

Society for American Archaeology



September/October 1995 13(4)

**".....computer graphics techniques make it possible to
incorporate the display of**

Click [here](#) to go to article

**artifact distributions in the structural and environmental
context of site architecture..."**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

[2. Editor's Corner](#)

[3. Letters to the Editor](#)

[4. Report from the Executive Board](#)

[5. Census Update](#)

[6. 1995 SAA Award Recipients](#)

[7. Point-Counterpoint -- Historic Preservation](#)

[8. Committee on Native American Relations](#)

Special Section: ArchaeoPolitics

[9. Preserving and Strengthening our National Archaeological Program](#)

[10. The First Session of the 104th Congress](#)

[11. Forecasting Archaeology's Political Future](#)

[12. Changing Times for Government Affairs](#)

[13. Briefings](#)

[14. Point-Counterpoint -- Site File Databases and GIS Systems](#)

[15. Creating Cultural Resource Data Layers: The Nebraska GIS Project, Part I](#)

[16. Creative Solutions for Restructuring American Archaeology: A Summary](#)

[17. Student Affairs Committee](#)

[18. A Virtual Computer Imaging Technique for Archaeological Research](#)

[19. Exchanges -- Archaeology in Ecuador](#)

[20. COSWA Corner](#)

[21. Insights -- The Case for CRM Training in Academic Institutions](#)

[22. 60th Annual Business Meeting](#)

[23. News and Notes](#)

[24. Positions Open and Wanted](#)

[25. Calendar](#)

The *SAA Bulletin* (ISSN 0741-5672) is published five times a year (January, March, June, September, and November) and is edited by [Kevin Pape](#) (Gray and Pape, Inc.) is Associate Editor of *Insights* (513)287-7700, and [John Kantner](#) and [Doug Kennett](#) are responsible for the electronic versions of the *Bulletin*. Please send all articles, announcements, letters to the editor, or other information for inclusion to *SAA Bulletin*, Department of Anthropology, University of California-Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, CA 93106-3210. For further information, please call (805)893-8604 or (805)893-8152, fax(805)893-8707, or email saanews@alishaw.ucsb.edu. Contributors are strongly encouraged to submit manuscripts of one page or more via email or by disk using any word processing software. The *SAA Bulletin* is provided free to members and institutional subscribers to *American Antiquity* and *Latin American Antiquity* worldwide. Items published reflect the views of the authors and the publication does not imply SAA endorsement.

Editor's Corner

I write these words to you while still in Peru, actually doing some archaeology rather than just talking about it. It feels very strange to be writing this as I am. I feel very far away from the hectic activity taking place in Washington, as Congress continues to debate the fate of historic preservation in the United States. Far away doesn't mean truly isolated, though; my staff and I, along with SAA leadership, have put together a number of interesting pieces to provide you with an update of what's been going on, and some assessment of prospects for the future.

You'll also notice that we've expanded the *Bulletin* substantially, at least for this issue, to include the report of the Annual Business Meeting (usually published in *American Antiquity* at a date far removed from the meeting itself), a review of the awards delivered at the meeting, various committee reports, the usual run of columns, and an advertising centerfold to assist you in your Christmas (or anytime) shopping.

Finally, I'd like to thank John Kantner and Valerie Olson, both graduate students in anthropology at UCSB, for their outstanding work on the *Bulletin* during my absence. Thanks guys!

Letters to the Editor

- [Letter from Steven R. Simms](#) on issues of being "politically correct"
 - [Letter from Lawrence E. Moore](#) on historical archaeology
-

Most archaeologists hold deep interest and respect for the Native American legacy. Most also hold that knowledge about the past gained through the process of scientific inquiry is a public good that helps to bind all humanity. I suspect that no amount of self-awareness of a respect for Indian heritage or as advocates for better Indian economic, educational, and health opportunities can balance the charges of ethnocentrism and bigotry assigned when we deviate from the "decisions" of "the Native American community." Despite lip service to learning about the past and reliance on the rules of evidence as dictated by a scientific canon, many archaeologists and the SAA have chosen to err on the side of political correctness.

At what point, however, does the discussion about cultural patrimony collide with the tribalism and division characteristic of multiculturalism? The exclusive status assigned cultural difference by multiculturalism assures a more ethnocentric world without equal dialogue about cultural similarities and an epistemology that transcends local ideology. Perhaps because archaeologists typically see themselves as committed to Native American legacies and issues, we are too uncritical. We thus risk joining the populist American tradition of anti-intellectualism. In the name of cultural relativism, and political (and career?) expedience, archaeologists increasingly acquiesce to virtually any position in the name of "support" for Native Americans.

While we can all cite instances of cooperation between archaeologists and Native Americans, a change for the better, there are some other sides as well. Just a few examples:

The Berkeley textbook committees trying to bar books in public schools that assert the peopling of the western hemisphere via the Bering land bridge in the last Ice Age because no Native American folktales speak of such a past. We thus endorse division of Native Americans from the world's peoples and acquiesce to disseminating a particular faith in the public schools. What is the difference from scientific creationism other than we can feel we are supporting Indian religion rather than the Christian right?

The recent draft rules of the Department of Interior NAGPRA Review Committee (distributed at the April 1995 SAA meetings), which, among many questionable points, states "there may be potential value in such (scientific) analyses, such values do not...confer a right of control...that supersedes the spiritual and cultural concerns of Native American people." Consider this in light of a preceding statement, "there are remains...for which it is not possible to identify specific cultural connections to any particular tribe. However such remains and objects, no matter how ancient, are nevertheless Native American." Ironically, these interpretations of NAGPRA (and the bill itself) smacks of division and ethnocentrism. We need only extend the term "ancient" a few thousand more years to include people of both hemispheres as ancestral. Once again, we endorse division and the separation of Native Americans from the world's peoples.

How far shall we go? A recent article in the *SAA Bulletin* [13(1):4] may give a hint. Speaking of what Native American archaeologists can do, SAA members are told, "We can determine what is appropriate to publish, and what is not. We can determine how and what is to be exhibited in museums. We can determine what gets studied,

photographed, recorded, and what should be left alone. We can determine what gets excavated, if at all, and how it should be done."

Perhaps I am just a fool when I mistake such discourse as analogous to the Christian right forcing their religious values down my throat via the legislative, judicial, and educational systems. The above passage could easily come from the mouth of Jimmy Swaggart or Pat Robertson. It is no less ideological or anti-intellectual than the scientific creationism that archaeologists (including the SAA) vociferously opposed in the 1980s. Where are we now? Like I say, we are torn by genuine ideals, but I wonder when we will stand up and argue for a pursuit of humanitarian ideals and a search for good that transcends such nativistic and short-sighted ideology.

I for one look forward to the day that some of the ever-escalating demands come to court--such as those stated in the passage above, or the calls for censorship rights over original notes, photos, and publication. I guess we are going to have to wait for that before comparing some of the claims made under the principle of cultural patrimony to those contained in, for instance, the First Amendment. At least then archaeologists and the SAA will be forced to pick some priorities, cast their gaze a bit more globally, and live up to our own press as the science that takes the long view of things.

Steven R. Simms
Associate Professor
Utah State University

[To Top of Page](#)

During the last several months, the defining concept of historical archaeology has been discussed within this newsletter. Leone and Potter [*SAA Bulletin* 12(4):14-15] began by describing a symposium devoted to the archaeology of capitalism; to them historical archaeology is the archaeology of capitalism. I [*SAA Bulletin* 13(1):3] argued that the Modern Period concept was broader in scope and offered a few comments regarding Marxist archaeology. Marshal Becker and Mark Hackbarth each replied to my paper and offered comments on the discussion in general. My responses to them are given below.

Becker [[SAA Bulletin 13\(2\):6](#)] made two statements that need to be answered. First he claimed that this discussion is nothing more than people expressing their "own very personal viewpoints." This is inaccurate. Leone and Potter are not alone in their views about historical archaeology. Other prominent scholars who have discussed the archaeology of capitalism include Charles Orser, Robert Paynter, Russell Handsman, Paul Shackel, and Barbara Little. Although little known, the Modern Period concept is also supported by some well known researchers. Robert Schuyler first described the basic tenets of it in his paper "A Complete Curriculum: Historical Archaeology on the Undergraduate Level" in *Archaeology and Education: The Classroom and Beyond* (K. C. Smith and F. P. McManamon, eds., 1991). In addition, the most recent textbook for the field adopts this perspective (C. E. Orser and B. M. Fagan, *Historical Archaeology*, 1995). Basically, the next generation of historical archaeology students will be learning about the Modern Period. So, the opinions delivered here are very much professional ones and are in line with current trends within the discipline.

The second issue that Becker addressed is his view that historical archaeology is nothing "without some relationship to the historical record." This idea has been popular and has even led some to feel that historical archaeology is unique due to its two data sets. This view is rather shallow. All archaeological research is interdisciplinary--everyone has to deal with the methodological problem of integrating archaeological information with other types of independent lines of data, whether these data be from pollen, phytoliths, geology, or the historical record. Defining the discipline based on the ability of its practitioners to integrate two data sets does not leave much room for growth and expansion. The discipline already is close to resolving this methodological problem. There has been a flurry of publications discussing text-aided archaeology, documentary archaeology, and the "written and the wrought." Leone's revision of Middle Range Theory and how it is applied to historical archaeology is at the cutting edge of this scholarship and will allow researchers to master the problem within the next decade. But where to next? Defining historical archaeology via a methodological issue cannot carry it deep into the 21st century. A definition based on chronology and the

substantive theme of modernization will do this and take the discipline to all corners of the world, into new methodological problems, and will generate a healthy respect from the public, who pay the bills. Becker is looking backward. The Modern Period will take historical archaeology forward.

The comments by Mark Hackbarth [[SAA Bulletin 13\(2\):6-7](#)] were very different. Basically, he seems to confuse academic freedom with social acceptance, credibility. First, he believes that I criticized the Marxist perspective for being a "defunct, failed strategy." These are his words, not mine. I advised the Marxists to reconsider their positions because they have no credibility. The fall of the communist nations means that the Marxist perspective has no support base from which to draw power and authority. Many social scientists, Marxist inspired or not, have argued that ideology supports and rationalizes social structures. I agree. What social structure does the Marxist's ideology support? Hackbarth refers to China and Cuba as being strong communist countries. Apparently he has not been paying attention to world events. Both these countries (and Vietnam and North Korea) are viewed as emerging markets by venture capitalists. China is undergoing important economic reforms at this time because it will acquire Hong Kong at the end of the century. This is going to place China in the capitalist world. China hosted a major technology trade fair in April wherein hundreds of Western companies shopped their products. Additionally, the Shanghai Stock Exchange has been thriving for several years, indicating that a partially free market already exists there. On a similar note, Cuba recently signed trade agreements with the United States; there are mutual funds available to those who wish to invest in Cuba. All the communist nations are restructuring their economies, bringing in Western capital. They have to, to survive.

Hackbarth also claimed that Marxism is still an acceptable academic perspective--and he is right. The "politically correct" movement has not completely done away with the idea of academic freedom. Marxists can publish what they please. Their analyses may be accurate but without credibility they are marginal and ineffective. In academia, Marxists perform before a small audience, themselves. Hackbarth should be encouraged--the Modern Period is wide open for analyses from the Marxist perspective. Charles Orser must have recognized this as he wrote the text mentioned above. However, the problem lies beyond academia. To become truly effective and achieve their social reform goals, Marxist archaeologists must develop a constituency within the American public through Public Archaeology. This means that they are willing to play poker with the credibility of the discipline. All it will take is a few interpretations that are sour on American life for the credibility of the whole discipline to be questioned. And the Enola Gay effect will be revisited upon the heads of American archaeologists. To ignore this lesson is foolish. While performing the normal duties of their jobs, Public archaeologists do not have academic freedom. They cannot chastise the institution or society that feeds them.

The third point made by Hackbarth is that he feels that the participants in this discussion are in "error" by assuming that they can "provide a unifying concept for all 500 years" of their focus. He supported this concern by arguing that people would inappropriately try to impose general theories of cultural homogeneity on the world. It seems that he missed the point of the discussion. Defining a discipline means identifying a common denominator that all the diverse practitioners can hover around. Likewise, no one said anything about the world becoming one big homogeneous place. It is true that many theories are linked to ideas of cultural homogeneity, but there is plenty of room to create theories of cultural diversity. Leone and Potter are well aware that capitalism is manifested in diverse ways around the world. Unfortunately, their perspective does not focus on enough diversity as it ignores other types of political-economic systems active within the modern world, and, due to its Marxist association, it introduces a social factor that has to be carefully monitored as archaeologists go about their business of interpreting the past to the general public. The Modern Period concept avoids both these issues; it offers a broad scope that subsumes the archaeology of capitalism and it sustains the professional character and credibility of the discipline.

The future of Modern Period archaeology is good. This is an adaptation that historical archaeology can take knowing full well that it is interesting and useful to society. At the same time, the temptation to shoulder the burdens of the world can be resisted.

Lawrence E. Moore
Heritage Resources Office
Fairfax County, Virginia

Report from the Executive Board

Keith W. Kintigh

The SAA Executive Board meets twice a year, at the annual meeting and during the fall. Although the draft minutes of the May 1995 board meeting run to 20 pages, this article reports only on the major issues considered and actions taken. Additional reports will follow subsequent board meetings.

Strategic Planning. The board spent a day following up on the strategic planning meeting held in the fall of 1994. One result was the development of a draft statement of goals for SAA that will be published in the *SAA Bulletin* for discussion and comment by the full membership.

Ethics, Certification, SOPA, and SAA. The board accepted the report of the Joint SAA/SOPA Task Force [[SAA Bulletin, 13\(3\):6-9, 14-15](#)]. Following considerable discussion and a meeting with the SHA and SOPA boards, the SAA board asked the task force to prepare, for Executive Board approval, a specific proposal that could be brought to a vote of the full SAA membership. Generally, it is proposed that SAA participate in the creation of a Register of Professional Archaeologists (ROPA) in collaboration with the Society of Professional Archeologists (SOPA), the Society for Historical Archaeology (SHA), and the Archaeological Institute of America (AIA).

Under this proposal, SOPA would cease to exist and many of its key functions would be taken over by ROPA. The goal of this effort is to expand professional commitments to basic ethical principles and standards of professional performance. Archaeologists voluntarily joining the Register would declare themselves accountable to a code similar to that maintained by SOPA. The Register would be governed by a board of directors and would be legally independent of SAA and the other sponsoring societies. It would be supported financially by the registered professional archaeologists and by the sponsoring societies.

The task force was asked to prepare informational materials concerning the proposal that would be distributed prior to votes on the proposal by the memberships of SOPA and the sponsoring societies. Currently, SOPA is expected to vote in May 1996; if approved, the proposal will be voted on by SAA, SHA, and AIA members in June.

Government Affairs. The board heard reports both from the Government Affairs Committee and from Donald Craib, SAA's manager of government affairs and counsel. The board expressed considerable concern over impending revisions to Section 106 or its regulations, the effects on archaeology of agency downsizing and reorganization, and potential actions of Congress that would affect the conduct of cultural resource management.

Augmenting SAA's substantial government affairs budget, the board authorized the expenditure of SAA reserve funds for efforts needed to protect the vital interests of archaeology from anticipated attacks. It was agreed that the government affairs efforts would be coordinated and executed by the Government Affairs Committee and Donald Craib, assisted as needed by members of the board. The board approved the recommendation presented by Judy Bense, the new chair of the Government Affairs Committee, that the committee would be reorganized around issue teams with strategies to deal with both short and long term issues.

In addition, the board established three new task forces. An informal task force was formed to work with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation on the revisions to Section 106. The Task Force on Archaeology and Ecosystem Management will be asked to draft policy statements and action items regarding the profession's concerns with ongoing ecosystem management initiatives. The Task Force on Federal and State Agency Archaeology will be asked to identify the concerns of agency archaeologists and to suggest workshops and other agency activities that could be associated with the SAA annual meeting. At the request of BLM, a representative

(Shereen Lerner) was appointed to attend a Wyoming meeting concerned with restructuring the 106 process. This was felt to be especially important in that an anticipated programmatic memorandum of agreement resulting from this meeting may be seen in Washington as a test case.

Public Education. Following a recommendation of the Public Education Committee, the board asked the Committee to develop a proposal for a national survey concerning public attitudes toward archaeology and historic preservation and identify possible sources of funding. While the board considers the recommended hiring of a permanent public education coordinator a high priority, there do not now appear to be sufficient funds to commit to this position. However, this question will be reconsidered at the November board meeting when more information on the accuracy of the 1996 revenue and expense projections will be available.

Publications. It was announced that Lynne Goldstein will be the new editor of *American Antiquity* and that Gary Feinman and Linda Manzanilla will be the new editors of *Latin American Antiquity*. The board approved new procedures recommended by the Publications Committee for the appointment of editors of the society's three major publications: (1) publish calls for proposals from prospective editors; (2) the committee will compile a list of those making proposals and, if necessary, solicit additional names; (3) the committee will rank order the list of possible editors; and (4) the Executive Board will make a final decision.

The board considered three options for the disposition of Current Research: a return to *American Antiquity*, moving it to the *Bulletin*, or the provision of an electronic version on an SAA server expected to be on-line in January (possibly with a hard copy version available separately at reasonable cost). Despite the fact that the board had intended to make a final decision, it was generally agreed that more input from the membership is needed.

Native American Relations. The board approved the recommendation of the Task Force on Native American Relations that the task force be transformed into a continuing advisory committee.

Latin America. The board approved the Task Force on Latin America's recommendation that it be transformed into a continuing advisory committee, the "Committee on the Americas." Several other task force recommendations intended to expand participation by Latin Americans in SAA were referred to appropriate committees or approved. The board approved SAA's cosponsorship, with INAH, of a conference, "Protecting the Archaeological Heritage of the Americas," for the fall of 1997.

NPS. Kate Stevenson, Associate Director for Cultural and Partnership Programs for the National Park Service, met with the board. She solicited SAA's advice on the issue of assessing significance under Section 106 in the context of the need to keep the costs of historic preservation associated with federal actions at reasonable levels while maintaining high professional standards. President Lipe encouraged the NPS to consult on this key issue outside the Park Service and indicated that there would be real benefits by involving SAA and the research community generally in these consultations. Stevenson listened to our concerns about archaeology within the Department of the Interior and indicated her and Director Kennedy's support for and interest in archaeology.

History of Archaeology. The board approved a recommendation from the History of Archaeology Committee for the establishment of the "Gordon R. Willey-Society for American Archaeology Symposium in the History of Archaeology," to be held at the annual meeting on a two-year cycle.

Budget and Administration. Fred Limp, SAA treasurer, reported that the society remains financially solvent and fiscally conservative. With minor changes, the board approved the fiscal 1996 budget recommended by the Budget and Planning Committee. This projects revenues and expense of about \$1.0 million with a surplus of \$22,000. The board unanimously approved a very positive review of Ralph Johnson's performance as executive director.

As this summary indicates, the Executive Board relies heavily on the society's committees. The board is most grateful to committee members and chairs and to those members who have provided input to the board. We encourage you to participate in the committees (a Committee Interest Form is in the last issue of the *Bulletin*) and to communicate your ideas to the board. A list of board members with their addresses is printed on the

inside front cover of *American Antiquity* and the inside back cover of *Latin American Antiquity*. A list of SAA committees and their members appears in *Archaeologists of the Americas*.

Keith W. Kintigh is secretary of the SAA Executive Board, and is with the Department of Anthropology at Arizona State University.

LAST PAGE TABLE OF CONTENTS NEXT PAGE

Census Update

Melinda A. Zeder

If you thought filling out the 1994 SAA Census was daunting, try processing the more than 1,600 responses we received! Despite the epic nature of the task, we are bravely moving on and have noted revealing and unexpected trends emerging from the mountains of data you provided.

Census data entry was completed some time ago, and serious number crunching is well underway. Last winter we produced an eight-page document describing, in great detail, the various ways we planned to query the census data. We circulated this document quite widely and have incorporated helpful comments and suggestions from COSWA among other interested groups. We are now systematically proceeding through this query protocol and should have completed analyses relating to membership, demographics, and training and employment by early fall. This protocol calls for:

- Computing mean and median salaries by sex, sex and age, work setting, work setting and sex, region and membership status.
- Computing the number of years it takes respondents to reach various salary levels and employment positions.
- Examining the rates of promotion and job advancement.
- Tracing regional, gender-, and age-based patterns in employment setting, work activities, and job satisfaction.
- Tracking work place trends over a five-year period.

