the US in general and some collectors lack “generalized trust in society and...in official institutions” and that in Denmark much more than here “it is seen as an expression of social trust and responsibility to hand in identified or unidentified objects to the local museum...”! We needn’t waste time waiting for that ethos to develop here. Advocates Denmark’s liberal model, using the drug trade as an analogy (i.e. can’t stop it, so try instead to control it) and contrasting it to legal or moral censure, which it calls a “prohibition” model. Also useful to compare to Bland (2005). Acknowledges the existence of irresponsible looting/trade; considers it minor in both frequency and impact, but it’s difficult to know if this is accurate or merely naïve.*

Elmendorf, Julia O.

1990 A Role for the Amateur Archeologist Allied in Decreasing Site Looting. In *Coping with Site Looting: Southeastern Perspectives*, ed. by J.Ehrenhard. SEAC On-line volume, <http://www.nps.gov/seac/coping.index.htm>.

*What the title says. Argues that we professionals must take the first steps.*

Espenshade, Chris and Patrick Severts (CORE)

2010 Two routes, One Destination: Teaching Professional Archaeologists and Avocational Archaeologists Best Practices in Metal Detector Studies. Ms. contributed by the authors.

*Describes outreach and education programs to educate both professionals (about technical details of metal-detecting) and collectors (about documentation, importance of context, research value of collections, etc.), including workshops that could be models to emulate.*

The Fossil Hunters (CORE)

2016 The Fossil Hunters Recent Finds. <http://verofossilhunters.com/birth-of-the-story-bone/>

*The group that found and apparently sold the recent incised mammoth bone in Florida. This case was described at some length in Bonnie’s 2014 American Antiquity paper. Bonnie herself recommended this item for the core reading list, as it represents an issue with which we must grapple. It should go without saying that Task Force member should not respond to their solicitation for funds to continue their noble, heroic, and entirely selfless endeavors. They think, therefore they are. And apparently they think they’re archaeologists, therefore they are?*

Francis, Julie

1978 The Effects of Casual Collection in Chipped Stone Artifacts. In *The Little Colorado Planning Unit*, edited by F. Plog, pp. 115-133. Arizona State University Anthropological Research Papers 13. Tempe, AZ, USA.

*Along with Lightfoot & Francis (below), documents bias by prior uncontrolled collection, patterning to some degree with road networks.*

Frison, George

1984 Avocational Archaeology: Its Past, Present and Future. In *Ethics and Values in Archaeology*, ed. by E. Greene, pp. 184-193. Free Press, New York.

*Notes the great number of and potential for collaboration with collectors, and argues for outreach to them. Implicitly, it echoes the distinction we make between responsible and irresponsible collectors. Responsible collectors have responsibilities, but Frison argues that professionals bear obligations to them as well, of respect, education, and genuine collaboration. Collaboration is a two-way street. Like other archaeologists, Frison began his career as a collector.*

Gathright, Raymond

2010 Gravel Bars, Walking Sticks, Scorchers and Archies: An Ethnographic Look at the Sub-culture of Native American Artifact Collectors. BS Honors Thesis, Texas A&M University-Commerce.

*Brief, limited collector ethnography, useful as an illustration of what could be done more extensively and on larger scales.*

Gerstenblith, Patty

2013 The law as mediator between archaeology and collecting. *Internet Archaeology* 33: doi: 10.11141/ia.33.10.

*A review of international preservation policy and practice as it concerns private collection, with some emphasis on the US. Advocates outreach and education.*

Kinnear, Patti

2008 Cooperation and Conflict: Examining Alternative Views of Archaeology on the Great Plains. *Plains Anthropologist* 53:161-177.

*Documents the sad state of relations between professionals, collectors and native Americans. Useful baseline information on what each constituency thinks of the others.*

Kolb, Jennifer and Howard VanLangen

1989 A Study of Prehistoric Site Distributions in Ozaukee and Washington Counties: The VanLangen Collection. In *The Southeastern Wisconsin Archaeological Program: 1988-89*, edited by L. Goldstein, E. Benchley and J. Kolb, pp. 71-84. Archaeological Research Laboratory, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Report of Investigations No. 101. Milwaukee, WI, USA.

*Report on regional survey that found 105 sites, 100 of them previously unknown to SHPO records, and most documented via private collections. Importance of thorough collector/collections survey shown by*



*the impact of a single collection on results: a total of 49 diagnostic points found in other collections, 78 in this one alone, including seven Paleo (vs. 1 otherwise) and 29 Late Archaic (vs. 4 otherwise).*

LaBelle, Jason M. (CORE)

2003 Coffee Cans and Folsom Points: Why We Cannot Continue to Ignore the Artifact Collectors. In *Ethical Issues in Archaeology*, edited by L.Zimmerman, K.Vitelli and J. Hollowell-Zimmer, pp. 115-127. Altamira Press, Walnut Creek, CA.