We are also examining numbers of dependents and marital status of respondents by age, gender, and region. Research interests and productivity of the broad and diverse pool of respondents are being assessed. We are cross-referencing funding history by at least four different variables. This is a huge amount of extremely interesting, complex and valuable information. We know the results will make the wait well worthwhile.

As yet, we are uncertain how to best proceed with the publication of the results. We want to get these data out to you quickly. At the same time, we want to make sure our results are as complete and as fully informed as possible. We are currently debating the merits of serializing the results by publishing summaries of various sections of the census as they become available. Alternately, we are considering waiting until the entire data query protocol is completed to publish a final and definitive summary. Whatever we decide, copies of the completed report, with all the supporting data tables, will be available to members.

Meanwhile, please rest assured that we are actively plowing through this remarkable data, and that the result of our efforts promises to provide a richly detailed profile of American archaeology. Once again, we thank you for your response to our census effort, and urge you to watch this space for future updates.

Melinda A. Zeder is with the Smithsonian Institution.

1995 SAA Award Recipients

The following awards were presented on May 5, 1995, at the society's annual business meeting, Minneapolis Hilton and Towers, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

List of Awards

- [Presidential Recognition Awards](#)
 - [Award for Excellence in Ceramic Studies](#)
 - [Crabtree Award](#)
 - [Award for Excellence in Cultural Resource Management](#)
 - [Dissertation Award](#)
 - [Fryxell Award](#)
 - [Award for Excellence in Lithic Studies](#)
 - [Outstanding Student Poster Award](#)
 - [Outstanding Professional/Non-Student Poster Award](#)
 - [Gene S. Stuart Award](#)
 - [Public Service Award](#)
 - [Distinguished Service Award](#)
-

Presidential Recognition Awards

Diane Gifford-Gonzalez

For her exceptional contributions to the SAA as a member of the Executive Board 1993-1995

Roger Anyon

For his exceptional contributions to the SAA as a member of the Executive Board 1993-1995

Bruce E. Rippeteau

For his exceptional service to the SAA as Secretary 1992-1995

Mark J. Lynott

For his outstanding contributions as co-chair of the SAA Ethics in Archaeology Task Force

Lynne Goldstein

For her exceptional contributions as co-chair of the SAA Task Force on Repatriation

Keith Kintigh

For his exceptional contributions as co-chair of the SAA Task Force on Repatriation

Robert Drennan

For his exceptional contributions as chair of the SAA Task Force on Latin America

Melinda A. Zeder

For her outstanding service as chair of the SAA Membership Committee and her exceptional initiative and vision in the development and implementation of the SAA Census

Paul Minnis

For his outstanding service to the SAA as program chair for the 1995 Annual Meeting

Mark Aldenderfer

For his impressive efforts in transforming the SAA Bulletin into a lively and provocative forum for debate and communication

Phyllis Messenger (on left), K C Smith (on right), and Cathy MacDonald (not shown)

For their initiative and vision in the development of the SAA newsletter *Archaeology and Public Education*

[To Top of Page](#)

Award for Excellence in Ceramic Studies

Prudence Rice

In recognition of her significant contribution to virtually all areas of ceramic research, especially her insightful research of specialized pottery production, and the leadership role she plays among ceramic researchers

Beginning in the mid-1970s, Prudence Rice's publications reflect her persistent focus on important issues of pottery change, provenance, specialized production, technology, and style. Her methodological and theoretical contributions--based primarily in Mesoamerica--have widely influenced ceramic studies, and her book, *Pottery Analysis*, is a crucial sourcebook and constant companion to archaeologists interested in pottery. Rice's edited and often reprinted volume, *Pots and Potters*, was designed as an outgrowth of the innovative book, *Ceramics and Man*, by Frederick Matson, also a recipient of this award.

Frederick Matson

In recognition of a distinguished career in which he pioneered new approaches to understanding the past through the analysis of ceramic ecology

Throughout a long and distinguished career, Frederick Matson has played a key role in expanding the scope of the study of ceramics by demonstrating how much can be learned by placing ceramics within an ecological context and by examining the influence of culture and environment on ceramic variation. His pioneering work, *Ceramics and Man*, laid the foundation for a new era of research. His own studies of pottery from a wide geographical area--Michigan to Syria--have provided excellent models for others.

[To Top of Page](#)

Crabtree Award

Jeff Carskadden

For his ground-breaking work in preserving and understanding the archaeology of the Central Muskingum River Valley of Southeastern Ohio

For nearly 30 years, Jeff Carskadden has devoted his considerable energies toward preserving and understanding the history and prehistory of the Muskingum Valley in southeastern Ohio. Along with his co-investigator, James Morton, he founded the Muskingum Valley Archaeological Survey in 1977 in order to conduct archaeological surveys and excavations in the Muskingum County area. He regularly publishes and is the sole or principal author of 83 articles that have appeared in journals such as the *Ohio Archaeologist*, the *West Virginia Archaeologist*, and *Historical Archaeology*. His excavations have produced some of the best data on late prehistoric village plan and organization anywhere in the Central Ohio Valley, and he has consistently shared his research. Recognizing the need to preserve the important records and collections amassed by nearly three decades of work, Carskadden has made arrangements to donate these to the Ohio Historical Society. His dedication to thorough and careful archaeological research is exemplary.

[To Top of Page](#)

Award for Excellence in Cultural Resource Management

Charles R. McGimsey III

For lifetime achievement in the management of cultural resources

Rightfully called the father of the CRM movement in archaeology, Charles McGimsey fought the early battles to establish CRM programs at the federal and state levels. With Carl Chapman and Hester Davis he wrote *Stewards of the Past*, which helped establish the concept of cultural resource management and changed the face of archaeology in the United States. He also wrote the seminal book on archaeological resource management, *Public Archaeology*. He is a founder of the Arkansas Archeological Survey, a state program that continues to serve as a model for others. He has been a leader in working with state and federal legislators in drafting legislation to preserve archaeological resources. His untiring efforts for archaeological resource management have had a profound impact on the practice of archaeology in the United States.

Calvin R. Cummings

For program administration and management in cultural resource management

Calvin Cummings has had a long and distinguished career in preserving and managing the cultural resources of this nation as a National Park Service archaeologist. In the southwest he played a pivotal role in establishing the Southwest Cultural Resources Center, a multidisciplinary management unit that links history, architectural preservation, and collections management with archaeology. He has also served an important role in the development of underwater archaeology in the United States, beginning with the Inundation Study, which sought to identify the impact of reservoir impoundment on archaeological sites. His foresight helped to pass the Abandoned Shipwreck Act and encouraged public debate on issues related to treasure hunting and archaeological ethics.

Lawrence E. Aten

For program administration and management in cultural resource management

Lawrence Aten's outstanding service to the National Park Service and the nation represents a significant contribution to the growth of cultural resource management during the last 25 years. Retiring in 1994, Aten is probably best known for his ten years as supervisor of the National Register of Historic Places program. He continually sought to make the registration process more accessible to both professional and general audiences, while maintaining the register's professional credibility, including instituting the National Register Information System. He also supervised creation of NPS's Cultural Resources Geographic Information Systems Facility, which has grown into a preeminent center for applying GIS technologies and methodologies to cultural resource

management. Throughout his career, he aggressively pursued the highest standards of integrity, professionalism, and credibility in government.

Shereen Lerner

For development of Arizona's Archaeology Week

Under Shereen Lerner's leadership as staff archaeologist in the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office, the small handful of Archaeology Week events soon exploded to nearly 100 events hosted throughout the state within a short period of time. She continued to direct the program during her tenure as the Arizona SHPO from 1987 to 1990, until its success exceeded a single week of activities and Arizona's Archaeology Week became Arizona Archaeology Month.

[To Top of Page](#)

Dissertation Award

David R. Abbott

For his dissertation *Hohokam Social Structure and Irrigation Management, The Ceramic Evidence from the Central Phoenix Basin*. This dissertation concerns issues of broad relevance to archaeology and anthropology, while informing the regional understanding of prehistory in an important way. The research rests on a solid database, and is methodologically both innovative and sound. It articulates social theory, archaeological principles, field observation and interpretations in a manner that is integrated and responsible.

[To Top of Page](#)

Fryxell Award

Robert J. Braidwood

For his pioneering work in the initial development of the interdisciplinary approach to the study of agricultural origins

In the late 1940s, Robert J. Braidwood and his wife, Linda S. Braidwood, set out to recover and interpret empirical evidence for the most important transition in human history--the shift from a hunting and gathering way of life to one that depended on agriculture. In order to study this transition, research at Jarmo and other sites within the hilly flanks of the Fertile Crescent drew together scientists of many different disciplines, including zoologists, geologists and botanists. This landmark program, which continued into the 1950s, not only established the origins of agriculture as a broad and important new field of archaeological inquiry, but also provided an impressive example of how interdisciplinary research could be structured and implemented. Braidwood's contributions continue to provide the framework for interdisciplinary research.

[To Top of Page](#)

Award for Excellence in Lithic Studies

Harry J. Shafer

For his sustained contributions to the understanding of lithic tool production systems in formative and complex societies in North America

Among the first to introduce detailed debitage studies and the definition of lithic reduction models in Texas archaeology, Harry Shafer pioneered many of the essential links between scientific method and theory in lithic

analysis. He also initiated early research on the identification of organic residues on stone tools, including a seminal study of Hinds Cave. For nearly 20 years he has been involved in lithic studies in the Maya area, notably at Colha and Pulltrouser Swamp in Belize, where, according to one associate, his work "has singularly transformed our ideas regarding systems of production and distribution in the Maya lowlands."

Lawrence H. Keeley

For his seminal contributions in lithic use-ware studies and his pioneering applications in high-power microscopy

Lawrence Keeley's work with surface polishes under high magnification, which allows discrimination among the kinds of polish on the basis of worked material, is well recognized. With Mark Newcomer, he used experimental blind tests to evaluate the accuracy of his technique, thus setting a standard for all use-wear analysis. During research on the lithics from the Mesolithic site of Meer II in Belgium, he adopted a number of approaches to microwear analysis that have been adopted by other lithic analysts.

[To Top of Page](#)

Outstanding Student Poster Award

Tim Hunt, Mark Madsen, and Carl Lipo

For their exceptional work in the poster "Examining Cultural Transmission Using Frequency Seriation"

Outstanding Professional/Non-Student Poster Award

Brenda J. Baker and Maria A. Liston

For their exceptional work in the poster "War is Hell: Eighteenth-Century Military Remains at Fort William Henry"

Gene S. Stuart Award

Nathan Seppa

For his well-written, well-researched article "Archaeology Faces Modern Foe" which informs the public of the ongoing, intentional destruction of archaeological resources and encourages efforts to condemn and prevent such damage

Public Service Award

Grand Canyon Trust

For its outstanding efforts to both increase public recognition of the importance of archaeological resources, and to influence public policy in order to better protect our archaeological heritage

[To Top of Page](#)

Distinguished Service Award

Stuart Struever

For serving the discipline of archaeology as an institution-builder in public archaeology, and in doing so, mobilizing public support for archaeological research and for developing archaeological centers, supported by thousands of private donations that combine high-quality research with public education and involvement.

In 1964, at a time when there was little formal public support for archaeological research, Stuart Struever, working with many others, became the founder and director of the Center for American Archaeology in Kampsville, Illinois. The center developed an archaeological research program supported by donation of time and money from thousands of private individuals. It provided the public, including laypeople and students, with an archaeological experience that explained how archaeologists interpret the past, all within a research context. To say that the center provided a new vision of how archaeology could be done is an understatement. The partnership, between archaeological professionals and the general public, is now mirrored in many organizations around the country. Further, the interdisciplinary cooperation espoused by the center, ranging from archaeology and bioanthropology to botany and zoology, provided an innovative model for archaeological research.

In the 1980s Struever carried the Kampsville model to a second remarkable institution, the Crow Canyon Archaeological Center in Cortez, Colorado, where he was president until his retirement in 1992. Crow Canyon embodies two of Struever's visionary goals: large-scale, sustained archaeological research and public education and involvement in archaeology. Crow Canyon's success in both of these areas was recognized with a presidential Historic Preservation Award in 1992, the highest honor for privately funded preservation achievements and the first such award to an archaeological program.

In addition to the many papers he has published on the topic of the public's role in archaeology, Struever wrote, with Felicia Antonelli Holton, a successful popular book, *Koster: Americans in Search of Their Prehistoric Past*, selected by the Book-of-the-Month Club. He served as president of Society for American Archaeology from 1975 to 1976, bringing his enthusiasm for public archaeology to professionals across the country.

LAST PAGE TABLE OF CONTENTS NEXT PAGE

Historic Preservation and Native American Sites

[Point](#) [Counterpoint](#)

POINT

Kurt Dongoske, Michael Yeatts, T.J. Ferguson, and Leigh Jenkins

In response to [Lynne Sebastian's letter in the SAA Bulletin \[13\(3\):3\]](#), we would like to address a few of the issues raised and point out additional issues that need to be considered in the greater context of historic preservation. We feel that these issues are particularly relevant at this time as the regulations implementing Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act are currently being redrafted.

Specifically, we are concerned about the double standard in evaluating historic properties of indigenous cultures as opposed to the dominant Anglo-American culture that is reflected in Sebastian's letter. Of equal concern is the suggested application of the regulatory burden of the Section 106 process as a determining factor in evaluating the historic significance of a property and the participation of a Native American tribe in that process.

To clarify an apparent misunderstanding, the Hopi Tribe considers ancestral archaeological sites as historic properties because of their significant role in Hopi history, culture, and religion, not just so that the Hopi Tribe can be consulted concerning mitigation of project impacts. While the Hopi Tribe does feel that it is important that they be consulted when ancestral properties are potentially going to be impacted, this is not the driving principle underlying the Hopi Tribe's position. It is precisely because these ancestral sites are integral to the history, culture, and religion of the Hopi people, in addition to the fact that many of these sites may contain shrines and other culturally sensitive features that necessitate culturally appropriate consideration and treatment, that the Hopi Tribe requests to be consulted on mitigative strategies.

We believe that one of the issues restricting acceptance of the Hopi Tribe's evaluations of significance is the narrow interpretation of the concept of Traditional Cultural Property (TCP). Prevalent among most federal agencies and SHPOs is the assumption that a TCP is synonymous with "in-use religious site." It is a sad, but true fact that the only federal legislation that gives consideration and any real form of regulatory protection to Native American sacred and religious sites located on federal lands is the recent amendments to the National Historic Preservation Act. Thus, Native American cultures are forced into the historic preservation arena in order to try and protect religious and sacred properties that are integrally tied to the continuation of their respective religions.

The Hopi Tribe feels that the evaluation of an ancestral prehistoric site as a historic property eligible under criteria other than, or in addition to, criterion *d* is consistent with the conventional application of the NHPA. These sites are a tangible record of an earlier period in Hopi culture, much as historic buildings in a town are a testament to the previous stages in American culture. Even though the location of other properties of a site may not be *a priori* knowledge by all members of the Hopi Tribe, the site is no less important as a historic property of the Hopi people. We would argue that very few people in an American city or town could identify all of the structures or properties on the National Register in their city, yet this is not a limitation in nominating them; they are still recognized as being of some greater historical importance beyond their strict scientific value. Moreover, this stricter requirement of proving importance and significance that is continually placed on Native American tribes to substantiate the importance of a historic property, but not on the general Anglo-American public, is

blatant hypocrisy at best. It is unfortunate that the criteria for evaluating eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places is based solely on Anglo-American concepts of historic preservation, and are arbitrarily applied when faced with indigenous perspectives of history and preservation.

Our second concern is the apparent subjugation of evaluation criteria to "pragmatic" considerations. If this is the driving factor for what is or is not important in history that is followed by most federal agencies and SHPOs, then we would suggest that there is an urgent need for wholesale changes to the functioning of the Section 106 process. That is, we recognize the pragmatics of the current compliance process, particularly in light of the current political climate in Washington, D.C., and similarly realize that Native Americans likely would have the most to lose if the Congress becomes too actively involved. Yet what is desperately needed is a more equitable, efficient method for considering the importance of all classes of historic properties and their relationship to the cultures that value them. Furthermore, we would suggest that it is not the involvement of the Native American tribes that slows down or burdens this regulatory process, but rather the failure of the federal agencies to initiate and provide for meaningful consultation early on in the process.

We are not asking that the Hopi Tribe or any other cultural group receive any special consideration in the application of the NHPA. Quite the contrary, we are, in fact, suggesting that the playing field be leveled; a historic property of importance to the Hopi culture should be evaluated in the context of Hopi historical and cultural values, just as a historic property associated with the dominant Anglo-American history is evaluated within the context of western cultural values. By accepting at face value that Anglo-American historic properties can be important for more than their scientific potential, but relegating the vast majority of historic properties valued by the Hopi people to "scientific resources" perpetuates the underlying assumption that a Western view of history is more adequate or "correct" than is the Native American perspective. Furthermore, justifying this perspective merely for bureaucratic efficiency as a response to the angry protestations of the private developmental sector is an insult to the goals of historic preservation.

It is not only unfair to Indians; we think this "pragmatism" will come back to haunt the goals of all preservation. We think once someone makes a political decision to ignore the values of one type of historic property (Native American TCPs), the stage is set for them to make the same political decision about other types of historic properties (e.g., prehistoric archaeological sites, historic buildings). It is only by standing together in a fair and uniform application of federal laws that our profession can weather the current assault on historic preservation.

Kurt Dongoske, Mike Yeatts, and Leigh Jenkins are with the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office. T.J. Ferguson is with the Institute of the North American West.

[To Top of Page](#)

COUNTERPOINT

Lynne Sebastian

I would like to express three points of disagreement. First, the double standard in applying the National Register criteria that you and your colleagues decry does not exist. It is an illusion created because you are comparing archaeological sites on the one hand with standing structures listed in the National Register on the other. If you look simply at archaeological sites, which are the subject of [my original letter in the SAA Bulletin](#), you will find that no such double standard exists.

Most historical archaeological sites--farms, ranches, homesteads, communities--are not considered to be eligible for the National Register under any criterion other than *d*. The exceptions are cases where we have historical records (which are generally written) that indicate that a particular property is specifically associated with events or persons important in the history of this country.

Most prehistoric archaeological sites--artifact scatters, fieldhouses, communities--are not considered to be eligible to the National Register under any criterion other than *d*. The exceptions are cases where we have

historical records (which are generally oral traditions) that indicate that a particular property is specifically associated with events or persons important in the prehistory of this country.

No written record, no eligibility under criteria *a* or *b*; no oral tradition, no eligibility under criteria *a* or *b*. If you want a level playing field, this is a level playing field.

I'm sure you don't mean to imply that Native American sites are never found eligible under criteria other than *d*. Our recently concluded consultations about the Salt Lake and pilgrimage trails--all found to be eligible under *a*--are a case in point. I would expect that most of the Hopi villages are eligible under both *a* and *c*. Awatovi is certainly eligible under *a*, so is Homolavi, and so are most Hisatsinom archaeological sites discussed in Hopi oral tradition.

Second, neither I nor any SHPO or federal agency personnel that I know with any experience in this process define traditional cultural properties as "in-use religious sites." Traditional cultural properties are historic sites eligible for the National Register under one or more of the criteria in 36 CFR 60.4. Their religious qualities are a separate issue dealt with under a separate law. What distinguishes these properties from other historic properties is the way that information about them is transmitted--through oral traditions rather than written histories.

Third, on the issue of whether consultation with tribes slows down the regulatory process, I think you might find some strong opinions on this subject out there. But this issue is entirely beside the point; what you are implying is exactly the opposite of what I said in my letter. The time-saving that I mentioned in my letter is not a result of some nefarious plot to cut tribes out of the consultation process by defining archaeological sites as being only eligible under criterion *d*. Tribes are consulted concerning all archaeological sites that they want to be consulted about, regardless of the eligibility criteria for the sites.

The time-saving issue has to do not with the participation of tribes, but with the participation of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. If all archaeological sites were eligible under criterion *a*, every federal undertaking that impacted an archaeological site would require council review. My point was, and is, if you start trying to run thousands and thousands of additional reviews through a tiny, understaffed agency, you will get major delays, the sites will not have gained additional protection, the tribes will not have gained any consultation rights that they do not already have, and we will have put our ability to protect all historic properties at risk.

Lynne Sebastian is the New Mexico State Archaeologist and Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer

[To Top of Page](#)

LAST PAGE TABLE OF CONTENTS NEXT PAGE

Committee on Native American Relations

Joe Watkins

At the 60th annual SAA meetings in Minneapolis, the Task Force on Native American/SAA Relations presented its report to the Executive Board. The Executive Board recognized that a single report could not sufficiently address the range of concerns of many Native American groups, and also that the work started by the task force should not be considered complete. Consequently, the Executive Board established the task force as an advisory committee.

Contents:

- [Background](#)
 - [Issues and Recommendations](#)
 - [The Committee on Native American Relations](#)
-

Background

The task force on Native American/SAA Relations had its inception at the Society's 55th Annual Meeting in Las Vegas, Nevada. President Jeremy Sabloff charged the task force to advise the society on how to make a programmatic beginning in bettering its communications and working relationships with Native American communities. President Sabloff asked Roger Anyon to chair the task force, and Anyon contacted individuals who were interested in its objectives. By October 31, 1990, the task force was complete, with Roger Anyon (chair), and members Allan Bramlette, Sarah Campbell, June Noelani Cleghorn, Linda Ellanna, Patrick Garrow, Andrea Hunter, Robert Kelly, Rick Knecht, Kevin McBride, and Joe Watkins.

Anyon's letter of appointment to the task force asked each member to outline his or her ideas on the following: (1) major issues in the relationship between Native Americans and archaeologists, (2) issues that need to be resolved, (3) how the task force should solicit input from tribal groups, and (4) possible funding sources for a conference.

In September 1992, the task force was reorganized with Joe Watkins (chair), Robert Kelly (vice-chair), and Roger Anyon as the task force liaison to the Executive Board. The remaining members were Allan Bramlette, Kurt Dongoske, Craig Gerlach, Patrick Garrow, Andrea Hunter, and Rick Knecht. Each member was asked to define a single issue affecting the relationship between Native Americans and SAA, and to examine that issue in detail. This allowed the task force to focus on specific issues rather than deal only in generalities.

At the same time, the task force worked to develop a questionnaire to poll the SAA membership about issues and relationships with Native American groups. Various drafts circulated through the task force, with a "final" draft submitted to the SAA Executive Director's office for review in December 1994. Unfortunately, our request for a review to the proposed questionnaire occurred just as the SAA began a comprehensive revision of its procedures and guidelines for involving the SAA membership in studies, including the methods of data collection, the ownership of data, use of the results, the types of research undertaken, and so forth. The new procedures are only now being formalized. Because of the uncertain time frame for reviewing the questionnaire, we decided to postpone the project until the new procedures are in place.

As a result of the task force's work, we were able to identify several issues concerning Native American and SAA relations and to provide the following recommendations.

Issues and Recommendations

Issue:

- * Continuing relationships between Native Americans and the Society for American Archaeology

Recommendation:

- * Establish a committee with regional representation

The task force recommended the formation of a Committee on Native American Relations to monitor Native American issues so that SAA can be an active organization rather than a reactive one. The committee will also provide a liaison with other SAA committees regarding Native American issues, as well as work to encourage Native American involvement in SAA to the greatest extent possible. It also recommended that the committee reflect regional and national representation and that Native Americans who are not professional anthropologists be included as committee members.

Issue:

- * Relationships between the Society for American Archaeology and other relevant organizations

Recommendation:

- * Establish a liaison with the National Museum of the American Indian and the Keepers of the Treasures organization and strengthen existing relationships with other organizations concerning Native American issues

The creation of the National Museum of the American Indian has brought forth many positive changes in the relationship between American Indians and the museum community, while the continued development of the Keepers of the Treasures (an organization dedicated to the retention and preservation of cultural, traditional, and ritualistic rites of Native Americans, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians) offers hope for interaction between more traditional Native Americans and archaeologists. We recommended that the Executive Board pursue formal relationships between the Society for American Archaeology and the National Museum for the American Indian, as well as with Keepers of the Treasures. It is also important that the society strengthen relationships with the Society for Applied Anthropology and other organizations, including the American Anthropological Association, that deal with the anthropology of Native Americans to develop consistent, discipline-wide policies.

Issue:

- * Responsibility of the archaeologist to Native American communities

Recommendation:

- * Encourage ethical behavior

Native American communities often do not distinguish archaeologists as a group from pothunters, graverobbers, and other groups destructive to native culture. A statement on ethics would facilitate the separation of archaeologists from these groups, and we urge SAA members to embrace the general ethics statements proposed by the Society's Committee for Ethics in Archaeology (specifically the "Responsibilities of Archaeologists to Other Interest Groups"). At the same time, archaeologists need to recognize their responsibilities to Native American communities, which include confidentiality of ethnographic information developed during research.

Issue:

- * Public education of both Native American groups and archaeologists

Recommendation:

* Encourage education through the formation of a Native American subcommittee of the Public Education Committee

A special effort must be made to educate Native American groups about archaeology; similarly, archaeologists should be receptive to education offered by Native American groups. A special subcommittee within the Public Education Committee, working in conjunction with the Committee on Native American Relations, can tailor educational outreach programs to Native American communities to show more fully what archaeology can offer them and to better communicate the things these communities would like to educate archaeologists about.

Issue:

* Lack of communication between archaeologists and Native American communities

Recommendation:

* Encourage members to establish meaningful dialogues with Native American communities

The task force recognizes the need for archaeologists to involve Native American communities at the earliest possible phase of research in order to obtain tribal input into the project and to develop research meaningful to all parties involved. Native American communities impacted by research should also be provided with popular accounts of their research in addition to scientific reports.

Issue:

* The destruction of the cultural resources of the Americas

Recommendation:

* Encourage the protection of shared resources through education, communication, and cooperation

Both native people and archaeologists view cultural material as a resource to be protected from destruction. However, native people often view archaeologists as a source of destruction only one step removed from pothunters. SAA members should involve Native American groups in our goal of protecting shared resources early in all planning sessions set up for such purposes.

Issue:

* The excavation and disposition of Native American human remains

Recommendations:

* Encourage SAA members to develop working relationships with Native American groups in their area of research prior to undertaking research that might lead to the discovery of human remains

Most task force members felt that reburial and repatriation issues head the list of concerns of Native American groups. Although these concerns are the focus of SAA's Task Force on Repatriation, it is nearly impossible to separate these very emotional issues from the broader concerns of the Native American relations committee. Human remains, when encountered during an excavation, and when not covered by legislation such as the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, must be treated in an entirely different manner than when such materials are already within a museum or similar institution. As such, pre-excavation agreements and strong working relationships between groups will enable all parties to understand the processes involved.

* Develop guidelines concerning requests for the return of human remains and/or cultural material by non-recognized or non-tribal Native American groups

The legislative intent of NAGPRA is to return human remains and certain classes of cultural items to the Native American groups from which they originally came. In recognition of the intent of NAGPRA, the society (perhaps through its Task Force on Repatriation) needs to provide more specific guidance to individuals and institutions for groups who are requesting repatriation, but who do not qualify for consideration under

NAGPRA, and for requests for the return of human remains and other cultural materials that are not covered under NAGPRA.

The Committee on Native American Relations

The committee met in Minneapolis with the original task force members and leadership. Additional members were added, bringing the total number of members to 17. Committee members (in alphabetical order) are Bruce Bradley, Sue Ann Curtis, Kurt Dongoske, Leonard Fors-man, Patrick Garrow, Rebecca Hawkins, Andrea Hunter, Robert Kelly, Rick Knecht, Dorothy Lippert, Angela Steiner, Scott Stuemke, Joe Watkins, and Diana Yupe.

We developed some short-range goals, with the primary goal being an autumn conference among committee members, Native Americans, and other interested parties to generate a mission statement and action items for the committee, and to establish middle- and long-range goals. Also, we established formal relationships and opened communication links between the committee and two subcommittees of the SAA's Public Education Committee.

Future plans are to involve more non-anthropologist Native Americans in the committee and to establish improved relationships with native communities across the United States.

If you would be interested in working with this committee, would like additional information, or would like to recommend someone for consideration for committee appointment, contact any member of the committee, Robert Kelly, or me in care of the SAA Executive Office.

Joe Watkins, who is the Chair of the Native American Relations Task Force, is with the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

[To Top of Page](#)

LAST PAGE TABLE OF CONTENTS NEXT PAGE

Special Section: Archaeopolitics

Preserving and Strengthening our National Archaeological Program

Bill Lipe

Contents:

- [Introduction](#)
 - [What is our message?](#)
 - [What can be done in Washington?](#)
 - [Grassroots efforts are essential](#)
 - [We must be prepared to change](#)
-

Introduction

Although the SAA's annual meeting in Minneapolis was one of the most successful and vigorous ever, there was a strong current of foreboding and even fear, as facts and rumors circulated regarding what Congress and various federal agencies might or might not do to the laws, regulations, and programs that today affect most aspects of American archaeology. Those members working in the resource management sector saw themselves as especially vulnerable, but academicians and museum specialists were also concerned about the funding prospects for important grant programs. Accompanying articles by Judy Bense, Donald Craib, and Ralph Johnson detail various aspects of what has happened and what might happen in Congress, and how SAA and other organizations are responding to these actions.

The good news is that so far (I write this in mid-August), the programs that most concern us have weathered the fiscal year 1996 appropriations process, with only "average" levels of cuts (though the National Endowment for the Humanities appears to be facing substantial downsizing). In general, "our" programs have fared better than those in many other areas, such as environmental and energy research and regulation, and social services. The article by Donald Craib and Ralph Johnson details the amounts appropriated by the House and Senate for programs of special interest to us.

My sense is that support for archaeology and historic preservation is fairly broadly distributed across both parties in this Congress, but that it does not appear to be very deep. Our programs are a minuscule part of the federal budget, and most members of Congress and their staffs know little about them (which provides us with an opportunity to educate them). Except for NEH, these programs do not appear to be ideologically targeted for attack. On the other hand, we still are not fully through the appropriations process, and differences between the Senate and House bills must still be resolved in conference this fall. If President Clinton vetoes appropriations bills that are important to us, funds will be shifted in the mad scramble at the end of the fiscal year to come up with something that will be veto-proof. So we could still have further losses or gains in the appropriations process.

Furthermore, as Loretta Neumann notes in her article, Congress has yet to complete work on a number of other bills that could dramatically affect archaeology and historic preservation. Some of these have moved through the

House, but the Senate is taking a much more deliberative look at them. And, as Judy Bense points out, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation may get "another look" from Congress, both because its funding is up for reauthorization, and because it may be the subject of oversight hearings. Furthermore, if Congress is truly serious about reducing the growth of the federal deficit--and as citizens, I think most of us hope it is--the squeeze on the discretionary portion of the federal budget will be even greater in future years. And, as federal agency budgets are constrained, small programs that are considered peripheral to the principal agency mission may be disproportionately reduced. Unfortunately, cultural resource management is not (yet) seen as a core responsibility by many agencies.

What are we to do? One approach is to wring our hands, expect the worst, and assume that we are powerless to save or strengthen programs that we care about. The other approach--which the SAA leadership and many members have adopted--is to work hard to educate Congress and the agencies about the contributions that archaeology and history make to the nation, and about the need for national programs in this area. I think the components of a successful approach are: 1) having a strong, clear, message; 2) maintaining a strong lobbying effort in Washington; 3) carrying out effective grassroots efforts to convince legislators and agency managers of archaeology's importance; 4) being willing to initiate adaptive changes in public archaeology.

What is our message?

I think it is this: Archaeological sites are the record--and often the only record--of more than 12,000 years of human occupation in North America. When they are destroyed without study, a part of that record is forever lost. The National Historic Preservation Act provides a time-tested system for ensuring that federal agencies "look before they bulldoze" when they carry out or facilitate projects that might damage sites. This system may need changes that make it more efficient, but we must have such a system to ensure that federal programs do not destroy irreplaceable parts of America's heritage. In addition, the Archaeological Resources Protection Act has proven to be a valuable tool for fighting archaeological looting and vandalism on public lands, when the land-managing agencies have the resources and commitment to employ it effectively. The small funds devoted to archaeology by the National Science Foundation and the National Endowment for the Humanities are enormously important stimulators of innovative basic research and new archaeological methods. We don't apologize for the several ways in which American archaeology relies on federal laws and programs; it is entirely appropriate that preserving and understanding America's archaeological heritage be a national concern.

What can be done in Washington?

The keys here are Capitol Hill lobbying, developing alliances with other organizations, and providing information for the members. Donald Craib, SAA government affairs manager, and Ralph Johnson, SAA executive director, are fully engaged in these tasks. Judy Bense, chair of the SAA Government Affairs Committee, is in constant touch with the SAA office regarding "inside the beltway efforts," as am I. On visits to congressional offices, Donald and I find that we generally get a positive reception to our message. Legislators know little about how federal laws and agency programs affect archaeology, but they are receptive to learning. Frequently, our visit is the first one they have had on these topics. Donald is spending as much time as he can on the Hill, getting to know legislators' staffs and getting the message across. When SAA members are in Washington, he can help set up meetings at Congressional or agency offices--these help enormously. Donald and Ralph have actively promoted SAA alliances with other organizations in D.C.--e.g., SHA, ACRA, SOPA, Preservation Action, the National Trust, the National Council of SHPOs--to find common ground and develop coordinated strategies. The SAA office is increasingly gearing up to provide information on government affairs to the members, and also for Congress and the agencies.

Grassroots efforts are essential

Archaeology has a long history of effective grassroots lobbying, as does the historic preservation community in general. Now is the time to redouble these efforts; this is the most important and effective way to get our message across. We can't afford to leave it just to the SAA staff, officers, and Government Affairs Committee.

Members of Congress respond first to constituents, so we must have strong voices for archaeology in every state, and if possible, in every congressional district. Calls, letters, and visits from constituents are the most important factors in influencing Congress. Legislators' local offices are also important points for grass-roots contacts. Legislators need to hear about exciting archaeological projects in their state and district, and we need to urge the many lay people who support archaeology in our areas to make that support known. SAA's government affairs network (GAN) now includes more than 130 members committed to actively working for archaeology in their areas, and Judy Bense is recruiting state representatives to take on special responsibilities for the network in each state.

We must be prepared to change

Congress's concerns for deregulation and budgetary constraints are forcing change in public and even academic archaeology, but other forces are at work as well. These include the emergence of Native American communities as partners in making decisions that affect archaeology, and the unprecedented growth of public interest in archaeology, as manifested by the rising circulation of the *Archaeology and Public Education* newsletter and the success of Passports in Time. In Minneapolis, provocative suggestions for change were energetically discussed during the forum on restructuring archaeology and in other sessions as well. In Wyoming, BLM managers met recently with archaeologists and representatives of industry to "reinvent Section 106," and the New Mexico deputy SHPO has called upon archaeologists to work together to do the same. Congress and powerful interest groups are asking not only that public programs (including public archaeology) grow less rapidly, but that they be less intrusive, less bureaucratic, and more friendly to business. These trends provide American archaeology with both challenges and opportunities. In this environment, we have a chance to develop research and resource management programs that not only use public funds more efficiently, but that are more effective in meeting our two national mandates--to protect the material record of the past, and to learn from it so that the American people can better understand the full cultural heritage of their nation.

Bill Lipe is president of the Society for American Archaeology.

[To Top of Page](#)

LAST PAGE TABLE OF CONTENTS NEXT PAGE

Special Section: Archaeopolitics

The First Session of the 104th Congress: Examining National Priorities for Archaeology

Donald Craib and Ralph Johnson

By posing two broad questions, members of the 104th Congress have established the context in which historic preservation programs are being reviewed. The questions are: What benefits accrue to the public from the expenditure of its funds in historic preservation programs, and What is the appropriate federal role in the historic preservation system?

Congressional activity reflects the attempt to respond to these questions. For example, proposals have come forward to eliminate agencies or reduce their appropriations. Responsibilities may be transferred from the federal to state and local governments. Oversight hearings are scheduled for this fall to examine the role, performance, and continued authorization of preservation programs. Legislation has been introduced to address private property rights, risk assessment, grazing, and wilderness. If enacted, these various proposals could have detrimental effects on the archaeological record and the practice of archaeology.

SAA is the only archaeological organization with a full-time government affairs specialist on its staff. However, while we may be aware of a number of actions affecting archaeology on Capitol Hill, we can only lobby a few issues at one time. These are our priorities for the moment: appropriations for the historic preservation system, and the continuation of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

Broadly, SAA's goals have been to:

- build awareness that historic preservation is a system whose programs are mutually dependent on one another and in which a cut in one program can disrupt the entire system
- advocate for the continued existence of and adequate funding for the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
- fight any attempts to make cuts to historic preservation programs that are disproportionate to cuts being made in other areas of government
- demonstrate the public benefits of historic preservation at each opportunity in the debate, and to
- work closely with SAA's many partners in preservation to share information and make efficient use of limited resources

To achieve these goals, many strategies must be employed--from visiting with members of Congress and their staffs to mobilizing grassroots participation. While this limited space doesn't allow us to elaborate the full range of SAA's actions and communications during this session of Congress, the activities related to appropriations do provide a case study.

Back in April SAA began its effort to inform Congress about the importance of adequately funding programs essential to the historic preservation system. Then-president Bruce Smith testified before the House Appropriations Committee's Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies. His testimony was followed by several days of visits to congressional offices by Bill Lipe (SAA president), Judy Bense (SAA Government Affairs Committee chair), and Donna Seifert and Bonnie McEwan (Society for Historical Archaeology president

and Government Affairs Committee chair), who were all in town for a three-day long lobbying blitz on Capitol Hill. Results from these meetings made it clear that many members of Congress and their staffs know very little about the federal historic preservation system, its public benefits, and how cuts in appropriations will impact programs in their districts. In order to provide information and illustrate the public benefits to them, Bill Lipe and Donald Craib over the past several months have made numerous visits to Capitol Hill to explain the federal preservation system to legislators and how severe funding cuts can have a detrimental impact on projects in their home districts. In addition, an action alert was sent to members of SAA's government affairs network (GAN) asking them to contact their members of Congress and explain the importance of continuing a federal role in historic preservation and how a reduced role would impact programs in their communities.

Meeting with members of Congress and their staffs can have beneficial consequences. For example, a meeting between Judy Bense and Rep. Joe Scarborough (R-Fla.) resulted in a joint visit to an archaeological site back in his district. Three days before the House voted on its appropriations bill, Donald Craib, Ralph Johnson, and Donna Seifert met with Rep. Phil English (R-Pa.) to discuss the House appropriations bill and to stress the important role that the Advisory Council plays in the historic preservation system. Days later during the House floor debate on the bill, Rep. English was one of two Republicans who took the floor and spoke in support of the Advisory Council, and he even mentioned the important role that it plays in the protection of archaeological sites!

Throughout the appropriations process the members of GAN have played an important and vital role in expressing SAA's position to members of Congress. GAN operates as the SAA's grassroots component of its government affairs program. Several action alerts and updates have been sent to GAN members asking them to contact their members of Congress and express the importance of adequate funding for programs in the historic preservation system.

Working with partners in the preservation community during the appropriations debate has certainly played an important role in the successes achieved so far. SAA, along with SHA, the American Cultural Resources Association (ACRA), National Trust for Historic Preservation, National Council for State Historic Preservation Officers, and others are members of the National Preservation Coordinating Council (NPCC), which acts as the formal coalition for the historic preservation community. This alliance enables its members to discuss issues, form a consensus, and then speak as one voice for the historic preservation community. In addition, SAA has worked on an ad hoc basis with SHA, the Society of Professional Archeologists, and ACRA by sending a joint letter to members of the Senate Appropriations Committee supporting the cultural resource budgets within the National Park Service (NPS), Bureau of Land Management (BLM), and the U.S. Forest Service (USFS).

So far, the preservation community has been successful in securing adequate funding for programs--considering the mood of Congress. The greatest achievement to date has been the continuation of the Advisory Council in the House appropriations bill, which originally planned to fund it for just one more year with the intent to close it down after that. The following chart shows the level of appropriations that President Clinton recommended in his budget, and the amounts appropriated by the House and the Senate for NPS and BLM cultural resource programs, the Heritage Program of the USFS, the Historic Preservation Fund (HPF), the Advisory Council, and the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH). These numbers will undoubtedly change after the conference committee works out the differences in the two bills.