*Eloquent testimonial both to the scale and quality of responsible (and some not so responsible) private collection. Certainly documents the contribution that such collections can make to scholarly research.*

Lightfoot, K. and Julie Francis

1978 The Effect of Casual Surface Collection on Behavioral Interpretations of Archaeological Data. In *The Little Colorado Planning Unit*, edited by F. Plog, pp. 91-113. Arizona State University Anthropological Research Papers 13. Tempe, AZ, USA.

*See Francis 1978, above.*

Miller, Patricia E.

2008 A Summary of Existing Data from Pennsylvania Upland Sites. In *Current Approaches to the Analysis and Interpretation of Small Lithic Sites in the Northeast*, edited by C.Rieth, pp. 167-176. NYSM Bulletin Sries 508.

*A single quote from this paper establishes its relevance: "The total number of diagnostic points recovered from plow-disturbed sites ranged from zero to 143, except for one site where data from a collector brought the total to 821." pg. 169.*

Pitblado, Bonnie L. (CORE)

2014 An Argument for Ethical, Proactive, Archaeologist-Artifact Collector Collaboration. *American Antiquity* 79:385-400.

*Strong argument in favor of respecting and collaborating with responsible collectors. Probably has had the greatest impact among professionals in recent years.*

Rotenstein, David S.

1997 Bending Contexts: A Historical Perspective on Relic Collections.

<http://historian4hire.net/relics/relics/htm>.

*Unpublished course paper about varieties of collectors, giving some sense of the range of backgrounds, interests, and practices among collectors. Also cites a 1978 survey of demographic characteristics of Pennsylvania collectors.*

Ruig, Jill L.

1995 Collectors as Taphonomic Agents for the Archaeological Record. Unpublished BA Thesis, Department of Archaeology and Palaeoanthropology, University of New England, Armidale, Australia.

*Admittedly very hard to find, this study is partly an ethnography of collectors and partly a taphonomic account of the damage that uncontrolled and unknown collection wreaks in Australia. Emphasis mostly on historical sites and bottle collectors, but with broader implications. One sobering estimate: as of 1978 Australia may have had 15,000 bottle collectors, and this in a national population of <15 million. Also demonstrates methods for tracking the scale and pattern of collecting activity.*

1980 Australia n=15 million: 15,000/15,000,000=0.001% of population.

1980 US population n=226 million; assuming same rate of .001 of population=226,000 collectors

SAA *Archaeological Record*, November 2015, Volume 15, Number 5, Special Section: Pros and Cons of Consulting Collectors). Edited by Bonnie Pitblado and Michael Shott.

*Contributions by people with highly diverse views on collecting: S. Terry Childs, Robert Connolly, Jim Cox, Lynn E. Fisher et al., Ted Goebel, Bonnie Pitblado & Michael J. Shott, Michael J. Shott and Bonnie Pitblado, and Joe Watkins.*

Sawaged, Tamie

1999 The Collecting Culture: An Exploration of the Collector Mentality and Archaeology's Response. *Nebraska Anthropologist*. Paper 121. <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/nebanthro/121>

*Abstract: "The collecting of cultural remains and the looting of sites have serious repercussions for the preservation of the archaeological record. The scientific community has long bemoaned this situation, but has developed few effective, proactive measures to stem the activities of collectors and looters. This lack of success can be attributed partially to a failure in researching and understanding the driving forces behind the collecting phenomenon. Thus, this paper has several main goals: to provide the archaeologist with some basic understanding of the collecting culture from the collector's perspective; to encourage the use of an integrated, multidisciplinary approach to address this issue; and to offer suggestions for the creation of new initiatives."*

*Initiatives largely amount to advocating constructive engagement with responsible collectors.*

Schiffer, Michael B.

1996 *Formation Processes of the Archaeological Record*. University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City, UT, USA.

*Pg. 116: "Recurrent collecting badly biases the surface remains at a site, especially depleting the artifacts, such as projectile points...that archaeologists use for chronological control. In severely collected sites...the surface remains from site to site become undesirably monotonous: a few small, undecorated sherds and lithic flakes."*

Shott, Michael J. (CORE)

2008a equal o nll roofht w ded l e vsbr cted: A Proposal for Conservation of Private Collections in American Archaeology. *SAA Archaeological Record* 8(2):30-35.