If you have comments about SAA's government affairs program, or would like to discuss any of these issues or strategies, please call us. SAA will continue to be vigilant in its efforts and will call on you in support of archaeology. Remember...it's only the first session of the 104th Congress!

Donald Craib is manager of government affairs and counsel for SAA, and Ralph Johnson is executive director.

[To Top of Page](#)

Special Section: Archaeopolitics

Forecasting Archaeology's Political Future

Loretta Neumann

I've been asked to give a forecast of the political future for archaeology, given the dramatic changes that have occurred this year in the Congress. Not an easy task. We've experienced upheavals before, such as when Ronald Reagan and the Senate Republicans swept into power in 1981. But this time is different. The new people who have come to the nation's capital have a much broader agenda. They don't want merely to change the way government works, they want to revamp it entirely. Some members of Congress who once seemed politically conservative now appear moderate. No federal program (except, perhaps, Defense) seems safe.

What happens in Congress does matter to archaeology. The federal government has great power, directly and indirectly, over the nation's archaeological record. Its regulatory arm helps to stop bulldozers from deliberately destroying sites. Its conservation agencies save resources in federally supported parks, historic sites, and museums. And its money funds scientific and scholarly research, fosters educational programs for the public, and supports state and local programs that benefit archaeological resources throughout the country.

So what does the future hold? Some bitter battles, I fear. The fight to save the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation--targeted for elimination in this year's budget process--was only the opening salvo. A similar effort is underway to eliminate the Council on Environmental Quality (the agency that guides implementation of the National Environmental Policy Act). Many provisions in House-passed bills implementing provisions of the Republican "Contract with America" would make it difficult if not impossible for federal regulators to promulgate rules to protect archaeological resources. Legislation is under consideration in both the House and Senate to give away to the states all the public lands in the West. Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management programs for managing and protecting cultural resources are being slashed. The National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities are being cut severely and appear slated for extinction. The archaeology program almost got wiped out of the National Science Foundation. The list goes on and on.

Those of us who work on these issues daily don't just want to preserve the status quo. But we also don't want to toss out abruptly and thoughtlessly the processes and programs that have served us well, if not perfectly, for many years. If Congress wants to change things, then we must work with them to do it carefully. We need to decide which issues are worth fighting over, which ones can be reasonably compromised and which ones, if any, we can do without. We also need to look ahead toward the elections next year. In 1996 those who are running for re-election will have to be more responsive to the constituents who elected them. We need to communicate to the members of Congress--and to the candidates who challenge them--about the values of archaeology and the necessary role that the federal government plays in managing and protecting archaeological resources. The task may seem overwhelming, but we've proven many times before that we can do it. My forecast is that if we do our job well, archaeology will end up being better off than it is today, with more and not less support in the Congress, regardless of which political party is in power.

Loretta Neumann is president of CEHP Incorporated.

[To Top of Page](#)

Special Section: Archaeopolitics

Changing Times for the Government Affairs Committee

Judith A. Bense

Contents:

- [A Short History](#)
 - [A New World](#)
 - [Government Affairs Network](#)
 - [Committee Membership](#)
 - [Summary](#)
-

The Government Affairs Committee of the Society for American Archaeology was formed about 25 years ago during one of the most formative phases of modern historic preservation and archaeology. Committee members have been involved in the growth and development of historic preservation at the federal level since that time. In addition to recommending policy positions for SAA on archaeological issues, members also lobby and keep track of problems, legislation, and federal agencies. Committee members have been pro-active from the start, especially through direct lobbying and encouraging grassroots support and pressure for specific archaeological concerns.

A Short History

At first, committee members were SAA's only lobbyists, dealing directly with legislators and their staffs. In the 1980s, Loretta Neumann and the Washington lobbying firms with which she was associated were contracted by SAA to lobby Congress, track archaeology legislation, and implement the policies set by the society. Neumann, now president of CEHP (Conservation, Environment, and Historic Preservation) Incorporated, had a long history of productive service to SAA.

Recently, the SAA Executive Board decided to shift to a staff position for lobbying as one part of a long-range plan to phase out previously contracted services and develop in-house capabilities in many areas. Today, the government affairs program is part of the SAA organization under the management of Donald F. Craib. At the April 1995 annual meeting, I became chair of the Government Affairs Committee and planned to spend my first year helping with the transition to the new program while redefining the role of the committee.

A New World

For the past few years Washington has been fairly quiet. Historic preservation action has concentrated on amending existing legislation, increasing budgets for existing programs such as the National Science Foundation and the Historic Preservation Fund, and lobbying for new programs such as "Legacy" in the Department of Defense.

As most of you know, things have changed in a hurry in Washington beginning with the November 1994 elections. Scores of new influential players, most of whom are not known to us, flooded the halls of Congress. Washington became politically charged and explosive almost overnight. For the first time in a long time, federal support for historic preservation and archaeology faced serious and critical review by legislators and their staffs bent on cutting the budget to meet the goals of the "Contract With America." The so-far-unsuccessful proposal to cut funding for the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation is a good example of how quickly the new decision-makers can act and can catch all of us by surprise. In addition, this fall the Advisory Council comes under scrutiny for reauthorization, and we hear that the House Resources Committee Subcommittee on Parks, Forest, and Lands Subcommittee is considering holding oversight hearings on aspects of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA).

The political atmosphere in Washington is steeped with concern over federal government programs. Very basic questions are being asked about the federal government's role in historic preservation by the new leaders in Congress. Those of us who lobbied in Washington and at home this summer found considerable support for archaeology and historic preservation. There is serious concern and support for preserving and responsibly managing our national heritage in the new Congress, accompanied by the sentiment of "let's not throw the baby out with the bath water." This support was demonstrated this summer with the defeat or reduction of proposals to cut funding for the Advisory Council, the Historic Preservation Fund, and the National Trust. It is our responsibility to mobilize that support in Congress.

The Government Affairs Committee is responding to these changing times in both structural and procedural ways. Donald Craib adds a new structural dimension to the committee and the society. The upheaval in Congress has fast-tracked the evolution of structural change in the SAA government affairs program and the committee. As described, the new government affairs system has already provided a new strength for SAA: our increased ability to build coalitions of legislators and staff on Capitol Hill and to directly participate, often as a senior partner, in coalitions of historic preservation and archaeology organizations in Washington. The relationship that has developed between the Craib, as manager of government affairs, and the Government Affairs Committee is a partnership. He is the on-the-scene political expert and lobbyist while the committee provides archaeological background information and direct grassroots political support.

Government Affairs Network

The first procedural initiative of the committee was to develop one of SAA's greatest strengths--grassroots support. The government affairs network (GAN) was initiated by Craib and established by the SAA Government Affairs Committee in January 1995 as a successor to SAA's former grassroots body, the Committee on Public Archaeology (COPA). GAN provides grassroots political support and information on political issues affecting archaeological resources and archaeologists. Most network activity will involve information dispersal, requests for information and action, and alerts of breaking events by email, fax, and phone. The SAA office in Washington coordinates information about the network, maintains the database of network members, and is the primary communication point.

Membership in the Government Affairs Network, which is unlimited, includes two types: general members and state representatives. General members can be self-selected by completing the form published in the February-March 1995 *SAA Bulletin*, or they can be recruited. Membership is based primarily on a member's interest in the political process of archaeology; however, the influence and position of an SAA member's political delegation can be a factor in recruitment. General membership in GAN is separate from membership in the Government Affairs Committee. GAN members must be available by email or fax and be willing to respond to requests for archaeological information and political support in the form of personal letters, phone calls, and occasional visits to representatives and senators. Given the dynamics of the political process, short-term notices and response requests are common. There are no term limits for GAN members, but responsiveness is required. One GAN member in each U.S. state, the District of Columbia, other countries in the Americas, and state amateur and professional organizations will be identified as the GAN state representative, serving primarily as information collectors and action motivators. State representatives can provide feedback after SAA members have met with members of Congress and provide advice and background information to the SAA office and leadership in

preparation for meetings with members of Congress and their staffs in Washington. It is hoped that state representatives for at least the 50 states will be identified by the 1996 annual meeting where the first Government Affairs Network meeting will be held.

To facilitate communication and interaction among the state representatives, the SAA office, and the committee chair, a new communications network (SAAnet) will be made available to each state representative. This communication network will have a restricted conference list specifically for government affairs. Access to the SAAnet will also be provided to SAA officers, board members, and committees.

Committee Membership

The second procedural change is a rethinking of committee membership and operation. I am in the process of revising government affairs membership and organization. Working with SAA leadership, politically experienced SAA members, senior committee members, the government affairs program manager, and the executive director, I am developing a proposal for the SAA Executive Board to modify the committee organization and operation so that the committee can work more effectively. This proposal is not final, but the basic areas of change have been identified, and an initial modification plan has been formulated. (Please remember that the proposed refinements discussed here are not final at this writing and are still subject to change.)

Under the proposal the core membership of the committee would continue to be small and made up of people who are handling specific issues, but a new type of membership would be encouraged: general membership. General members would be individuals who are politically astute and experienced who can provide information and advise on a wide range of issues. General members will not necessarily be the point person for a specific issue, legislation, or agency; they will function more as resource people for the committee.

Another new type of informal association is also proposed: advisors. This affiliation is designed to harness the expertise of individuals who do not wish to or cannot be formal members because of the scope of their professional commitments or a position, such as a job in government. In addition to core members, general members, and advisors, another type of committee participation is being strongly considered: issue teams. These teams would be made up of loosely organized groups of people selected by individual committee members or advisors to help on specific issues. They will not be members of the committee, only associated with it as a team member. Those wishing to serve in any of these capacities may volunteer or they may be recruited. Because of the responsibilities of membership and the political sensitivity of the issues dealt with by the committee, core and general members as well as advisors must be approved by the committee chair, government affairs manager, and pertinent members of the SAA leadership.

Summary

With the development and implementation of the changes described above, the operation of government affairs in SAA is expanding to become more efficient and effective. With the development of the government affairs program and electronic communication, committee members and GAN participants are more informed than ever before. Government Affairs Program Manager Donald Craib, President Bill Lipe, Executive Director Ralph Johnson, and myself worked closely together this summer during the firestorm that broke out in the budgeting process. New political alliances were formed and old ones were strengthened and reorganized. SAA government affairs and the committee are already operating on a new level. We visited many of the newly influential legislators and their staffs now in key decision-making positions and educated each about the historic preservation process and archaeology. And we are keeping up our contacts with previous supporters from both parties. New relationships are being formed such as that with Rep. Phil English (R-Pa.). Rep. English met with Donald Craib who informed him about the proposed Advisory Council funding cuts. A few days later, English provided critical support for the Sanders amendment to restore Advisory Council funding in the House floor vote on appropriations. SAA's government affairs activities now are more embedded in our organization, are becoming more efficiently operated, and are a part of the day-to-day operation of the society.

The original goal of the SAA Government Affairs Committee was and continues to be to support and further the interests of archaeology and historic preservation. Today, we are facing rapid change in government. With the many new players, new leaders, a new party in power, a "Contract with America," and a new reality for archaeology, we are endeavoring to streamline the Government Affairs committee to meet the challenges. The new Congress is committed to cutting budgets and simplifying government; we do not oppose those goals. The country needs a balanced budget and an efficient government. The Government Affairs Committee, government affairs program staff, and SAA leadership are working very hard to defend archaeology and historic preservation. We think that even the most dedicated budget cutters will see that these programs address a national interest. We must stay alert and continually refine our organization and communications to focus our resources where we can be most effective. Our greatest political strengths are our large membership for grassroots political support and lobbying on Capitol Hill.

If you want to know more about the dynamic world of archaeology and government affairs, have suggestions on how to improve our operations, or want to participate as a professional, amateur, or student, please contact me or Donald Craib at the SAA office in Washington. We are all affected by government, and it is our watch. I think we are on the right track, but we can always use a fresh idea and another pair of hands.

Judy Bense chairs the SAA Government Affairs Committee.

[To Top of Page](#)

LAST PAGE TABLE OF CONTENTS NEXT PAGE

Briefings

Ralph Johnson

Contents:

- [Archaeologists of the Americas](#)
 - [SAA Online](#)
 - [International FaxBack Service](#)
 - [Public Benefits Conference](#)
 - [Emergency Response to Virginia Floods](#)
 - [Editor-designates Announced](#)
 - [Annual Meeting News](#)
-

Archaeologists of the Americas

SAA's membership has now surpassed 5,600 members and you'll find each individual listed in the 1995 edition of the directory. This edition includes fax numbers and email addresses for those members who furnished this information on their membership renewal invoices. AOA is scheduled for a mid-September mailing.

SAA Online

Increasingly, SAA is using various information technologies to deliver services and exchange communications. Most recently, SAA has been registered on the Internet as "saa.org" and has installed an Ethernet-to-Internet router on the local area network in the office. You may now send email to SAA at headquarters@saa.org (a complete list of email addresses for SAA staff members and departments will appear in *Archaeologists of the Americas*). SAA's elected leaders, staff, and Task Force on Information Technology members are all working to launch two new electronic services for SAA--SAAnet and a World Wide Web home page.

SAAnet will provide easy-to-use graphical software for board and committee members to send email to one another or to committee conferences, and to conduct online chats. SAAnet, operational this fall, is being developed as a tool to help those responsible for carrying out the society's program of work to communicate more efficiently with one another.

Additionally, an SAA site on the World Wide Web will be launched by the end of this year. The Web site will give SAA the ability to deliver complex information quickly and easily to all members (as well as to potentially huge external audiences) with Internet access. With the explosive growth of the Web and the proliferation of local service providers who offer low-cost access to the Internet, SAA's ability to make information and services available to members--in the form and at the time you want it--is being significantly enhanced.

Your thoughts and comments about these matters are invited; email responses (to ralph_johnson@saa.org) are welcome! Additional information will appear in the November issue of the *SAA Bulletin*, when the Executive Board will be seeking reactions through an advisory poll on a new model being proposed for the delivery of current research.

International FaxBack Service

SAA's FaxBack service, which provides a way to retrieve stored documents on demand via fax, can now be accessed by members worldwide. From your telephone or fax machine hand set, call (919) 361-1338, or (800) 375-5603 within the U.S., and respond to the voice prompt by entering a document number: 7220 for a contact list of members of the U.S. Congress, 7221 for Guidelines for Organizers of annual meeting sessions, 7222 for Call for Submissions for annual meeting presentations.

Public Benefits Conference

Increasingly, archaeology is being asked to answer the question: Why should public funds be spent on site survey, excavation, analysis, curation, and interpretation? A conference designed to address this question and explore the public benefits of archaeology is planned for November 5-8, 1995, in Santa Fe, N.M. SAA is joining with the National Park Service, National Trust for Historic Preservation, National Council of State Historic Preservation Officers, New Mexico State Historic Preservation Office, and the Society for Historical Archaeology to sponsor the conference. The conference will survey the multiple benefits of and multiple audiences for archaeology, identify case studies to include in a publication on the topic of public benefits, and explore how archaeology can better communicate its message to the media, political leadership, and the public. For information about the conference, registration fees, and hotel information, contact Barbara Little at the National Register of Historic Places at (202) 343-9513 (leave both telephone and fax numbers). Space is limited and hotel reservations must be made by October 5.

Emergency Response to Virginia Floods

SAA and the Society for Historical Archaeology are participating in the working group on on-site assistance as part of the archaeological community's involvement with the National Task Force on Emergency Response. The task force is undertaking efforts to encourage cultural institutions and individuals to take steps to be prepared, mitigate possible risks, and develop effective plans for response and recovery in order to limit loss to cultural resources from natural disasters and man-made emergencies (see *SAA Bulletin* 13[2]:15 for background). The potential for disasters to imperil archaeological resources was underscored by a report from Kay McCarron at the most recent working group meeting.

McCarron (archaeologist with Fairfax County, Va.) explained that 17 counties in western Virginia became presidentially declared disaster areas following torrential rains in June. According to the United States Geological Survey, the damage to some areas was considered a 500 to 1,000 year geological event. McCarron fears that many archaeological sites in upper watershed locations were destroyed, and reports that the flooding altered land surfaces to a degree that many remaining sites can't be located except through the use of Global Positioning Systems.

Formulating these initial assessments has been difficult, McCarron says, because no disaster management plan was in place. For example, the Federal Emergency Management Agency was unable to provide maps of the flooding Rapidan River tributaries--so McCarron's first task was to contact the U.S. Forest Service, the Shenandoah National Park, county governments, and others who could help identify at-risk archaeological sites. Ultimately, the Virginia Department of Historic Resources developed a temporary damage assessment policy and requested assistance from the Archeological Society of Virginia to inspect known significant sites and assess the flood damage. While McCarron hopes an initial damage assessment will be completed by the end of September, a more thorough survey may take a year.

This case study illustrates why the working group on on-site assistance is developing a model for emergency response that addresses elements such as formulating interagency agreements, assessing damage, undertaking triage, building communications systems and information hotlines, deploying technical expertise through referral networks, and coordinating local and national resources. SAA salutes the Archeological Society of Virginia and Kay McCarron for vigorously responding to the disaster, particularly in the absence of a well-developed model, and for their shared commitment to preserving the archaeological record.

Editor-designates Announced

At its meeting in Minneapolis, the Executive Board approved the editor-designates for both SAA journals.

Lynne Goldstein (University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee) was appointed editor-designate of *American Antiquity*. The first issue of the journal under her editorship will be July 1996; effective September 1, 1995, all manuscripts and queries about manuscripts in progress should be addressed to her.

Gary Feinman (University of Wisconsin, Madison) and Linda Manzanilla (Instituto de Investigaciones Antropológicas, UNAM, Ciudad Universitaria, Mexico, D.F.) were appointed co-editors-designate of *Latin American Antiquity*. The first issue of *Latin American Antiquity* under their editorship will be September 1996. Beginning September 16, 1995, all manuscripts and queries about manuscripts in progress should be addressed to Gary Feinman.

The respective editors' terms will officially begin at the 1996 annual business meeting in New Orleans.

Annual Meeting News

A new tradition begins in this issue of the *SAA Bulletin*, based on policy set by the Executive Board after considerable deliberation. The newsletter issue following the annual meeting will henceforth contain [reports delivered at the annual business meeting](#), [awards presented](#), and [a summary of Executive Board meetings](#). Including these items in the *Bulletin* rather than *American Antiquity* helps keep the finite number of pages in SAA journals focused on articles, and delivers news to members as soon as possible after the annual meeting.

Because the *SAA Bulletin* is sent to all members worldwide, to institutional subscribers of both journals, and is also available on the Internet, the news it contains reaches the largest audience of any SAA publication. Like the journals, the newsletter is printed on acid-free paper for archival storage. A full set of back issues is maintained at the SAA office, with individual issues available to members on request while supplies last.

Ralph Johnson is executive director of SAA.

[To Top of Page](#)

LAST PAGE TABLE OF CONTENTS NEXT PAGE

Site File Databases and GIS Systems

[Point](#)
[Counterpoint](#)

POINT

Steven LeBlanc

In a recent *SAA Bulletin* [12(5):13,22], Jim Ebert raised the issue of what is the best approach to electronically manage archeological site records. While he points out the merits of using Geographic Information Systems (GIS) as an analytic tool, it would appear that he is proposing to use such systems as the primary data storage environment. As I have discussed this issue with him at some length, I am surprised that he still holds this view. I think he correctly sees, as I do, the benefits of using GIS systems for some analysis, but this is far different from using a GIS as a general purpose data repository. Because this issue is a very important one, I feel that it is useful to outline what I believe an overall data analytic environment should be like. While this will be directed toward site records, the logic is virtually identical to excavation or surface collection data.

As Ebert alludes to, experience has overwhelmingly demonstrated that one should always buy software instead of writing it oneself. As Ebert points out, many states use systems written from the ground up, which turns out to be a very expensive process when all costs are considered. However, I also believe that no one piece of software, or hardware, can do everything. Ebert seems to be correctly proposing that writing one's own site management system is a poor idea, but I believe the evidence is against him when he argues that an application based on a GIS system can adequately fill all the relevant needs. That is, I agree with Jim that most site management systems are not nearly as useful and efficient as they should be, but we disagree as to the reason. He seems to feel that they are flawed because they are not based on GIS systems, while I believe that their quality is limited because they have been custom-written.

From a technical perspective, Ebert argues that the simple flat-file data structure of a GIS is adequate for site records, but that the relational data model is too complex for such an application. I believe that the opposite is true and that this has been amply demonstrated. A relational data structure results in higher quality data with fewer inconsistencies and errors, and is more efficient in terms of data entry, data maintenance, and overall performance. Such a data structure has been overwhelmingly shown to be easy to use and maintain. In addition to a number of SHPO offices that successfully use a relational data structure, a very large number of anthropology museums also use it for their collection data. If anything, site data are more complex than collection data, and so the benefits of a relational data structure are even greater for site records. Probably one of the best examples is the New Mexico site system. New Mexico has probably utilized GIS as intensively as any SHPO system, yet their primary data structure is not a simple GIS database, but is instead a very sophisticated and expensive relational database. That is, the system is fundamentally a relational data structure with the GIS added on. I believe this to be the correct approach.

What is frequently misunderstood is that a database itself is not an application. A huge investment in design and programming is required to provide it with the structure and tools to do what is needed. The most obvious concerns are vocabulary control, data validation, proper searching, and reporting capability. The ability to handle images of site photos, forms, maps, and other documents can now be inexpensively integrated with computerized site records. Thus, the concept of what the database actually is should be very broad. It really

consists of the underlying database engine itself, the application program, the basic data, and images. I think it is quite clear that the best environment for application development and complex site data is not a GIS, but instead an application that integrates them all.

These broad functions and many others constitute a good site record application. They are not inherent in any database, including any GIS database. To get the best functionality and the most cost-effective programs, the underlying database should be much more powerful than those integrated with a typical GIS. That does not mean that the GIS cannot be seen or designed as an "application" that accesses the same database as the basic application. However, a GIS does not have the specific functionality to handle a large and complex automated site file. Furthermore, I do not believe that spatial relations are the primary focus of site data research or use. Administrative use is extremely important, as is non-spatial statistical analysis. Finally, virtually all SHPO organizations and many others rightly integrate both historic structure and archeological site records. There are only minor roles for GIS regarding these records.

At a more technical level, there is a question of how one integrates the GIS (or other statistical package) with the basic data. There are two approaches. The first is to use the query language capability of the GIS or statistical package to access the data directly. This is the approach taken by New Mexico. Virtually all good databases will allow such an approach and it is the best one if the data are simple enough. A second approach is to "export" the data to the application after they have been manipulated. At one level, this is very inefficient as it requires an additional step. It does, however, allow the data to be stored and manipulated in very complex ways before they are exported. Of course, those who use simple data structures feel that direct query is preferable, while those with complex data see the opposite. One cannot measure the validity of the two positions without considering the underlying data and the potential for data analysis.

In summary, there are a number of agencies that use custom software for their basic site records. They allow for as much standardization as any other approach, and they serve both researcher and administrator. The relational data model has worked very well in these cases, as it does for data derived from excavation. Even though many agencies have yet to add GIS capability, they provide a successful model of how to manage site data. Other successful implementations are those that use a powerful relational database with a custom application and a GIS. SHPOs are better off looking to these examples instead of trying to build a complete solution based on a GIS as Ebert suggests.

Steven LeBlanc is with Questor Systems, Inc., of South Pasadena, Calif.

[To Top of Page](#)

COUNTERPOINT

Jim Ebert, Eric Ingbar, and Roger Werner

A reader of Steven LeBlanc's reply to our article on research into methods for automating SHPO databases [*SAA Bulletin* 12(5):13,22] who went back and looked at the original news item would sense immediately that we are in substantial agreement. Unfortunately, there are some specific differences as well, most of which we think have semantic roots. Some of LeBlanc's critique points out general weaknesses of electronic data management, which we find apt but would extend somewhat further based on our knowledge of Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and other database management techniques and software gained through many years of collective experience in this area. Some of his other perceptions seem to stem from a misunderstanding, on his part, of just what Geographic Information Systems are, and how the data contained in SHPO archives across the country are actually used. Our knowledge of the nature and uses of SHPO archives is based on nearly a year of research involving direct mail, telephone, and face-to-face contact with SHPOs, their database managers, SHPO database users, and cultural resource managers in all but a few states, as reported in the *SAA Bulletin* article.

When we began considering how SHPO archives might best be converted to computerized databases, we contacted Steve because we thought the Questor Systems software, which he developed and markets, might have a role to play in organizing SHPO's data. The Questor Systems software is relationally organized about a lexicon of words that identify items; spatial relationships are quite appropriately not important in the system. Many state site forms contain lexical entries--text entries into blanks. These convey a great deal of important information that can probably never be adequately entered as encoded or standardized data into a computer, and for this reason SHPO databases will probably always at least include past site forms, possibly in document-imaged format. The lexicon system attempts to deal with the wealth of textual description found in site files, but we think it may be too flexible since it allows unnecessary ambiguity in what should be comparable observations. The lexicon model copes with cultural records in their past and present formats, but a fundamental question is whether recording archaeological observations should continue to depend upon idiosyncratic narrative.

Most of the respondents to our surveys felt that GIS would suit their needs better than an aspatial textual database system. A lexical tool may be a desirable part of such a system but need not lie at its heart to achieve the benefits of "relationality". There seem to be two main misunderstandings between LeBlanc and us: (1) the "relationality" of GIS and other database management techniques, and (2) the rationale behind and uses of SHPO archives.

GIS means Geographic Information *Systems*. We don't interpret GIS to mean some specific kind of software, but rather an approach, and in a real way even a philosophy, for managing digital data. In a GIS approach, the "relationality" of components of the database focuses first on geographic or spatial data *as well as* allowing other links between data items. Some off-the-shelf GIS software packages come with what LeBlanc calls "flat file" data managers (for the non-spatial data associated with spatial data in the GIS). Other tabular data managers included with higher-end GIS packages, such as the Info part of Arc/Info, can be customized by the user to be "non-spatially relational" with multiple layers of lookup tables, or scrapped entirely and easily replaced by well-known RDBMS (Relational Database Management System) engines (e.g., the numerous packages capable of using SQL). There is no basis for regarding GIS approaches to SHPO database management as non-relational.

It doesn't go the other way, however. While RDBMS software can of course store spatial coordinates, a non-GIS database manager cannot in an efficient or user-friendly way relate non-spatial data items using spatial relationships. For instance, even the best non-spatial relational database managers cannot create new data layers (i.e., a map with associated tabular data) by creating buffers around points, lines, or polygons; or by joining or splitting polygons or lines and then associating tabular data from both datasets with new polygons. A GIS-centered database management system is the most, and really the *only*, appropriate way to organize data that are primarily spatial.

Contrary to what LeBlanc seems to feel, the most basic property of all data in SHPO archives is spatial location. It is nice to think that someday it will be easy to use SHPO archives for archaeological research (this will probably happen after they are converted to GIS-centered databases), but the reason these archives exist is to facilitate the fulfillment of laws and government policy that require the assessment of impacts to cultural resources on lands to be developed, mined, or otherwise disturbed. SHPO archives are universally organized around maps that show locations of cultural sites or properties, the survey projects that have been undertaken to find these sites, and the boundaries of real estate upon which assessments have been or must be made. Cultural resource managers and cultural resource firms search SHPO archives to find whether areas have been surveyed and whether sites or other cultural resources were found. Often voluminous non-spatial data is recorded for each site and project as well, but these data are primarily intended to be used to determine the one central, most important, non-spatial characteristic of sites the law requires--whether they are eligible for nomination to the National Register or whether they trigger other regulatory mandates.

Nowhere in our original article did we argue that "...a relational data model is too complex" for SHPO archives or any other purpose. LeBlanc feels that relational database structures have been "overwhelmingly shown to be easy to use and maintain." Almost every major database system (whether GIS or tabular) of which we are aware has required difficult, time-consuming labor to create. The successful systems are easy to use and maintain, but were not easy to create. Relational structures are important and are here to stay in data management. GIS should be considered a powerful tool in the relational toolbox, especially in applications such as SHPO archives that are

"map-driven." The hard work of creating a records management system is made even more laborious if one refuses to use appropriate tools, such as GIS, because of a limited conception of what these tools can and cannot do.

We wonder if it is misunderstood by anyone that a database is not an application. Certainly, much thought must be invested in developing a database structure that fulfills the needs of database users while at the same time facilitating the constant updating and maintenance that SHPO databases require. This is exactly the focus of our ongoing research on SHPO data automation.

Jim Ebert is with Ebert & Associates, Inc., Albuquerque, N.M. Eric Ingbar is with Gnomon, Inc., Carson City, Nev. Roger Werner is with Archeological Services, Inc., Stockton, Calif.

[To Top of Page](#)

LAST PAGE TABLE OF CONTENTS NEXT PAGE

Creating Cultural Resource Data Layers:

Experiences from the Nebraska Cultural Resources GIS Project Part I: Creating the Data Layers

LuAnn Wandsnider and Christopher Dore

Contents:

- [Creating Cultural Resource Data Layers](#)
 - [Archaeological Site Layer](#)
 - [Survey Block Layer](#)
 - **Site Locational Accuracy** will be in the next issue of the *SAA Bulletin*
-

In a recent *SAA Bulletin* article [12(5):13,22], Jim Ebert outlined issues regarding the conversion of statewide archaeological site databases, maintained by state historic preservation officers (SHPOs), to data layers to be included in a Geographic Information System (GIS). He identified factors that affect this conversion process, including the need for compatible databases between states, the specialized needs of individual SHPOs, and the relative low cost and wide availability of generalized GIS technology.

At the University of Nebraska, with the help of the Nebraska State Historical Society (NSHS), we have recently completed the initial conversion of the Nebraska site database to a GIS data layer. This conversion has taken place without engaging the critical issues identified by Ebert. Our strategy has been simply to bring the site and survey databases into a low-cost, easy-to-use GIS. We and those at NSHS responsible for responding to questions about the database can now experiment with the kinds of management and research questions that were previously difficult or impossible to ask but that are easily posed and answered with GIS technology. For Nebraska, the issue of compatibility with other archaeological databases has yet to be broached.

Nebraska has little federal land and no state laws governing the inventory and protection of cultural resources. For this reason, as of November 1994, information for only 5,665 archaeological sites recorded as far back as 1930 had been reported to the NSHS, which serves as the clearinghouse for information on state cultural resources. Many of the recently located sites have been reported by archaeological surveys associated with federally funded ground disturbance, especially highway improvements. The GIS conversion was supported by a grant from the Nebraska Department of Roads as part of the IS-TEA program, which recognized the need for an archaeological data layer to enable short- and long-term planning for highway construction and maintenance.

Here we report some of our conversion experiences, hoping to assist others contemplating or engaged in a similar process. Our report has two parts. First, we deal with the practical aspects of the conversion process and the lessons we learned. Second, with a cultural resource data layer in hand, the critical question becomes, "what is its accuracy?" GIS- and CAD-assisted road design is a binary operation: either the site is or is not within the planned right-of-way. It is imperative, therefore, to assess the quality of the locational information contained in the archaeological database.

As part of the Nebraska Cultural Resources GIS Project, we created two data layers, one for archaeological sites and the other for survey areas. For both tasks, we selected TNTmips (developed by MicroImages of Lincoln, Neb.), a menu-driven, PC-based product that was easy to learn, flexible enough to meet our needs (vector and raster databases can both be accommodated), and of low cost (\$5,000). It also has the ability to export the files in Arc/Info (a GIS standard) and other formats, so by building the GIS database with this software, we were not committed to the product should our needs expand beyond it.

Archaeological Site Layer

Creating the site GIS layer involved converting the extant state cultural resource database to GIS, which was relatively painless. The dBASE III+ file, containing records on 5,665 sites and maintained by the NSHS, was easily imported. For all sites, a legal description was coded, but for this locational information to be useful in the GIS, it had to be converted to the latitude/longitude graticule using a United States Geological Survey (USGS) program developed for Nebraska. For 1,371 sites, UTM zone and coordinates were available, and from these, three different layers containing sites in the three UTM zones that span Nebraska were created. From these UTM layers and the latitude/longitude layer, we developed a single site layer in the State Plane coordinate system tied to the North American 1983 Datum and employing the GRS80 ellipsoid.

As we undertook the conversion process, we became reacquainted with several critical geographic concepts: geoid, ellipsoid, datum, coordinate system, and projection. The geoid is the actual earth's surface measured at mean sea level; the ellipsoid is an elliptical approximation of the geoid that takes into account the flattening of the earth at the poles; a datum is the arbitrary origin of the graticule or grid coordinate system; a coordinate system is a numeric system for describing locations in space; and a projection is a particular way of viewing a coordinate system.

Why are these important? When we describe the locations of sites, we use either latitude and longitude or coordinates in a particular grid system, e.g., UTM and State Plane. Each descriptor has its advantages and disadvantages. On one hand, archaeologists are comfortable with the UTM coordinate system, and coordinates can be assigned with some accuracy at field locations using USGS maps. On the other hand, statewide archaeological databases span several UTM zones, creating data management problems. In addition, many other GIS layers available from other agencies are based in the latitude/longitude graticule. Interpolating longitude and latitude from a USGS map is difficult and error prone.

A wide variety of ellipsoids are in use. These, however, tend to be consistent for any given area of the globe, since an ellipsoid is chosen to provide a "best fit" for particular areas of the earth's surface (geoid).

Each coordinate system by zone has at least one datum and relies on a particular ellipsoid. Herein lies a problem for archaeologists: when we record the coordinates of a site from a paper map, we rarely record the datum or note the ellipsoid. Importantly, USGS has recently accepted a new model of the earth with projection parameters that use satellite and terrestrial data and that are therefore consistent over wider areas. Maps older than 1984 use the Clarke 1866 ellipsoid and the North American 1927 Datum; more recent maps use the GRS80 ellipsoid and North American 1983 Datum. The spatial difference for identical coordinates determined with different ellipsoid and datum parameters can be as much as 300 meters! In addition to recording UTM zone and coordinates, it is important to record the reference datum.

However, with GIS and Global Position System (GPS) receivers, coordinates can be converted to virtually any of the ellipsoids, coordinate systems, and datums. Importantly, all three of these must be specified to fix an accurate location. If a field worker is using a GPS receiver to relocate a previously recorded site, the worker must specify the appropriate parameters on the receiver. Recording the datum, ellipsoid, and coordinate system along with the site coordinates is essential both for projects using GPS equipment as well as for those working from paper maps, where this information is usually available on the map itself.

Survey Block Layer

A layer containing boundaries of 258 blocks surveyed as part of 87 projects was created through digitization. The NSHS maintains a library of survey reports in which the locations and boundaries of survey areas were reported for about half of the survey projects done in Nebraska (mostly after 1990). While an electronic report database is maintained by the SHPO, it contains no information on survey unit boundaries. Rather, this information is usually transferred to the appropriate county map at a scale of 1:126,720, which we found too coarsely resolved for our purposes.

When creating the survey area boundary layer, we relied on the more primary source, which was usually the original report. We found that photocopies of USGS or other maps included distortions of up to 100 m. Therefore, we usually transferred the reported survey polygon to a USGS quad sheet and digitized it using the UTM ticks to georeference the digitization. If USGS maps with the survey areas were available, we digitized from these. On rare occasions, high-quality photocopies were included in reports, so we digitized from these, using prominent features common to the report map and a reference quad sheet to georeference the survey polygon.

In addition to the survey of extensive blocks, numerous surveys have been conducted along road rights-of-way. A letter report with a photocopy of the county map is on file at NSHS. We are presently experimenting with ways to incorporate this information into the survey block layer other than through digitization. Under consideration is the batch processing of road segments delimited by mile-markers to which a linear ROW buffers could then be applied. Alternatively, tracing appropriate road segments as they appear on the screen is also being considered.

The accuracy of this survey boundary layer is variable, reflecting the quality of the digitizing source. Furthermore, for early work associated with the River Basin Surveys, survey boundaries and parameters are often known only through oral tradition. In the GIS data table, we include a variable that codes the quality of the digitized maps.

After we created the cultural resource layers, the next major problem to address was the accuracy of the coordinate data. The errors introduced in recording site data, the scale of the original legal descriptions, and errors inherent in UTM coordinates can affect the accuracy of data entered into the GIS layer. To address this problem, we needed to evaluate the accuracy of locational information.

Part II: Site Locational Accuracy, will be presented in the November/December issue of the SAA Bulletin.

LuAnn Wandsnider is assistant professor of anthropology at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Christopher D. Dore is a principal in the firm Archaeological Mapping Specialists and is an adjunct assistant professor of anthropology at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

[To Top of Page](#)

LAST PAGE TABLE OF CONTENTS NEXT PAGE

Finding Creative Solutions for Restructuring American Archaeology: A Summary

Catherine M. Cameron and Roger Anyon

America is changing socially, politically, and economically, and it is dramatically transforming the context within which archaeology is conducted. The SAA Executive Board's evening panel discussion in Minneapolis, "Finding Creative Solutions for Restructuring American Archaeology," sought ways for archaeologists not only to survive these troubled times, but to maximize archaeology's contribution to our post-modern world. The Board invited a panel of experts representing the diversity of archaeological practice: David Anderson (National Park Service), Don Fowler (University of Nevada-Reno), Leigh Jenkins (Hopi Tribe), Michael J. Moratto (Infotec Research), Margaret Nelson (SUNY-Buffalo), and Brona G. Simon (Massachusetts Historical Commission). The session, moderated by SAA President William Lipe, had an open mike that allowed the audience to raise important issues and suggest ways that archaeology's challenges could be met.

The discussion centered on several major themes. Education was mentioned by virtually every panelist; we need to educate ourselves and we need to educate the public about the importance of archaeology. Anderson and Moratto emphasized that most archaeologists work in Cultural Resource Management (CRM); we need to provide training relevant to CRM careers and reward individuals who excel in CRM archaeology. Nelson pointed out that the natural partnership between academia and CRM should be exploited so that students learn how to conduct research in a CRM context. She noted that academics must reeducate themselves so they can teach CRM methods and approaches to their students. Fowler described the unique continuing education program at the University of Nevada-Reno where courses have been developed to keep CRM archaeologists current with the latest methods and theories. He also emphasized the need for academics to participate in their own continuing education about developments within CRM.

The importance of public education was a recurring theme stressed by the panelists. Lipe pointed out that the past 25 years have been the Golden Age of archaeology; we have learned a tremendous amount about the past. The interested public (a group, as Lipe noted, that is growing) is our most important customer and we must package our information about the past so that it is understandable and accessible to the public. Nelson advised academics to learn to work with primary school teachers to help them teach archaeology to their young students whose minds are open to diverse views of the past. She praised SAA's Public Education Committee, whose newsletter, distributed to nearly 10,000 subscribers, contains actual lesson plans for elementary school teachers.

Simon suggested that archaeologists learn public relations, such as how to give the press information that sounds as exciting as it is. She believes that learning how to write for popular publication should be part of every archaeologist's training. Members of the audience expressed concern that so few archaeologists were making efforts to educate the public about the importance of archaeology. For example, Lynne Sebastian, New Mexico's deputy SHPO, reported that no academic archaeologists and only three of more than 50 contract companies in New Mexico took part in New Mexico's Annual Archaeology Week. Panel members agreed that public education was *every* archaeologist's duty.

As the session made clear, Native American traditional knowledge is a source of information about the past that can no longer be ignored by archaeologists. Leigh Jenkins spoke eloquently about the approaches the Hopi Tribe has taken to document their past. Using Hopi as an example, he urged archaeologists to address research questions of importance to Native Americans and employ their knowledge of the past in scientific studies. As a

cautionary note, Jenkins also stressed that archaeologists should not lose their objectivity to the pressures of political manipulation. Simon cited several examples from Massachusetts in which Native Americans and archaeologists are collaborating on projects, including a field school run jointly by a state university and a local tribe. Simon pointed out the importance of giving students the opportunity to learn *how* to learn from Native American people. Fowler advised archaeologists to work in a culturally equitable manner and noted that the University of Nevada-Reno will be offering courses with Native American instructors who will teach government archaeologists and others how to consult with the Native American community. Partnerships between Native Americans and archaeologists will be a significant part of 21st-century archaeology.

The topic that drew the most intense debate surrounded the appropriate treatment of archaeological sites, balancing the need for scientific knowledge about the past, a conservation ethic, and the realities of our changing legislative mandate. Anderson advocated preservation and stabilization of sites, rather than excavation. Both Anderson and Simon asserted that academic research should be conducted only at threatened sites, and Anderson added that superior salvage archaeology should be rewarded. Fowler encouraged the use of cooperative agreements between federal agencies and academia that allow academic research and training of students while fulfilling the requirements of federal laws. Nelson gathered an intriguing set of data demonstrating that, contrary to current criticism, less than one-fourth of archaeological dissertations were based on excavation projects conducted by students. Nelson's study also showed that the use of museum data for dissertation research has doubled in the past two years. Nelson's study indicated that ethical concerns about excessive excavation have had an effect on academic training.