*My own plea to at least consider collections as research data, along with a brief historical sketch of collecting that involved Henry David Thoreau and John Wesley Powell.*

Society for American Archaeology (CORE)

1996 Principles of Archaeological Ethics. <http://www.saa.org/ABOUTSAA/COMMITTEES/ethics/principles.html>.

*For general reference!*

Thomas, Suzie (CORE)

2015 Collaborate, Condemn, or Ignore? Responding to Non-Archaeological Approaches to Archaeological Heritage. *European Journal of Archaeology* 18:312-335.

*Chronicles the author's guarded, reluctant involvement with popular television shows that challenge our professional ethics. Suggests the three categories of response captured by the title, and justifies working with popular media constructively while maintaining ethical standards. (On a merely semantic note, relevant both to this paper and this task force's mission, perhaps "engage" is preferable to "collaborate" which, in historic perspective, carries ethical baggage.) Admirable courage merely to engage in the first place, and to reflect upon that engagement for the reference of other professionals.*

Thulman, David K.

2011 Lower End Artifact Collection: Is a Practical Accommodation Possible among Archaeologists, Collectors, and Museums? Paper presented at the Museum and Antiquities Lecture Series, George Washington University. Washington, D.C., USA. April.

*Acknowledges widespread collection in SE (mostly FL) but also argues that many collectors are receptive to outreach and collaboration.*

**APPENDIX TASK C: TASK FORCE DRAFT STATEMENT FOR PEER-REVIEW**

August 10, 2016

Dear Peer-Reviewer:

In November 2015, the Society for American Archaeology (SAA) Executive Board drafted Motion 136-54.5, creating a task force (TF) to “define appropriate relationships among professional archaeologists, avocational archaeologists, and responsible artifact collectors in light of the SAA Principles of Archaeological Ethics and legal statutes,” ***producing a statement for dissemination to SAA members and other archaeological stakeholders.***

The SAA Board asked Dr. Bonnie Pitblado (University of Oklahoma) to chair the TF, and Pitblado in turn asked Dr. Michael Shott (University of Akron, OH) to help spearhead the effort. Pitblado and Shott assembled a 13-member TF representing 3 continents, all archaeological sectors, and the avocational and collecting communities. In addition to Pitblado and Shott, TF members include Scott Brosowske (TX), Virginia Butler (OR), Jim Cox (OK), Chris Espenshade (PA), Angela Neller (WA), Giovanna Peebles (VT), Peter Pilles (AZ), Richard Shipley (UT), Guadalupe Sanchez Miranda (Sonora, Mexico), Rafael Suárez (Uruguay), and Suzie Thomas (Finland).

After months of discussion, the TF has developed a draft statement per SAA’s Motion. The statement represents the consensus view of TF members. However, the TF wishes to gain additional feedback from as many archaeological stakeholders as possible prior to finalizing the statement for submission to SAA for Board approval and formal dissemination.

The TF would therefore be extremely grateful for any input you are willing to offer about the working draft. If you have lots to say, please do not hesitate to write as much as you like—and know that the TF will read every word. If you just want to register something like “looks good,” that too will help the TF gauge if we have or have not struck a balance that works for most stakeholders. ***As we note at the end of this document, we will be able to consider all feedback we receive by August 26, 2016.***

We ask that reviewers share a few key bits of demographic information to help the TF contextualize the input we receive. We would appreciate it if you would answer the following few questions:

1. With which demographic do you currently identify? (you may check more than one)
    - Artifact collector
    - Avocational archaeologist
    - Professional archaeologist, Sector(s): \_\_\_\_\_
    - Archaeology/Anthropology student, UG or Grad Student? \_\_\_\_\_
    - Museum professional
    - Other stakeholder (please elaborate to help the TF be as inclusive as possible): \_\_\_\_\_
- 
-

2. Have you identified with an alternative demographic (as listed in question 1) at some point in the past? (For example, some professionals began their archaeological pursuits as artifact collectors).

- Yes
- No

Please elaborate on your response if you like: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

3. What geographic region do you consider your home base?

- USA, State/Region: \_\_\_\_\_
- Canada, Province/Region: \_\_\_\_\_
- Central America, Country/Region: \_\_\_\_\_
- South America, Country/Region: \_\_\_\_\_
- Europe, Country/Region: \_\_\_\_\_
- Other Continent/Country/Region: \_\_\_\_\_

If you would like to provide a short description that captures who you are in more detail, we encourage you to do so. You can use your name if you like, although you certainly don't have to. If you do use your name, we will not use it in any report or other document that we write. For example, you might say something like "I am an accountant and part-time farmer in Missouri, and I have collected artifacts from my fields for 30 years, and in that time I have never worked with an archaeologist" or "My name is Bonnie Pitblado and I am professor of anthropology at the University of Oklahoma. Virtually all of the archaeological research I have ever done has benefited from the involvement of non-archaeologist partners."