In a query from the audience, Keith Kintigh, SAA secretary, wondered whether we needed a more dramatic shake-up of our public archaeology program than had been suggested by the panel. Moratto's response was affirmative. He noted that approximately \$450 million is spent each year on archaeology and the results are unsatisfactory. Thousands of dollars are spent to excavate sites on some projects where the recovered data are redundant or unexciting, while other projects are so poorly funded that highly significant sites are given perfunctory or incomplete treatment. Moratto suggested that the current revision of the Section 106 regulations (36 CFR Part 800) is an opportunity to change CRM archaeology from a project-driven focus to one that is research-driven. He proposed the establishment of regional research boards to set research agendas for the decade to come. These research boards would screen federal undertakings and recommend archaeological excavation where the greatest knowledge could be gained from this type of operation. Project proponents would be required to contribute a small portion of the cost for each project to a "bank" that would fund such research. Moratto noted that this process would not only maximize archaeological knowledge, but it would also give developers and other project proponents what they want: reasonable costs and predictability.

The audience discussion touched on a number of other topics. In response to concerns about the delays that archaeology might cause to much-needed projects, both Moratto and Simon pointed out that the flexibility in our current regulations (and in some cases, state law) should allow agencies to prevent such delays. Audience members also raised the problem of federal contracts being let to the "lowest bidder." Anderson contended that it was the responsibility of the federal employee with oversight of the project to bring inadequate products to the attention of the agency's contracting officer, who has the ability to withhold payment. Anderson also suggested that the new CRM organization (American Cultural Resources Association) may improve the policing of firms that conduct contract archaeology.

"Finding Creative Solutions for Restructuring American Archaeology" was well received. We heard many positive comments on the directions proposed by the panelists during discussion. The Executive Boards is considering developing another session for the 1996 Annual Meeting in New Orleans. "Restructuring II" might include more time devoted to audience participation and/or a more focused discussion on one or a few topics. Any ideas? Please contact SAA Executive Director Ralph Johnson by October 15 by writing SAA, 900 Second St. N.E. #12, Washington, DC 20002-3557, (202) 789-8200, fax (202) 789-0284.

Catherine Cameron is with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. Roger Anyon is with the Zuni Tribe's Heritage and Historic Preservation Office. Both are also members of the SAA Executive Board.

[To Top of Page](#)

Student Affairs Committee

Alicia L. Wise

Post-Summer Regrouping

Welcome home from the field or out of the lab and back to glorious academia. Now is a good time for us to regroup and organize ourselves for upcoming projects. If you are around and interested in being **involved**, please drop a note to the email or airmail addresses below.

Current Projects

The committee meeting in Minneapolis was very successful this year, with approximately 10 people attending. This included Barbara Stark, our liaison with the Executive Board, and Sarah Bayne, our liaison with the SAA head office. Thanks to all who attended and for all the good ideas that were generated!

Brochure for New Student Members -- Volunteers are being sought to help create a handy, helpful guide for new student members of SAA. The deadline is quickly approaching, so please contact us with your ideas and enthusiasm. We are especially looking for people to contribute on the following topics:

- Volunteering at the annual meetings
- Student and New Member reception at annual meetings
- Benefits of receiving the *SAA Bulletin*
- Interviewing at annual meetings through the Employment Service Center
- Other perks of SAA membership (e.g., networking with professors, attending/organizing symposia, receiving *American Antiquity* or *Latin American Antiquity*, etc.)
- Thematic roundtable luncheons at the meetings
- Presenting meeting papers
- Your experiences with the Student Affairs Committee (e.g., as a campus representative, Internet liaison, or liaison to other committees).
- Other SAA resources of interest to students.

Thanks!

Sixty-one people attended the thematic roundtable luncheons organized by Louise Senior of the University of Arizona and the Student Affairs Committee. Thirteen professionals volunteered their time, energy, and the luncheon fee to facilitate these tables: David Anderson, Meg Conkey, Carole Crumley, Dena Dincauze, Bill Doelle, Christine Hastorf, David Meltzer, Nancy Parezo, Anne Pyburn, Michael Schiffer, Karen Vitelli, Bernard Wailes, and John Yellen. **Thank you** to all the participants, the faculty facilitators, and especially to Louise Senior for a complicated job well done.

New Contact Address

We are looking forward to hearing from you. Please contact the Student Affairs Committee to ask questions, re-establish contact, or to volunteer. Address until November 1995: Department of Archaeology Sciences, University of Bradford, Bradford, W. Yorks, England BD7 1DP, 011-44-1274-383547, fax 011-44-1274-385190,

email A.L.Wise@bradford.ac.uk. Address from December 1995: Department of Anthropology CB3115, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC 2759903115, (919) 962-1243, fax (919) 962-1613, email Wise@email.unc.edu.

Alicia Wise is a student in the Anthropology Department of the University of North Carolina.

[To Top of Page](#)

LAST PAGE TABLE OF CONTENTS NEXT PAGE

A Virtual Computer Imaging Technique for Archaeological Research

Philip Peterson, F. David Fracchia, and Brian Hayden

Contents:

- [Visualization in archaeology](#)
 - [Visualization at the Keatley Creek Site](#)
 - [Methods](#)
 - [Virtual reconstruction](#)
 - [Spatial data display](#)
 - [Light availability](#)
 - [Results](#)
 - [Future Work](#)
 - [Acknowledgments](#)
-

The study of prehistoric architectural remains generally includes consideration of how different areas of a structure were utilized. This type of analysis can be important in developing models of social organization of the site's former inhabitants. In the case presented here, we describe how computer graphics techniques make it possible to incorporate the display of artifact data distributions into the structural and environmental context of site architecture (specifically, a prehistoric pithouse) in order to assist in the modeling of socioeconomic organization. We have found that visualizing excavation data in this manner can be a valuable aid in the identification of correlations between the spatial distribution of artifacts and significant site features, as well as a useful tool for identifying architectural constraints on usage areas.

Visualization in Archaeology

Computer graphics techniques are increasingly being used to visualize complex data in archaeological investigation. In recent years, several projects involving the creation of detailed virtual reconstructions of archaeological sites have been undertaken. In these applications, a three-dimensional (3D) computer graphics model of the site is constructed and viewed using standard modeling, rendering, and animation techniques.

Some of the most well-known examples of virtual reconstruction have involved the application of computer graphics techniques in the recreation of historical architecture. Initially applied to the modeling of the temple precinct of Roman Bath, these techniques were later refined and applied to the more ambitious modeling of the Saxon Minster of Winchester (Reilly, *IBM Systems Journal*, 28(4):569-579, 1989). A later project, the modeling of the Furness Abbey (Delooze and Wood, *Computer and Quantitative Methods in Archaeology*, pp. 141-148, Oxford, 1990), expanded on the techniques pioneered in the earlier efforts and offered interactive viewing capabilities, although at a fairly low degree of realism.

Recent efforts in virtual reconstruction have produced increasingly photorealistic results. A detailed model of the Dresden Frauenkirche, destroyed during the Second World War, has been used to create a high-resolution, computer-generated film (Collins, *IEEE Computer Graphics and Applications*, pp. 13-15, Nov. 1993). Unlike most archaeological sites where the only source of data is the site itself, original plans and photographs of the

architecture existed on which to base the model. One of the outstanding features of this reconstruction is the attention paid to the recreation of interior lighting and surface detail, evoking in the viewer a *sense* of the architectural space. Attention to detail and accurate surface characteristics are also evident in the virtual reconstruction of the Visir tomb in Egypt (Palamidese *et al.*, *IEEE Proceedings of Visualization '93*, pp. 420-423, Oct. 1993). In both of these cases, the visualization is not the ultimate goal; rather, it is a part of a process leading to the physical reconstruction of the site.

Computer graphics techniques have also been applied to the analysis of archaeological sites. In particular, the ability to visually relate the distribution of data to surface characteristics has proven useful in the identification of spatial correlations. This technique can be extended to include less tangible features such as viewsheds (the regions of a scene not obscured to the viewer by occluding features) and solar paths (the apparent path of the sun for a given date and time with respect to the viewer). While less physical than surface characteristics, these environmental factors are nonetheless important. Analyses of these features have been applied in architecture, and have potential application in archaeology.

The computer modeling approach that we have employed also opens up a new potential for analyzing artifact concentrations that may be related to uneven surfaces, such as wall slopes, shallow depressions in the floor, raised floor areas, and areas of partial roof collapse. A 3D model that includes main structural supports also facilitates the assessment of areas in which activity would be restricted and which might therefore be reserved for other purposes such as storage. Visual display of selected types of artifact concentrations in such a 3D setting make these organizational considerations very easy to recognize.

Visualization at the Keatley Creek Site

The Keatley Creek site in British Columbia, Canada, consists of over 100 cultural depressions, several of which have been fully excavated since 1986. The majority of these depressions are the remains of pithouse dwellings that were occupied from 1,100 to over 2,400 years ago. The case we present here describes the virtual reconstruction of one of the largest of these dwellings, with a rim diameter of approximately 19 m.

Methods

The tools and techniques used to create this visualization range from the manual collection of data to the use of commercial software to render some of the more detailed images. The interactive application described in this paper is a custom program written by the authors using Silicon Graphics OpenInventor(TM) toolkit. The pithouse model can be imported from this application into commercial software available from Alias Research Inc.(TM) in order to generate higher-quality images at noninteractive rates. Although the software used to model the pithouse can be used on other platforms, it would likely run more slowly and produce less realistic results. Archaeologists can also use other less powerful, but still useful, modeling and rendering software packages that are commercially available for most computer platforms at increasingly lower prices.

Virtual reconstruction

In constructing the model, the focus was on creating a visual representation that conveyed the major structural features, yet was simple enough to navigate at interactive rates on a Silicon Graphics Indigo² workstation. Features that were not necessary to convey the basic architectural shape were intentionally left out, including the intricate roof thatching and other decorative details.

The floor was reconstructed from survey data by fitting a non-uniform rational b-spline (NURB) surface that interpolated known surface points ([Figure 1a](#)). Due to the irregular nature of this surface and its lack of symmetry, the reconstruction of the floor was an unusually complex task given the current software. Beams, posts, and joists were modeled as simple cylinders of varying thickness. Their orientation was based on archaeological data, such as evidence (earth coloration, preserved wood fibers, etc.) indicating the size and placement of both vertical posts on the pithouse floor and major and minor beams pinned to the edge of the

structure ([Figure 1b](#)). Ethnohistoric descriptions of pithouses were used to amplify the details. Given the archaeological data, an architectural study provided further information indicating the most probable height of the posts and the incline of the beams necessary to maintain structural integrity, as well as the proper width, length and distribution of the joists crossing the beams that support the roof ([Figure 1c](#)).

The roof covering of the 3D model was constructed from simple polygonal patches. The vertices of the patches were simply the positions that the posts, beams and joists intersected, offset so that the roof sat upon the underlying structure. In order to achieve more realism, the patches were randomly perturbed and texture mapped; that is, a two-dimensional (2D) image of a thatch-like texture was mapped to the polygons ([Figure 1d](#)).

In addition to the major structural components of the pithouse, simple representations of significant interior features are included. In [Figure 2](#), spheres on the pithouse floor indicate hearth locations and black disks denote storage pits.

The user can move in, out, and around the model in real time by steering a virtual camera using a mouse. The standard display is in the first-person (that is, the user's virtual point of view), and the interaction method used does not require the user to change focus away from the model. Allowing the user to move about the structure serves two purposes. First, it provides a convenient method for a user-selected view of the data. Second, it can provide a sense of space within the 3D model and aid in delimiting the bounds of the structure. In addition, an orthographic overview of the floor can be displayed simultaneously.

Spatial data display

Most artifact data at this site were recorded as discrete counts within square regions, determined using standard archaeological methodology (Spafford, Master's thesis, Simon Fraser University, Department of Archaeology, 1991). Two meter-wide strips were drawn vertically and horizontally, sectioning the site. Each square region was subdivided into 16 numbered subsquares (50 x 50 cm each), for which artifact counts were recorded.

Conventional 2D distribution plots of the pithouse data display the artifact frequencies using a limited number of shades of gray (the darker the shade, the higher the number) and superimposed over significant interior features such as hearths and storage pits ([Figure 3](#)). Although the plots do provide an archaeologist with a tool for analyzing the data, the context is restricted to 2D spatial information. Furthermore, the superimposed shaded squares are opaque and obscure underlying features such as postholes, hearths, and pits. This, along with the limited shades of gray, makes overlaying multiple distributions difficult if not impossible without loss of information. It is also difficult to visualize how artifacts mapped on standard 2D plots may have varied across irregular surfaces such as lower or upper wall slopes (where some artifacts appear to have been stored) versus flat floor areas. In general, 2D plots must omit many types of relevant data and can take painstaking efforts to decipher.

As in the conventional plot, artifact distributions in our model are plotted as discrete counts associated with the excavated subsquares. However, each artifact type is given a unique user-defined color, and its frequency is reflected in the transparency of each colored square; the higher the frequency, the greater the opacity. The color of a square is determined by linearly interpolating (blending) the colors of all those artifacts and the pithouse features (terrain, interior, architecture) that coincide with that square, using their associated transparencies. Thus, it is possible to distinguish between several distributions on a single plot. (Unfortunately it is difficult to distinguish between the colors of each distinct artifact distribution once the color image is converted to a greyscale image. The reader is referred to the original article which contains the color images: Peterson *et al.*, *IEEE Computer Graphics and Applications*, 15(4): 41-46, July 1995.)

Our approach moves even further beyond traditional methods by placing the data in a 3D perspective view of the reconstructed pithouse ([Figure 4](#)). This provides the user with a tool for examining the correlation between the artifacts and significant architectural features.

Light availability

A characteristic feature of pithouse architecture is the central smoke-hole ([Figure 2](#)). This opening at the apex of the roof structure is the only source of natural light in the dwelling. This limitation suggests the hypothesis that use of different areas of the floor was subject, at least partially, to the availability of working light.

A single light source is modeled to approximate the illuminated areas of the house interior. Specifically, the model takes into account the beam of direct sunlight entering the smoke-hole as well as a small amount of sunlight scattered by the atmosphere ([Figure 5a](#)). The light source is modeled as a spotlight having a cone-shaped beam whose width, when entering the pithouse, approximates the area of the smoke-hole ([Figure 5b](#)). By changing the angle of the cone, the light distribution varies to approximate the direct and scattered sunlight. [Figure 5c](#) illustrates, with the aid of fog effects, the cone of light as it enters the 3D pithouse model and illuminates the floor.

The path of the sun is calculated for the site and can be specified to correspond to a given date. The user can then interactively model the daily motion of the light to see its relation to data distributions on the floor surface ([Figure 4](#)). While this method does not produce an accurate model of actual sunlight distribution, it does provide a useful approximation for data exploration.

Results

In the case presented here, we have used 3D computer graphics techniques to integrate the display of spatial data into a model of a prehistoric pithouse. This has provided us with some valuable insight into the effects that the structure of a pithouse can have on *usage* areas within the dwelling. By viewing artifacts in their original context, we were able to more readily identify potential relationships between artifact distribution and the pithouse structure.

Artifact data from the Keatley Creek excavation are probably the most detailed and comprehensive ever collected from a site of this type. Various hypotheses exist relating the spatial distribution of these artifact types to areas of the pithouse floor. In order to visualize how particular data distributions relate to the site, distributions were layered onto the surface model of the floor ([Figure 4](#)). Using the 3D model has the advantage of making any relationships to surface slope immediately obvious. For example, 3D displays can show when a high density of artifacts is found on a wall slope, which may indicate a probable storage area.

While the analysis of spatial relationships between data and floor position has proved useful, we have found that the most insightful information from this visualization comes as a result of considering the constraints the structure imposes on usage areas. Analysis of an orthographic projection of bifaces, heavily retouched scrapers, and debitage revealed that the bifaces tended to be distributed in the central region close to the hearths, which supports the common assumption that they were associated with food preparation. The scrapers are more concentrated around approximately two-thirds of the perimeter of the floor and on wall slopes, possibly indicating that they were set aside in storage locations near the wall for safe-keeping and later re-use. Debitage, being the by-product of several processes, is scattered throughout the floor with the densest concentrations at the periphery. While not identifiable in the 2D plot, it is readily seen in [Figures 2](#) and [4](#) that the ceiling height at the edge is quite low, and therefore this area could not have been useful for much more than sleeping, tasks performed while sitting, or storage. These constraints on movement can best be appreciated in a 3D model by the introduction of scale human figures.

Another form of architectural constraint inherent in the pithouse structure is the availability of working light. Since the only source of natural light is the smoke-hole, we have approximated how much of the interior would be lit at a given time of day. By examining both orthographic distributions and 3D views ([Figure 4](#)), it is apparent that heavily retouched scrapers are more dominant in the area lit by the midday sun. This would suggest that these artifacts are associated with work requiring some visual acuity.

Future Work

While the use of computer graphics as a visualization technique in archaeology is becoming more common, there are still many possibilities for further research. In particular, the case presented here can be augmented in several ways. Our research up to this point has concentrated on creating a model of major structural features only. We have taken this approach for two reasons. First, it was necessary to minimize the complexity of the model in order to maintain interactivity on available hardware. Second, the structural factors we were most interested in studying did not require significant structural complexity. With access to faster hardware, more detailed features could be incorporated without sacrificing display speed or interactivity.

While the simple lighting model implemented thus far has proven useful, the development of a more accurate model that also accounts for light from multiple hearths would provide a better basis for work area theories. Furthermore, the positioning of human figures of various statistical proportions within the structure would aid in determining whether certain hypothesized tasks could be performed (without colliding with the roof, for example). These figures may also provide a better sense of space within the model. A further enhancement would be to implement the model in a virtual reality (VR) environment. In addition to providing the user with a sense of the architectural space, VR techniques have great potential for integrating the display of data in the context of a computer model.

A much more difficult visualization problem is the perceptual limitations which arise from the combination of multiple artifact distributions, interior features, architectural structures, the terrain model, and sunlight. In our model, the ground elevation provides shading, the beams, posts and roof are texture-mapped, the pits and hearths are colored, the artifact distributions have color and transparency, and the lighting model affects intensity. The challenge is to determine methods of blending such features together such that the information provided by each component is not lost. For example, the lighting model can greatly affect the intensity, and thus perceived transparency, of the squares. One possible solution is the use of glyphs, such as a pie chart for each subsquare that is divided into the various types of artifacts. Another is to divide the subsquare into smaller subregions that are assigned to specific artifact types.

It would be of interest to integrate the visualization model with the underlying data such that it is not just a passive display device, but also a tool for querying data and performing statistical functions. For example, using the mouse to choose a particular subsquare could result in the textual or graphical display of the incident artifacts. Aside from greatly facilitating research and analysis, the creation of interactive, virtual 3D models of prehistoric structures has obvious pedagogical values both for classroom uses, distance educational programs, special presentations, and interpretive centers. These are significant advantages that can more than repay the initial high cost of developing the database.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported in part by Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) research and equipment grants and a post-graduate scholarship.

Philip Peterson and F. David Fracchia are in the School of Computing Science and Brian Hayden is in the Department of Archaeology at Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, B.C.

[To Top of Page](#)

LAST PAGE TABLE OF CONTENTS NEXT PAGE

Exchanges -- Interamerican Dialogue

Between Crisis and Hope: Archaeology in Ecuador

Ernesto Salazar

Contents:

- [The Ecuadorian Archaeological Establishment](#)
 - [The Instituto de Patrimonio Cultural](#)
 - [The Ecuadorian State, the Public, and the Cultural Resources](#)
 - [Ecuadorian Archaeologists and their Foreign Colleagues](#)
 - [Achievements and Expectations of Ecuadorian Archaeology](#)
-

As in many Latin American countries, archaeology in Ecuador is the Cinderella of the sciences, except she has yet to find her prince to pick up her crystal slipper.

Ecuador is a country rich in archaeological resources, with a chronology extending from Paleoindian times to the Inka conquest. The country also has a vast legacy of historical monuments that, unfortunately, have been ignored in archaeological investigations.