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Thank you for answering those questions. Now, please read the following the statement and share your thoughts in whatever form you like—affix them to the end of this document; insert them as comments within the text; write them in an e-mail; whatever works best for you. The TF deeply appreciates any and all insights from as broad a cross-section as possible of people with a passion for archaeology and its physical expressions.

## ***Draft statement for review by stakeholders***

We ask that readers of this statement understand that the task force intends for the document to be read and interpreted holistically. For example, if a reader focuses upon a task force recommendation in isolation, without contextualizing it based on the preceding premises, he or she may draw conclusions that the task force did not intend and does not condone.

The task force identifies the following as its operating premises:

- Artifact collecting and metal detecting will continue no matter what SAA does or does not do.
- All archaeological collecting, whether by professionals, avocationalists or collectors, impacts the archaeological record and its interpretation, and mitigating that impact is always the ideal.
- The terms “professional archaeologist,” “avocational archaeologist,” and “artifact collector” are defined differently by different people, and many shift their affiliation and activities over time. For example, a “collector” today may identify as a “professional archaeologist” next year.
- Avocational archaeologists, including many artifact collectors, have often been valuable partners to archaeologists, sharing their passion for the past, local expertise, and preservation ethic. Archaeological knowledge throughout the Americas and world has advanced as the direct result of artifacts and data that collectors have shared with professionals.
- Some artifact collectors do not share the values and interests that unify professionals and many avocationalists, instead viewing artifacts primarily as commodities with financial value.
- The nature of the relationship among professionals and other archaeological stakeholders varies across the Americas and world. To successfully collaborate, all parties must be mindful of local traditions, the importance of tribal concerns, unique laws governing heritage, and so on.
- Professional archaeologists have an ethical obligation to engage with those who possess knowledge of a project area or an interest in the past.
- Professional archaeologists have frequently failed to productively engage with avocationalists and artifact collectors. Consequently, we do not know the nature and degree of undocumented collecting’s effect upon the archaeological record. This knowledge gap threatens archaeologists’ ability to draw meaningful conclusions about the prehistory of *any* area that has been collected.
- Sharing knowledge via public education and outreach is the single best way to maximize awareness of and strong stewardship for the archaeological record on the part of all stakeholders.

Building on these premises, the task force strongly recommends that professional archaeologists actively engage avocationalists, including “responsible” and “responsive” collectors, in their work. Although the task force concludes that labels reinforce divisiveness, *in general*, we define “responsible” collectors as those who:

- Obtain landowner permission to collect artifacts
- Limit collecting to the ground surface or plowzone, where impacts to sites due to collecting can be more readily mitigated than when uncontrolled excavation has occurred
- Record and are willing to share at least basic provenience information for collected artifacts

- Avoid commercializing their artifact collections
- Serve as strong stewards for their collections during and beyond their lifetime

The task force uses the term “responsive collector” to refer to collectors who are not yet aware of archaeological standards and therefore may not have maintained them, *but who are receptive to learning and applying them.*

Because, as stipulated, collecting is popular, cannot be stopped, and alters the documented record, our only recourse for the sake of preservation and research is collaboration as a cornerstone of appropriate relationships with collectors. The task force emphasizes the following points as keys to successful collaboration among stakeholders:

- Collaboration can only succeed in an atmosphere of respect. Professional archaeologists must respect non-professionals for their particular knowledge and experiences, and professionals should expect respect from non-professionals in return.
- Collaboration among professionals, avocationalists and collectors will often involve compromise. There is no perfect professional, no perfect avocationalist, and no perfect collector. However, imperfect people can collaborate in good faith to improve care for and understanding of the archaeological record in its entirety.
- Archaeologists must use both their common sense and their best training and skills as anthropologists to decide how to best engage responsible/responsive collectors in their work.
- Collaboration must not lead professionals to breach the principles they have pledged to uphold as members of SAA or other archaeological organizations. Professionals have an obligation to know, understand, and apply those principles in their practice of archaeology.
- Professionals can neither force nor should they expect collectors to follow the ethical principles to which professionals subscribe. However, professionals would do well to recognize that when they treat avocationalists and collectors with respect and a spirit of non-condescending education, many collectors will voluntarily uphold most or all of the ethical principles professionals do.
- Professionals and avocationalists including collectors must recognize that people are capable of profound changes in their attitudes and behaviors. Archaeologists should not immediately dismiss prospective collector-collaborators because they at some point violated what we define today as basic standards for responsible collecting. Likewise, collectors are encouraged not to “write off” all professional archaeologists because some have been disrespectful in the past.
- Professionals and responsible/responsive collectors should collaborate in the documentation of private collections. SAA should consult European partners for models of collaboration that could be adapted to variable North, Central and South American circumstances.
- Above all else, the key to productive collaboration lies in vastly increased public education and outreach by all archaeologists. To paraphrase the words of anthropological foremother Margaret Mead, archaeologists should never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can preserve the past; indeed, it’s the only thing that ever has.