Precolumbian archaeology in Ecuador is more than 100 years old, but from a historic perspective, it is disjointed. In terms of chronology, the Formative Period has been studied most intensively, but primarily only on the coast. Other prehistoric periods have received only superficial attention, with most information coming from old excavations and private collections; these studies have emphasized the study of ceramics rather than the resolution of theoretical problems. Geographically, only a few provinces, particularly those along the coast, have been subjected to systematic research. There are entire provinces in the Sierra and Amazon regions that have never been subjected to a regional archaeological survey. It is therefore no exaggeration to state that half the country has yet to receive any systematic archaeological investigation. This is a shame, since the structure of the state itself requires continuity with its Precolumbian past, which should provide an incentive for archaeological research.

Ecuador is a country in search of its cultural identity. The media constantly spreads, and outwardly promotes, foreign traditions that are detrimental to the local heritage with its deep Precolumbian roots. As a consequence, the country has generally underestimated the importance of archaeological research and knowledge of our past. For example, it is inconceivable that the country continues to build its national origin on the hypothetical Precolumbian reign of Quito, whose existence has not been demonstrated by either history or archaeology, while at the same time ignoring 10,000 years of cultural history in which Ecuadorians should take pride. On the other hand, the powerful indigenous movement that has recently influenced the political life of the country needs to have a clear identification with the Precolumbian past. Archaeological research can clarify the past of Ecuadorian ethnic groups so that they can establish their rights in a white-mestizo culture. Some groups have already successfully used archaeological and historical evidence to establish their territorial rights. Finally, I should point out that Ecuador is planning its future on tourism, which increases yearly. This could be a great

opportunity for the development of archaeological research, particularly considering the fact that major tourist countries (e.g., Spain, Mexico, Peru) base a good part of their tourist attraction on their archaeological resources.

The Ecuadorian Archaeological Establishment

Ecuadorian archaeology is represented by two groups of people who differ greatly in their contributions and academic standards. The first group consists of national archaeologists, who until the 1970s were amateurs and self-taught scholars working on their own, publishing articles in newspapers or producing an occasional descriptive work. Certainly, archaeologists such as J. Jijon y Caamaño or Emilio Estrada exceeded the academic level of their fellow countrymen. However, there is a significant lack of theoretical models in the scientific contributions made by Ecuadorian archaeologists, and research is still at the level of theoretical inquiry that Taylor calls "Historiography." This tendency began to change in the 1970s, when the first Ecuadorian archaeologists trained in academic settings emerged prepared to address the theoretical and methodological problems of the Precolumbian past.

The other group of Ecuadorian archaeologists consists of foreign professionals or doctoral candidates conducting research in Ecuador. They have temporarily made this country the center of their research, generally financed by universities or cultural institutions from abroad. It is not surprising, therefore, that most of the scientific contributions about the Ecuadorian past have been made by this group. Ecuadorian archaeologists represent less than 10 percent of the total number of archaeologists who have worked in the country. Because science does not recognize political frontiers, we do not disparage the contributions made by our foreign colleagues. However, our country needs national archaeologists to discover and study our cultural past, thereby strengthening the national identity.

Until the 1970s, the country did not have an academic center for training archaeologists. In the early 1980s, the Department of Anthropology at the Universidad Católica, the only one of its kind in the country and one which was traditionally indifferent to archaeological research, introduced an archaeological curriculum that responded to the need to more closely link archaeology to anthropology than to history. Likewise, the Escuela Politécnica del Litoral established its School of Archaeology (now the Center for Archaeological and Anthropological Studies) for training professionals from the entire Andean region, although ultimately all of its pupils were Ecuadorian. Both centers offer degrees equivalent to a North American B.A. However, the Escuela has now practically closed its doors, while the Department of Anthropology at the Universidad Católica only recently began to include archaeology in its curriculum. Other research initiatives in the early 1980s include the Centro de Investigaciones Arqueológicas, no longer active after the death of its founder, the Ecuadorian archaeologist Padre Pedro Porras; a foundation called the Programa de Antropología para el Ecuador, also inactive since the death of its founder; and the ECUABEL Project, an experimental program between Ecuador and Belgium for the restoration of historical monuments and archaeological research, which is also no longer active. Finally, the Museo del Banco Central established an archaeological research program that had the best financial support in the country, but which is now inactive due to economic reasons and internal conflicts. By this time in the 1980s, foreign archaeologists became interested in conducting research in Ecuador. This allowed for the extension of the archaeological map, which before 1970 was restricted to the central Sierra region, the Santa Elena Peninsula, and the north coast, while the Amazon region was known only through the works of Evans and Meggers along the Napo River. Especially notable are the Columbia University investigations of the Santa Elena Peninsula; the University of Illinois, which studied the Formative Period along the coast; the Spanish investigation of Ingapirca and the province of Esmeraldas; the German mission that worked in Cochasquí in 1965; and the French mission's survey of the province of Loja.

The dissemination of national archaeological work has been scattered in journals that are irregularly published and not exclusively dedicated to archaeology. In the early part of the century, the "official" medium of archaeological research was the *Boletín de la Sociedad Ecuatoriana de Estudios Históricos-Americanos*, which gathered the works of researchers trained in the shadow of González Suárez. When the Academia Nacional de Historia and its new *Boletín* were established, they actually preferred to publish archaeological research. However, the frequency of archaeological articles decreased over the years, and now has almost ceased completely. The "old" *Boletín de Informaciones Científicas Nacionales*, sporadically produced by La Casa de la

Cultura Ecuatoriana, published numerous archaeological articles, primarily during the 1940s. The *Cuadernos de Arqueología e Historia* that appeared in Guayaquil in 1951 were at one point the platform for several amateurs and professional archaeologists, until their circulation stopped. The same thing happened in the 1960s to the journal *Humanitas* of the Universidad Central, which published many pioneering works on the Ecuadorian Paleoindian period. In the 1980s, there was the *Miscelánea Antropológica Ecuatoriana*, published by the Museo del Banco Central, which promised to be a permanent platform for Ecuadorian archaeology. However, few Ecuadorian archaeologists published in this journal; its publication was habitually late until it finally disappeared. There are currently some journals, such as *Revista de Antropología* (Casa de la Cultura-Cuenca), *Antropología Ecuatoriana* (Casa de la Cultura-Quito), *Sarance* (Instituto Otavaleño de Antropología), and *Memoria* (Marka), which publish some articles on archaeology. However, Ecuadorian archaeology has not been able to produce its own journal.

Ecuadorian archaeology has not been very successful in the arena of professional relationships. An attempt in the 1980s to establish the Sociedad Ecuatoriana de Arqueología failed, as have several conferences and symposia that, professionally, have meant little to Ecuadorian archaeologists. Until 1975, most of these meetings were attended mainly by amateurs in archaeology. The so-called *Primer Congreso Ecuatoriano de Arqueología* (Ibarra, 1976) was not national nor archaeological, and it held little importance to the profession. The two *Encuentros para la Defensa del Patrimonio Nacional* organized by the Universidad de Guayaquil have yet to discuss the defense of the archaeological legacy of the country, which lately has been the victim of depredation. In comparison, the symposia that have been relevant to the profession have been the *Primer Simposio de Correlaciones Antropológicas Andino-Mesoamericano* (Salinas, 1971, with late publication in 1982), the *Coloquio Carlos Cevallos Menéndez* (Guayaquil, 1982), the congress *Diez Años de Arqueología Ecuatoriana* (Cuenca, 1988), and the *Encuentro Ecuatoriano-Colombiano sobre Culturas Comunes* (Esmeraldas, 1990), the last three without any supporting publications. Finally, the international symposium *Arqueología Sudamericana: una Reevaluación del Formativo*, sponsored by the National Geographic Society and the Smithsonian Institution, took place in Cuenca in 1992, inexplicably without the presence of Ecuadorian archaeologists.

The cessation of the research program sponsored by the Museo del Banco Central was a heavy blow to archaeology in this country. Currently, there is no institution for financing archaeological research projects, which has created a major crisis in Ecuadorian archaeology that does not appear as if it will be solved in the near future. Consequently, archaeology in Ecuador has regressed to its state in the 1960s, when most of the research was accomplished by foreigners.

The Instituto de Patrimonio Cultural

The legal body responsible for the management of archaeological resources is the Instituto Nacional de Patrimonio Cultural (INPC), which was not created until 1978 even though state laws regarding cultural heritage date back to 1945. The lack of funds and personnel with which to enforce the law has been a great handicap for the INPC, which has witnessed the destruction of archaeological sites, the work of many archaeologists without a required permit, and the intrusion of other state agencies in the management of archaeological resources. Fortunately, things are starting to change. The Dirección de Arqueología of the INPC has established new rules for archaeological research, which include supervision by an archaeologist of the INPC, required submission of reports to the INPC, and the restriction of archaeological materials taken abroad for analyses that cannot be done within the country. Furthermore, regulations have been established so that local, national, and transnational organizations include archaeological investigations as part of their development projects. Compliance with these new laws has been halfhearted, and in most cases the organizations do not concern themselves with the quality of the research. The oil companies, for example, have not published any archaeological reports, and in some cases, they do not even employ the right personnel for the research. It is well known that a psychologist was once hired to conduct archaeological research in their area. In a laudable gesture, the Dirección de Arqueología has been involved in an incentive program for the private sector and local state organizations (i.e., provincial advisory boards) so that they will invest their funds in archaeological research. Certainly, the funds that are obtained are generally small, but it is nonetheless important that small organizations become involved in the recovery and preservation of archaeological resources. At the individual level, the INPC still has a great task ahead to increase preservation awareness in the population. For example, it is very common for private land

owners to refrain from reporting an archaeological site for fear that their property will be expropriated, or they fail to report the looting of a site to avoid becoming involved in a lawsuit.

The Ecuadorian State, the Public, and the Cultural Resources

The Ecuadorian state has maintained an ambiguous position on cultural resources, with actions based more on the personal ethics of the government functionaries than on any real policy for the protection of these resources. The erratic management of the resources is clearly demonstrated by several events. In the 1980s, the Ecuadorian government was involved in a long but successful judicial dispute with Italy over the repatriation of 10,000 Precolumbian pieces taken out of the country by an antique dealer. In contrast, in 1990 the government wanted to initiate an irrigation project involving the construction of a dam for the Culebrillas Lagoon, which is the mythical place of origin of the Cañari. The dam would have raised the water level by 25 m, which meant that part of the Inka road and several Precolumbian buildings would have been flooded. Curiously, the Minister of Education and Culture and the director of the INPC authorized this construction, ignoring other alternatives that would have avoided destruction of this archaeological legacy. As might be expected, Ecuadorian archaeologists were strongly opposed to the project, and were able to stop it. This incident was highly significant for two reasons: for the first time in the history of the country, an ethnic group, the Cañaris, vigorously defended their sacred lagoon; and also for the first time, an archaeological issue, the preservation of Precolumbian remains, was debated in Congress. The state has spent great sums of money on the acquisition of archaeological artifacts and on the establishment of the Museo del Banco Central, the best equipped in the country. Unfortunately, the museum, which for many years was the source of appreciation of Precolumbian cultures, has been closed for five years. Last April, the press reported that one of the most important Precolumbian gold collections, which had been sent by the Museo del Banco Central to be exhibited in several European countries, had been abandoned in a storage facility in Italy, and that museum authorities were not concerned with either its preservation or its repatriation.

The lack of state interest in archaeological resources is reflected in the actions and attitudes of the general population. A survey made by the Department of Anthropology of the Universidad Católica showed that the average citizen has only a vague notion of the contributions of archaeology to the reinforcement of the national identity, and has never visited an archaeological site nor read about the past of the country. This is mainly due to the inadequate teaching of archaeology in the schools. In general, texts rely on research conducted in the 1920s and 1930s and present a diffused view of archaeology that does not contribute in a positive manner to the understanding of Ecuadorian cultural history. The lack of comprehension is such that it is frequent for well-intentioned teachers, unaware of the laws, to send their students to archaeological sites to bring back objects for the school "museum," which, as might be expected, is rarely open. Similarly, the exposure of Ecuadorian archaeology by the media is almost nonexistent. Occasionally, the newspapers have an article about an archaeological site (invariably Ingapirca, Rumiucucho, or La Tolita), usually with the same conceptual errors that characterize the textbooks. Television offers nothing on this subject, for the simple reason that there are no educational programs in Ecuador. For an archaeologist, publishing a scientific article in the press implies having a circle of friends that includes a reporter who can give him or her media exposure. The overall situation can be attributed to the lack of scientific journals in Ecuador and to the mistaken notion that the general public is not interested in archaeology.

Ecuadorian Archaeologists and Their Foreign Colleagues

In 1972, Evans and Meggers reported in *American Antiquity* that a type of archaeological "imperialism" seemed to characterize the relationship between North American archaeologists and their Latin American colleagues. Time has passed and the manifestations of this imperialism have decreased in favor of an integration between archaeologists on both sides of the Río Grande. For example, the largest archaeological society in the United States, the Society for American Archaeology, has founded a journal dedicated exclusively to Latin American archaeology, and has established a low-cost subscription to *American Antiquity* for Latin American archaeologists.

A better understanding of our situation as Ecuadorian archaeologists would encourage a more fluid scientific relationship with us. Our North American colleagues often fail to recognize that it is difficult to be a scientist in a developing country. Like all Latin American archaeologists, Ecuadorian researchers generally receive very low salaries and it is almost impossible to dedicate time to writing specialized literature. The acquisition of books and subscriptions to specialized journals have to be made with personal funds, and this is not always possible for professionals who are working two or three jobs just to support themselves. In the United States, this situation could be easily resolved by a trip to the library. Unfortunately, our libraries primarily consist of "donations," of which archaeological donations are the least frequent.

Consequently, the Ecuadorian archaeologist increasingly falls behind on the knowledge of what is current in the profession. This situation is aggravated by the numerous colleagues from the United States and other countries who do research in Ecuador yet never submit the research results to their Ecuadorian colleagues or to a library in Ecuador. Because of this situation, it is not surprising that some foreign archaeologists do not consider their Ecuadorian peers to be genuine scientists. Many times, the relationship lasts only until the Ecuadorian archaeologist tells them about interesting sites, and then they disappear and are never seen again.

Fortunately, this attitude is not widespread. There are some foreign Ecuadorianists who maintain a very close relationship with us, not only in the professional realm, but in the personal one as well. Some North American archaeologists constantly "feed" us with books, reprints of their articles, copies of articles written by those who do not send anything, and sometimes they even surprise us with a welcome gift in the form of a subscription to a journal. At the regional level, Ecuadorian archaeologists maintain very good relations with our Colombian colleagues, with whom we have participated in joint symposiums. With our Peruvian colleagues, however, this relationship is almost nonexistent. It is a shame that political reasons have not allowed for a greater exchange with these professionals, who are linked to us not only by common research interests but also by the same cultural heritage.

The relationship between us and our North American colleagues could be positively reinforced with simple actions. An archaeological association in the United States would not be impoverished if it were to send a permanent subscription of its journals to the Biblioteca Nacional or to the Biblioteca del Banco Central. Nor would an organization that is sponsoring a symposium on Ecuadorian archaeology be hindered by occasionally sending an Ecuadorian archaeologist to learn from and to share ideas with the colleagues whom they admire and whose literature they read. Finally, the participation of Ecuadorian archaeologists in projects supervised by their North American colleagues would further encourage professional integration. By this, I do not refer to the hiring of Ecuadorian field workers, which is already a requirement of the INPC, but to the participation of Ecuadorian scholars in more demanding positions in research projects.

Achievements and Expectations of Ecuadorian Archaeology

In spite of the difficulties of the last two decades, Ecuadorian archaeology has taken some giant steps forward, producing results that would greatly surprise an observer from the 1970s. The study of early hunter-gatherers was stimulated in the 1960s with the excavation of the El Inga site, but interest in this area of research has not continued. Even though investigation of the Las Vegas culture provides us with a complete image of hunter-gatherers along the coast, there are still many questions about the initial peopling of the country, the lifeways of these hunter-gatherers in the three ecosystems of Ecuador, and their transition to an agricultural way of life. Clearly, a systematic survey of the country in search of its earliest inhabitants is urgently needed. The Formative Period on the coast, particularly the Valdivia culture, has been studied from all the angles, including chronology, the origins of the ceramics, the origin of agriculture, settlement patterns, geographic distribution, iconography, and so forth. Much less attention has been given to the Machalilla and Chorrera cultures, for which the available information comes from early excavations. Investigations of Formative Period occupation in areas away from the coast have been confined to the few Formative sites in the Sierra and Amazon regions. The excellent research at the site of Pirincay, where Chorrera ceramics from the Upano River valley, and from the north of Peru, *Spondylus* shells and semiprecious stones from the coast, and evidence of the introduction of camelids has been found, demonstrates that this type of research can be very productive.

The subsequent Precolumbian periods of Regional Development and Integration have been studied from two different points of view. First, there is the study of regional exchange, which is a wide-open field of research at the moment since the exchange of *Spondylus* shell and obsidian is only currently being initiated. Second, there is research on the complex societies that characterize these periods. In Ecuador, these political entities have been examined in great detail through ethnohistorical research but have only recently been taken up by archaeology, such as the investigations in Agua Blanca, La Tolita, the Jama Valley, La Florida, and the Sangay complex. Even though the country has many well-known Inka sites, archaeological research has concentrated only in old Tomebamba, in Ingapirca, and in Rumicucho, with unsatisfactory results. The preservation of Inka monumental sites has not been very successful because the state has preferred to spend large sums of money on historical monuments that, paradoxically, have hardly been subjected to the archaeological testing required by the law. In reality, it can be said that there is no historical archaeology in Ecuador.

Ernesto Salazar is a Professor in the Anthropology Department of the Universidad Católica of Ecuador in Quito.

[To Top of Page](#)

LAST PAGE TABLE OF CONTENTS NEXT PAGE

COSWA Corner

Katherine A. Spielmann

Women as Professionals Roundtable Luncheon -- Over 100 participants and 20 table co-hosts came together to discuss career issues over lunch at the SAA Annual Meeting in Minneapolis. Topics included issues in academic careers, the job market, museums, publication, and public policy. The event was coorganized by COSWA members Miriam Stark and Elizabeth Chilton and chaired by Peggy Nelson. SAA provided room space and handled reservations as part of the annual meeting. The coorganizers received a great deal of positive feedback on the roundtables from both hosts and participants. Chilton will organize another series of roundtables at the 1996 SAA meetings.

Women's Network Reception -- During the SAA meetings in Minneapolis, women gathered at an informal reception to share news and information about women in archaeology. Mary Van Buren organized the event, with SAA providing meeting space. SAA, SHA, and AIA members provided information on COSWA and COSWA-like committees within these archaeological organizations. This year's reception was less well attended than last year's, and plans are afoot to change the time of the reception in 1996. The format will also be altered to encourage the networking that was the original purpose of this event.

Regional Women's Reception -- Elizabeth Chilton organized a luncheon reception for women on April 3 during the Northeastern Anthropological Association Meetings at Lake Placid. Eighteen people attended. Chilton began the lunch by outlining networking opportunities for women. Discussion then turned to opportunities for future events at the NEAA meetings, such as panel discussions, guest speakers, receptions, and the development of a women's caucus. An address list was sent out after the meeting so that the participants could keep in touch and to facilitate the organization of future events.

Society for Women Archaeologists -- The society has been organized as a response to a concern that women archaeologists need a context in the profession to discuss issues that are not now being addressed. The society produces a newsletter. Dues are \$15.00 for the gainfully employed and \$5.00 for students and the under-employed. You can join by writing to Society for Women Archaeologists, P.O. Box 4624, Rockville, MD 20849-4624.

COSWA Call for Board Members -- COSWA board members are appointed for two-year terms beginning in November. COSWA meets annually at the SAA meetings, with a less formal meeting in the fall at the AAA meetings. During the year, board members are active on subcommittees that focus on the collection and dissemination of information on the status of women in various aspects of the archaeological profession.

There are 10 board members including one student member; three board members are rotating off the committee this fall. If you are interested in becoming a COSWA board member please write to Katherine Spielmann, Department of Anthropology, Box 872402, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 83287-2402, or email atkxs@asuvm.inre.asu.edu. In your letter or message please discuss the interests that you have in COSWA. We recognize that far more than 10 women are interested in COSWA-related activities and would like to involve as many women as we can in the activities of the subcommittees within COSWA.