**Peer-Reviewers:** Again, please provide feedback below, as part of the text itself using “comments,” in the body of an e-mail, or in whatever form works best for you. Return your input to the TF member who sent you the draft, or if you are not sure where it originated, to TF chair Bonnie Pitblado ([bonnie.pitblado@ou.edu](mailto:bonnie.pitblado@ou.edu)). You may also send responses by “snail mail” to Bonnie Pitblado: 455 W Lindsey St., Rm. 521, Norman, OK 73019. ***All responses will be kept confidential, and no reviewer names will be used in communications with SAA or in any other context. The TF will be able to consider all feedback received by August 26, 2016.***



## Appendix D: External Input Coding Guide

**Respondent number:** This will allow us to keep track of who is who, anonymously, on the spreadsheet. Please code respondents using the primary sector designation (below) and the number they have been assigned in the master log. For example, if you are assessing collector responses, your respondent numbers will look like “C-1, “C-2” all the way through “C-38.” If you are doing CRM archaeologists, your numbers will look like “P-CRM-12” or “P-CRM-15”

**Primary Sector:** This should correspond to with how a person first-and-foremost identifies. In most cases, people are grouped already by primary sector, although “professional archaeologist” responses are not filed according to sub-group. That information will need to be culled from the entries.

- **A:** Avocational
- **C:** Collector
- **M:** Museum archaeologist
- **P-Ac:** Professional Archaeologist, Academic
- **P-CRM:** Professional Archaeologist, CRM
- **P-G:** Professional Archaeologist working for a government of any sort and at any level (federal, state, local, tribal, etc.)
- **S-UG:** Student, undergraduate (not sure if there are any of these, but it doesn’t hurt to have a code)
- **S-G:** Student, graduate
- **O:** Other Stakeholder

**Region as listed:** Whatever region of the US or country the respondent has listed on the form.

**M/F.** We did not ask for this, and in some cases it won’t be discernible. In most cases it will, though, and it would be interesting to get a sense for the breakdown of men versus women responding.

- **M**
- **F**
- **U (unknown)**

**Assessment (Assess):** A characterization of the general tenor of the review. This will give us a way to quantify the degree of buy-in the statement generated in draft form.

- **F:** Fully supportive
- **S-M:** Supportive with minor changes along the lines of additional verbiage in bullet items
- **S-S:** Supportive with suggested substantive changes (e.g., “statement should reflect greater respect for descendent communities” or “discuss laws in more depth”)
- **U:** Unsupportive
- **Unk:** Respondent didn’t speak to the statement (but shared anecdotes or other information).

**Comments (up to 3):** Feedback provided by respondents

**APPENDIX E: ALL CODED DATA**

See separate document, file name "Appendix E"

## APPENDIX F: ALL TASK FORCE MEMBER ACTION ITEMS

### VIRGINIA BUTLER

#### Short term:

1) Create A SAA interest group? Or an established SAA Committee? Perhaps both are needed. I think the topic is important enough that the SAA should consider creating a committee on this theme. Then use the interest group to build greater grassroots interest.

3) Modify the SAA webpage, “for the public” so that it engages a broader range of publics, like collectors, and avocational archaeologists. Maybe the website could list archaeologists in each state that are receptive to working with collectors.

#### Long-term:

1) Promote, incentivize partnerships that show the value of collector-professional-and descendant community links. I think this could happen in several ways. New Award from the SAAs? Promotion of such partnerships on the SAA website, in a feature that could rotate quarterly or something? Bonnie’s work that shows this power with the Paleoindian record of the U.S. is great in this regard. We need to showcase other models. We need to make collaborations more than what *someone should do*, to showing the range of values that accrue to an individual/or academic program/or other stakeholder groups that actually embraces this fundamentally.

2) We need more research on the scholarship of collecting. The Task Force spoke of this sometime ago. We are working blind right now. What parts of the country have the most activity; what is the nature of that activity. Some of this work could involve archival/on-line work with social media, but I think the richest work would be socio-cultural, where students/researchers would explore some fundamental attitudes and contexts that encourage or promote collecting, sales, etc. Neil Brodie and colleagues have done much on this. Perhaps one thing the TF could do is come up with list of research questions that we could post – that masters students/phd students and advisors could draw on for guidance. (I think we started this list of topics, I think we should develop this more). Having this knowledge would be extremely useful to professionals that are seeking to build partnerships.

3) One particular question the TF raised was, how does the relationship between collectors and professionals vary around the world. Which policies are doing a good job of promoting partnerships between collectors and professionals. How could these be tailored for particular settings/countries? Legal, ethical, cultural barriers. This is a PhD project or two.

4) Professionals (I start with professionals, but collectors should be brought into this of course) need to come up with many more ways to “share” the archaeological record. Right now, we’re too protective of it; we hold it way too close. Public Education –outreach is an obvious way for professionals and collectors to share what they know/ the public. This needs to happen at all levels. Academics need to

educate our students on the importance of public outreach- education in professional practice. CRM. We need to work at various levels to promote creative mitigation, where the outreach /education could satisfy some aspects of compliance. Right now, citizens of Oregon are told almost nothing about results of CRM projects that takes place in our state. This is public financing. How can this be? Past practice, the laws are not specific on the need to share information. We need to shake things up so that outreach/education is more of what archaeologists do (than strictly archaeological field work/analysis, write-up for a professional audience). Collectors should absolutely be part of this education effort. They have huge amounts of knowledge and passion to share. In fact, this passion is our common ground.

## **CHRIS ESPENSHADE**

### Short Term:

1. Revise SAA ethical principles to emphasize an ethical mandate that archaeologists incorporate all appropriate data in their studies, including data held by collectors/collaborators. Clarify that the past behaviors of collectors does not represent a valid excuse to ignore their data. Ideally, SAA would encourage RPA to also strengthen their ethical requirements regarding the consideration and inclusion of collector data.
2. The SAA should issue a clear policy stressing the value and importance of engaging collectors whenever possible in professional research. I guess this will be our statement.
3. Create SAA guidelines on the ethical treatment of collectors/collaborators. We do not want archaeologists being viewed as using collectors. We need to teach best practices among our peers.
4. Create a web-page listing/calendar of opportunities for collectors to be involved in research
5. Create an affordable SAA adjunct membership category for collectors that does not require full embrace of the SAA ethical principles. I see this as a sort of halfway house approach, a welcoming step toward improving the ethics of collectors.
6. Create a statement of best practices we would like to see collectors voluntarily adopt. Liaise with collecting/detecting organizations, archaeological societies/clubs, and publications to explain these best practices. Encourage detector manufacturers and retailers to make collectors aware of these best practices.
7. Encourage SHPO, State Archaeologists, THPOs, and other compliance officers to require consultants to find and use collector data when available. Currently, the possible existence of collector data is generally ignored during the review (and scope of work and budgeting) process. Most reports are absolutely mute on collector data. This may require presentations at the national meetings of the appropriate national associations.

### Long Term:

1. Fund a study of the numbers, motivations, and behaviors of collectors in North America. Natasha Ferguson of the Scottish Treasure Trove program has just completed a similar study for hobbyist detectors in Scotland, and her study may serve as a model (I await a copy. I will share once I get it.).

2. Assure that there are training programs in every state/province for collectors who wish to collaborate with archaeologists. Create a database of trained collectors who have expressed an interest in working with professionals (make collaboration easier).
3. Assure that all states/provinces facilitate the recording of site locations by collectors.
4. At each SAA meeting, have at least one session devoted solely to products of collaboration with collectors. Ideally, this session would be digitally recorded and made available to our peers and the general public as examples of why we want to collaborate.
5. Create a webinar on the value and diverse means of collaboration with collectors. This would be targeted at SAA members and archaeology students. Ideally, this would be offered free.
6. Encourage university programs and field schools to include collaboration with collectors in their curricula. SAA should assist in the development of appropriate curricula.
7. Create an annual SAA award for the best collector/collaborative effort.
8. Encourage affiliated regional and state conferences to actively promote collaboration (many already do this, while others are a bit resistant).
9. Liaise with detector companies and retailers to begin bridging between the professional and avocational communities.

### **ANGELA NELLER**

I came up with more conference sessions and publications on positive working relationships. There are plenty of examples. I spent a weekend in June volunteering on a NGS funded project that was a resulted on avocational archaeologists contacting and working with professional archaeologists to protect important sites in the Roanoke River valley.

I think a SAA committee on the topic would be good to. Also continued oversight and voice by SAA on TV shows that glorify artifact collecting. Just some thoughts.

### **GIOVANNA PEBLES**

#### **The 5 most immediate and concrete things we recommend doing to shore-up collaborative relationships among past-loving demographics:**

(1) Create a small working group of professional archaeologists, engaged collectors (such as Jim and Richard and "leaders" in the collecting community such as Butch Holcombe, Editor of American Digger Magazine), and Native people to develop a detailed plan (that includes the what/who/when) for increasing education and outreach among archaeologists and collectors.

Examples of what the detailed plan could include:

Develop a shopping list of education and outreach opportunities for archaeologists and collectors to interact, for example:

- Talks and lectures in small towns, talk to schools, Lions Club, Rotary Club, libraries, agricultural fairs, articles in collecting websites and magazines
- Open field projects to volunteers and visitors
- Inform communities through social media that there's a dig scheduled in town; etc.
- Recruit collectors as volunteers on our projects

From the archaeologists' perspective, develop "best practices" for collectors

From the collectors' perspective, develop scenarios (best practices?) for archaeologists to improve two-way learning and respectful collaborations. (As Scott had suggested a few months ago, "develop best practices" (or strategies) for archaeologists to develop and maintain healthy working relationships with individual collectors... i.e. proper etiquette for archaeologists.)

(2) Create a small working group of Native people (like Bonnie Newsom), professional archaeologists, and engaged collectors (such as Jim and Richard and "leaders" in the collecting community such as Butch Holcombe, Editor of American Digger Magazine) to develop a short educational video informing collectors why collecting is spiritually harmful to most Native people and physically harmful to pre-Contact heritage sites. Post on YouTube and distribute widely through social media and all collector forums. **[ask SAA Board for funding and possibly work with The Archaeology Channel]**

(3) Request the SAA Board to (a) expedite revisions to the SAA [Principles of Archaeological Ethics](#) and (b) strengthen public and community outreach and engagement in ALL principles.

**Five longer-term goals--bigger initiatives that we recommend that SAA spearhead/support/nurture to "put the Society's money where its mouth is" in terms of improving collaboration**

(1) Using Survey Monkey through social media and the many networks with which our TF connected to, obtain data from collectors regarding who they are, their collections, and collecting practices. Examples of questions include (note, collectors in the above working group must help design the survey questionnaire):

- who collects
- why do they collect
- how long have they been collecting
- collecting areas
- collecting methods: surface collecting, digging, do they ask landowner permission or not
- do they record information or not
- if they record information, what do they record?
- if they do not record information, why not
- size of their collection (s)
- do they sell artifacts
- if yes, do they need the money to keep food on the table
- would they like to know more about archaeology
- would they like to collaborate with archaeologists given the opportunity
- what do they WANT to happen to their collections when they pass on
- have they made plans for their collections after passing on
- if a museum or non-profit organization was willing to take care of their collection once they had passed on, would they be willing to provide money to that organization to help care for their collection into the future? \$500? \$1,000? \$5,000? more?

(2) Using Survey Monkey through social media and the many networks with which our TF connected to, obtain data from professional archaeologists regarding their interaction with collectors or lack thereof.

(3) Develop a short educational video informing collectors why collecting is spiritually harmful to most Native people and physically harmful to pre-Contact heritage site. Post on YouTube and distribute widely through social media and all collector forums.

(4) Create several pilot projects with CRM firms to hire knowledgeable collectors at an hourly "going wage" to work as field crew on archaeology projects

(5) Encourage professors at the undergraduate and especially graduate level to include the "best collaborative practices for archaeologists" in their curricula both in the classroom and in the field.

## **BONNIE PITBLADO**

### 1. Immediate goals:

(A) Develop a "best practices" guide for collectors (perhaps advocate that SAA name another Task Force to do this)

(B) Assemble a list-serve of all e-mail addresses of people who submitted feedback to us; ask that group of 150 - 200 respondents to serve as an informal advisory group on collaborative initiatives

(C) Found an SAA "Interest Group" to carry on and expand the work of the Force

(D) Compile a database of archaeologists willing to serve as points-of-contact for collectors wanting to reach out, but nervous about doing so (this idea suggested by a collector)

(E) Create a campaign to encourage field archaeologists to reach out to members of the communities in which they work as a formal part of their research. Target members of all archaeological sectors, including but not limited to academics, government, and CRM professionals.

### 2. Long-term goals:

(A) Rebuild trust and relationships among archaeologists, avocationalists and collectors (with more emphasis on avocationalists than I'd have thought necessary until reading their comments to us). Doing this effectively will require strategic planning.

(B) Create an online, nationwide database for collectors to archive their collections and that can serve as "match-making" site for members of one constituency (e.g. collector) who want to work with another (e.g. professional)

(C) Develop and implement measures to debunk the misconception on the part of many members of the public that archaeologists can and will seize artifacts and sites on their own private land.

(D) Brainstorm strategies to encourage more archaeologists to devote more time to outreach and education. Some do tons, others do none. For example, work with NSF to change "broader impacts" specs to *require* O & E by everyone receiving NSF grants.

(E) Study collector communities in much more depth to understand much more about who collects and for what reasons; what sort of damage they do to sites by surface collecting; etc.

## **MIKE SHOTT**

A quick list of suggested action items:

1. Establish clear minimal (and also higher) standards for reasonable documentation of private artifact collections by collectors (i.e. collectors' responsibilities).
  - a. After devising, circulating and revising draft standards, distribute as widely as possible via SAA, CoAS, etc.
2. Advocate need to document private collections in course of research and preservation/CRM projects (i.e. professionals' responsibilities toward the accumulated database that private collections represent).
  - a. Establish clear minimal standards for reasonable documentation of private collections in course of research and preservation/ CRM projects.
3. This is vague: some initiative to deal with the curation crisis. Appealing for more resources is fine, but won't by itself produce results. So, in view of existing limitations, we must consider what needs to be done, why and how. I'd argue for comprehensive 2D and selective 3D digital documentation of artifacts, and archival-quality copying of collections catalogues, logs, notebooks, etc., or of production of same in course of collections documentation. Obviously, #3 relates to #2. Who does this? Where and how are data archived? Good questions. Who? Who knows? Where? SHPOs, presumably. How? TBD from discussion.
4. At least one, preferably several, pilot projects in collections documentation, to address both #2-3 above. SAA should sponsor or support in them, but can't be expected to fund them. One thing we need to do is think seriously about external support. On project-specific bases, there's always the NSF's of the world. But for systematic, region-wide (eventually, statewide, but let's crawl before we walk, unsteadily) collections documentation fairly large-scale outside support is needed. Mellon bankrolled tDAR to the tune of \$1million+. Nothing wrong with tDAR (although it seems to function more as an on-line library card catalog than actually a form of direct access to documents, which are held behind a fee-for-service wall, this despite Mellon's support), but existing and undocumented collections deserve documentation at least as much.
  - a. As part of such documentation efforts, we should design and offer workshops that reach out to collectors and explain how and why their collections form a small but integral part of a larger documentary record of past human activity.
  - b. Because any documentation project will engage collectors at a range of ages and stages in their lives and careers, some collectors will continue their activity long after a single project. Somehow—haven't thought about this—we need to devise some way to maintain contact with collectors and to update documentation of their collections as they update the collections themselves.

## **SUZIE THOMAS**

(1) The 5 most immediate and concrete things we recommend doing to shore-up collaborative relationships among past-loving demographics;



A. Develop a digital presence within SAA and especially for TF, to demonstrate and communicate the group's purpose and the SAA's stance towards artefact collector and avocationalists. This should include the "essentials" that avocationalists need to know, including their legal obligations and how they can find the main points of contact in their respective locales. Ideally I see this as something that comes top of the list in Google when responsible and responsive individuals are trying to find more information to help them 'do the right thing'. It might also include a social media presence (although this will take regular updating!). It might also have a repository for existing literature and other resources.

B. Promote and publicise the TF statement as widely as possible when it is ready to launch

C. Create a standing committee or similar off the back of TF to ensure that there is always at least one session at SAA meeting and other relevant conferences within archaeological sector to keep discussion of these issues going.

D. Create an online discussion forum or similar within SAA for archaeologists to discuss, in a "safe place" their personal experiences, positive and negative, concerning encounters with avocationalists and collectors – allowing them a place to air their views and gain advice and support from colleagues. Maybe password protected in order that they can air their views without fear of repercussions

E. Create a tangible connection with the researchers in Europe currently exploring similar issues!

(2) Five longer-term goals--bigger initiatives that we recommend that SAA spearhead/support/nurture to "put the Society's money where its mouth is" in terms of improving collaboration

A. Deeper research into understanding avocational artefact hunting and collecting in the US:

1. Understanding the motivations and world-views of collectors and artefact hunters – including collating known data and generating new data through survey and other methods

2. Ascertaining the current scale of the activity (activities)

B. Collating examples of best practice in collaboration/engagement at US-wide level – I'd imagine as with A this might take the form of a research project/team or one or more doctoral theses.

C. Identifying the current barriers to engagement, based on A and B but also on data from archaeologists (e.g. surveys as some have already discussed in TF) to understand the issues concerning attitudes within the archaeological sector as well as other sectors.

D. Devise literature and other resources (e.g. online learning - MOOCs?) to raise awareness and generate discussion at undergraduate and postgraduate level among archaeology and anthropology students – i.e. help our trainers equip the next generations to address and consider issues around

collaborating with artefact collectors and others without prejudice. Might also include suggested ppt slides for us and others to use.

E. Devise outreach material and other resources intended for the avocational communities in order to promote best practice among them, and encourage them to reach out to archaeologists and other heritage professionals.