Katherine A. Spielmann is at Arizona State University and chairs the SAA Committee on the Status of Women in Archaeology.

[To Top of Page](#)

INSIGHTS

THE MANY FACES OF CRM

The Case for CRM Training in Academic Institutions

Dennis B. Blanton

Many of us openly question whether traditional graduate training adequately prepares students for typical jobs in contemporary archaeology. The close of the century certainly finds archaeology a thriving discipline, but it could be argued that the term "discipline" alone is too limiting, and that we would do well to acknowledge the existence of "enterprise" within the profession. Such a vision would allow us to account for the now-dominant career option in archaeology: cultural resource management (CRM). An impressive segment of contemporary archaeologists are scholarly business sophisticates contending daily with complex legal requirements, fiscal and personnel management, and marketing strategies, not to mention research designs, potsherds, stratigraphic profiles, and preservation options. In essence, this new image would embody the professionalization of what we do.

Increasing threats to sites have made CRM essential, and as a result, archaeology is more relevant than ever. CRMers are now represented by an SAA task force on consulting archaeology and a national association of cultural resource management professionals (ACRA). As CRM practitioners have organized at an unprecedented scale, their dialogue has spotlighted a series of common concerns. Ranking prominently among them is a clamor for better training; specifically to prepare students to function within the CRM environment. Joe Schuldenrein vividly drew attention to the need for professional training in the last issue of the [SAA Bulletin](#) [13(3):22-24].

This raises the obvious question of how best to reach the goal of providing quality, CRM-specific training. Foremost among the options is to build it into academic programs. Therefore, the balance of this article will elaborate on crucial requirements for an effective, institutionally based CRM training program where the key focus is to prepare graduate students for jobs in the upper echelons of CRM organizations. To provide a context for this issue I will review lessons based on experience that reveal, as much as anything, how *not* to succeed at training the kind of professionals in demand.

Universities and smaller colleges are not necessarily strangers to CRM archaeology. A minority are already emphasizing CRM in parts of their programs, and doing it very well. Many faculty members or departments, however, have only sought contracts when they recognized particularly juicy research opportunities or needed to fill summer field time. Some good work has been done, and students have gained experience through these opportunistic forays into the contract world. Realistically, such projects are no better, and perhaps worse, at preparing students to function at the senior levels of CRM than would a standard field school.

Alternatively, many universities boast "centers" or "institutes" through which compliance contracts and other grant-funded projects are conducted. These operations are typically allied with, but somewhat independent of,

anthropology departments, and often represent their public service branches. While it is true that these organizations ostensibly serve to offer training and research opportunities for students, the commitment to training is not so strong as to be formalized. Often, any training relevant to a CRM career is picked up seat-of-the-pants by savvy students, but most students are motivated more by the need to pay bills than by career planning. I do not mean to disparage these operations; they do provide a necessary public service and sponsor important research. Indeed, I work at one myself. It is simply a fact that the priorities of most such organizations seldom differ from private consulting firms, where monetary considerations influence decision making, as often as the research program. Under these circumstances, an effective training program for students can be a hindrance.

Anthropology departments are often no closer to producing students who can function well in positions of responsibility than typical research centers. It is frustrating, and potentially demoralizing, for eager recipients of graduate degrees (and prospective employers!) to discover that they have been prepared only to enter a CRM operation at the level of a field or lab technician. The reasons are as diverse as the fact that field schools do not address concepts of archaeological survey, or that courses have not prepared them to evaluate site significance, prepare proposals, manage crews, and simply write a decent report. It is a harsh indictment of current affairs when university-based CRM operations are reluctant or unable to fill positions of responsibility with the graduates of an anthropology department across campus!

A factor complicating the creation of formal CRM training programs at universities is adherence to the traditional ideal of a liberal arts education. Institutions committed to this tradition are often averse to any notion of professional training that might be construed as vocational education. Archaeology's niche in the realm of humanities/social sciences, as opposed to physical sciences, contributes to the resistance. The philosophical problem need not be insurmountable if anthropology departments and arts and sciences faculty maintain a commitment to traditional training for undergraduates, while embracing proven models for graduate training used by some business schools and environmental science departments.

Some colleagues maintain that universities are not the place for CRM operations, citing among other reasons their failure thus far to groom students into desirable employees. While I have elaborated on some of these shortcomings, I am satisfied that institutions can be the ideal training environment for CRM archaeologists. This can occur where anthropology departments and on-campus research centers forge strong alliances, capitalizing on the respective educational and practical experiences each staff can boast. As indicated, simply establishing archaeological research centers on campuses with anthropology faculty does not usually solve the problem. Certain fundamental requirements are necessary to succeed.

Commitment: Across the board, from the provost to field technicians, there must be a genuine commitment to the training program. Everyone must agree that a priority will be placed on producing students capable of "hitting the ground running" at CRM firms upon graduation. This will require formalization of a CRM "track" in graduate archaeology programs. In particular, the university administration must be comfortable with the concept of job training, anthropology faculty must agree to advise and teach CRM students, and research center managers must afford the time to shepherd students through hands-on training requirements. Agreement on these principles will prevent situations that plague unsuccessful programs such as the temptation for research center managers to use their positions only as a stepping stone toward teaching positions, the advertisement of a CRM track just to bait students, and treatment of CRM-oriented students as second-class citizens.

Resources: Another critical component of university training is the research center, which actually functions day-to-day in the CRM world and provides the outlet for practical, hands-on experience. This organization must itself be formally structured, officially supported by the parent institution, and recognized by the SHPO in order to play an effective role. This implies that a center should consist of separate office and lab space, requisite equipment, and independent staff, as well as demonstrated success in contract completion. A phantom organization that exists only in a desk drawer is not adequate. In effect, a successful research center must be capable of filling the dual role of serving clients in need of cultural resource studies, and designing a program of student involvement that will satisfy the requirements of the department's CRM track. This criterion depends upon senior staff members that can actually play the dual role, serving both as principal investigators and instructors. The two do not have to be incompatible if the other requirements are in place.

Funding: A barometer of the commitment an institution has to a quality training program is the level of funding it offers. It is difficult, at best, for senior research center staff to succeed in a dual role without hard money support. Otherwise, any potential release time that might be devoted to students would be consumed by the demands of contract administration and marketing; soft money staff have no more time or inclination to sustain a training program than most private contractors. How funding is obtained can vary, but at least one option is to earmark a large portion of indirect costs to support research center staff involved in student training.

Curriculum: Designing a curriculum for CRM track graduate students will require the knowledge of CRM practice that research center staff possess, and the input of anthropology faculty familiar with university and departmental academic policies. It would also be wise to consult private contractors for their thoughts on the essential elements of a training program. I cannot imagine that any of us would advocate abandoning the essential core courses that are the backbone of an anthropology program over purely "practical" courses suited to CRM. Instead, a CRM track would require successful completion of a specific number of courses, beyond the core classes, that were designed with a CRM career in mind. Exactly how these are put together and structured will vary, but essential topics include legislation and official guidelines, ethics, CRM field strategies, resource evaluation (i.e., application of National Register criteria), proposal writing, personnel management, and business practices. A final requirement would be completion of a CRM research project in lieu of the usual thesis. Ideally, the student would complete a small project from beginning to end, under the mentorship of a qualified research staffer, with an acceptable proposal, budget, research design, and technical report as the final products.

Currently the programs of this kind that exist or are under development are designed to train M.A. level students; completion of an M.A. is the minimum training required to satisfy principal investigator or other senior positions. Increasingly, however, Ph.D. credentials are in demand and it may be advantageous to offer a CRM option in the context of these programs. CRM course evaluations and informal polls of students both reveal that interest in this alternative runs high, and on more than one occasion we have been told that the CRM course was the most useful they had taken. An official poll of students nationwide might provide some hard numbers that will aid decision-making.

Whether CRM as we know it will be significantly changed by the "downsizing" in federal government remains to be seen. The successful evasion of budget cuts thus far is encouraging, and is some indication of the acceptance of our role. Regardless, it is unlikely that cultural resource management will be eliminated altogether, and as long as it represents a viable career option, a need for training will exist. Consequently, it is the responsibility of academic institutions to design programs consistent with a real life job market by offering a CRM option along with traditional academic training.

I will close with an appeal for information from institutions that have formalized CRM training programs. Depending on the response, I will gladly follow up with a review of their common elements as a means of sharing successful ideas.

Dennis B. Blanton is codirector of the Center for Archaeological Research at the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg, Va. The thoughts expressed here are his alone, but he wishes to acknowledge the benefit of discussions with Donald W. Linebaugh, the other codirector at WMCAR, as well as other staff members.

[To Top of Page](#)

LAST PAGE TABLE OF CONTENTS NEXT PAGE

Society for American Archaeology 60th Annual Business Meeting

President Bill Lipe presents out-going president Bruce Smith with a special achievement award.

Contents:

- [Minutes of the Meeting](#)
 - [Report of the President](#)
 - [Report of the President-elect](#)
 - [Report of the Treasurer](#)
 - [Report of the Secretary](#)
 - [Report of the Executive Director](#)
 - [Report of the Editor, *SAA Bulletin*](#)
 - [Report of the Editor, *American Antiquity*](#)
 - [Report of the Editor, *Latin American Antiquity*](#)
 - [Report of the Government Affairs Committee](#)
-

Minutes of the Meeting

At 6:12 p.m. President Bruce Smith called the 60th Annual Business Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology to order. The Secretary established that a quorum existed per the bylaws, and the President sought approval of the minutes of the 59th Annual Business Meeting (1994) in Anaheim, California, these having been duly published in *American Antiquity* (January 1995 60:184-190). It was so moved, seconded, and these minutes were approved.

The president then delivered his report (hereafter, see), including announcing record conference attendance of 2,277. The President also reviewed the near conclusion of the transfer of our society to our own home office, as well as subsequent transformation and growth under our new Executive Director Ralph Johnson. At this juncture spontaneous and sustained applause erupted. President Smith exhorted members to continue their exemplary service to the society, and thanked those who had assisted him as President.

President-elect William D. Lipe spoke (hereafter, see), with several announcements including an outline of current thoughts and studies of a possible joint Registry of Professional Archaeologists. This registry would be derived from, and with, the Society of Professional Archeologists and the Society for Historical Archaeology, and possibly the American Institute of Archaeology. Dr. Lipe specifically lauded the Native American Task Force (now upgraded to a full committee) and the Public Education Committee. Finally, he reviewed various challenges to the society such as possible revision of national laws relating to archaeology and SAA's plans and responses.

Treasurer W. Fred Limp then delivered his report (hereafter, see) indicating a strong financial position with a proposed budget of \$937,000. He also thanked Executive Director Johnson and his staff including David Whitlock and Elaine Talbott, and also Finance Committee Chair Daniel G. Roberts.

Secretary Bruce E. Rippeteau delivered his report (hereafter, see), which extended thanks to the committee chairs and SAA home office, and reported election results. Incoming officers include: Treasurer-elect, Robert L. Bettinger; Executive Board Position #3, Margaret C. Nelson; Executive Board Position #4, George S. Smith; and for the 1996 Nominating Committee Members, Kathleen Deagan and Deborah Nichols. All are to assume office later in this meeting.

The Executive Director of SAA and an ex-officio Board Member, Ralph C. Johnson, delivered his report (hereafter, see) in which he expressed his appreciation for the opportunity to serve SAA, as well as for the high quality of his staff and the assistance of our members.

Our three SAA Editors, Michael Graves for *American Antiquity*, David Pendergast for *Latin American Antiquity*, and Mark Aldenderfer for the *SAA Bulletin*, all three being *ex-officio* Board Members, then reported (hereafter, see).

Aldenderfer spoke first recalling this past year's *SAA Bulletin* events. These included the range of voices heard such as Native Americans, Latin American archaeologists, consulting archaeologists, and the use of electronic mail.

Graves spoke next as Editor of *American Antiquity*. He reviewed the cover changes and the importance of establishing the center of journal activities at the home office. Mike also cited the contributions of Janet Walker in accomplishing this transition smoothly. He then passed the upcoming 1996 editorship to Lynne Goldstein.

Pendergast reported that *Latin American Antiquity* is nearly current with publishing dates and that Gary Feinman will be incoming editor next year.

Following our customary agenda, we then received remarks from the Committee on Government Affairs, Dean Snow, chairman (outgoing). Dean's report (hereafter, see) covered the "reinventing of government" events of the last year and the emergence of our own effective lobbyist Donald Craib U.S. government changes and agency reorganizations are indeed concerns for 1996.

As the highlight of our Annual Business Meeting, President Smith presented a total of 30 Awards; 29 to individuals and one to an organization.

Presidential Recognition Awards were given to Phyllis Messenger, K C Smith, and Cathy MacDonald, Diane Gifford-Gonzalez, Roger Anyon, Bruce E. Rippeteau, Mark J. Lynott, Alison Wylie, Lynne Goldstein, Keith Kintigh, Robert Drennan, Melinda A. Zeder, Paul Minnis, and Mark Aldenderfer. Awards for Excellence in Ceramic Studies were given to Prudence Rice and Frederick Matson. Awards for Excellence in Lithic Studies were given to Harry J. Shafer and Lawrence H. Keeley. The Crabtree Award went to Jeff Carskadden. The Award for Excellence in Cultural Resource Management were given to Charles R. McGimsey III, Calvin R. Cummings, Lawrence E. Aten, and Shereen Lerner. The Dissertation Award went to David R. Abbott. The Distinguished Service Award went to Stuart Struever, and the Fryxell Award was given to Robert J. Braidwood. The Gene S. Stuart Award went to Nathan Seppa. The Public Service Award was given to the Grand Canyon Trust. The Outstanding Student Poster Award went to the team of Tim Hunt, Mark Madsen, and Carl Lipo, and the Outstanding Professional/Non-Student Poster Award to Brenda J. Baker and Maria A. Liston.

The awards having been presented to great acclaim, as his last official act, President Smith turned the meeting and the gavel over to now-President Lipe.

New Business consisted, first, of President Bill Lipe presenting a Special Achievement and Appreciation Award to Bruce Smith, commending him on behalf of the entire Board, the staff, and the membership.

Ceremonial Resolutions, customarily presented for readers of *American Antiquity* within the Secretary's Report (hereafter, see), were delivered by Chair Jon Muller who diligently prepared and presented the thank-you Resolutions for the Annual Meeting, especially our thanks to this year's Program Chair Paul Minnis and his

excellent committee. Also noted were the service of Board members, and condolences for departed colleagues A standing moment of silence was observed.

The 60th Annual Business Meeting was adjourned at 6:39 p.m. by President Lipe.

Bruce Rippeteau

Secretary

[To Top of Page](#)

Report of the President

Three years ago, when I came on the Executive Board of the SAA as President-elect, we were preparing for our second major episode of organizational transition. Ten years earlier we had gotten out from under the AAA, and in 1992 we were ready to end our long and productive relationship with Jerry Miller and Bostrom Management and to set up our own independent office.

We are now 36 months into this new phase in the history of SAA, and as I prepare to pass the presidency on to Bill Lipe later in the Business Meeting this evening, I want to take about six or seven minutes to briefly talk about how SAA is being transformed. I say "being transformed" because while many of the central elements of the transition plan are now in place, and in many ways the transition to an independent office has been successfully accomplished, this episode of recent dramatic change has not led to a new, now-in-place, steady state existence for SAA. Rather it has engendered a number of strong forces for an expanded and accelerated second cycle of change, which we are now well into. What is the cause of this second cycle of growth and change? To a great extent it is the direct result of the establishment of a highly efficient and highly dedicated executive headquarters staff, under the remarkable leadership of Ralph Johnson.

Having worked in the federal government for many years, I have come to appreciate people who work hard, who are good at what they do, and who have a natural enthusiasm for their work--three attributes that often go together--and for me it has been a great pleasure over the last several years to watch Ralph Johnson build an outstanding staff for SAA's central office through careful selection of dedicated professionals. If you have not yet met the SAA staff here at the annual meeting make sure to stop by the SAA office in the Railway Express building near Union Station next time you are in Washington. Check out where your annual dues are going (ask to see the corporate sauna) and introduce yourself to the SAA staff--they are the strong central core of the Society for American Archaeology--and they are doing an extraordinary job for us.

A major element of the transition plan to establish our own office was to consolidate all of the various activities under one roof, and this, too, along with assembling a very dedicated hardworking staff, has contributed to the second wave of change in SAA. Donald Craib, the SAA manager of government affairs and legal counsel, has brought an impressive background and a wealth of new ideas to the society, and Janet Walker, the SAA manager of publications, has already made impressive contributions to our publications programs. As these major subcontracting elements of SAA's operation have been brought in-house, we have gained the obvious advantage of being able to better organize our day-to-day activities, and to better plan for new initiatives--things that SAA should be doing and now can take on because of our smoothly running, free-standing central office.

It was generally recognized that once the new office was up and running, that SAA could and should address a variety of challenges, and take a stronger leadership role in American archaeology--but no one anticipated either the level of expectations that would exist, or the volume and diversity of new opportunities and challenges that would emerge. As in any episode of change, many of the ideas for new initiatives come from within (the core staff and the executive board, task forces, and committees of SAA), and some are responses to external events, many of which can be traced to Congress and federal agencies. These new demands and opportunities are going to place increasing pressure upon all parts of SAA, and since I only have 90 minutes or so left before I join the

ranks of the past presidents, I would like to make three simple points for you to consider regarding what SAA is, and the role we all will play in its future.

The first point to be made is that the 5,500 members of SAA *are* the SAA. At any one time, only about 350 people (six percent of the membership) are listed in our administrative directory of leadership positions in the society, but the leadership of SAA turns over rapidly, and while the officers and Executive Board struggle with a wide variety of issues, the more than 30 committees and task forces take up the vast majority of the work of SAA. All the members of the Executive Board are elected, and the committees and task forces are open to any SAA member. Your recent *SAA Bulletin* contained an [open call for expression of interest in serving on them](#). This doesn't guarantee that you can immediately be appointed to any committee you are interested in-- but it does indicate that SAA is wide open to member participation.

The SAA, I would argue, provides an excellent vehicle or platform of positive action for any member who has ideas and a willingness to volunteer their time and energy. Any SAA member can shape the future by simply getting involved, and getting involved means more than providing casual commentary about what SAA should be focusing on. If as an SAA member you think the society should be doing something, or doing it better, be sure to pass on your ideas and opinions, but better yet, get directly involved so you can be sure that whatever it is you believe so strongly in is done right.

Behind every success story SAA has, you will find people who have taken the initiative and made a commitment to turn their ideas into reality. The second point I would like to make is that SAA now faces an interesting dilemma--on the one hand, many people have justifiably high expectations of what we can and should accomplish across a broad range of important issues, from education to resource protection to lobbying to repatriation-- but at the same time there is an interesting counter-perspective that SAA might be growing too big, too impersonal, with too big an appetite--that it is turning into the Great White Shark, the Evil Empire. So, SAA should on the one hand do more, but at the same time do less--don't get too big for your britches, but make sure to fulfill your rightful leadership obligations in archaeology.

These concerns are important ones, particularly in regard to our relationships with other organizations such as the Society for Historical Archaeology and the newly formed American Cultural Resources Association. SAA is very interested in building stronger partnerships with SHA, ACRA, and other national and regional organizations in a number of areas and, in general, supporting and fostering other archaeological organizations. Open communication and cooperation are key to the mutual development and support of complementary archaeological societies, and I think that SAA's expanding equal-partner cooperation with the Society for Historical Archaeology provides an excellent model for the future.

The final point I would like to make has to do with the internal challenges that face SAA, which promise just as exciting a future as the external initiatives involving other archaeological organizations, indigenous peoples, avocational groups, the U.S. Congress and federal agencies, and the general public.

The SAA has a diverse constituency in terms of work setting, theoretical and methodological proclivities, and topical and geographical interests, to name just a few of the axes of internal variation that exist. SAA has a strong and central interest in serving all of these various constituencies by providing a variety of support functions and forums for communication within and between them.

SAA is encouraging the development of interest groups, with today's round-table luncheons being a first step toward the establishment of better interaction between people who share common interests. The society also supports the convening of a variety of scholarly and professional organizations at its annual meeting. We foster communication through the publication of our journals and the *SAA Bulletin* and are making a concerned effort to reach out to include more archaeologists from throughout the Americas.

SAA is also expanding its partnerships with a number of federal agencies, and is working to increase the range and depth of services and opportunities for professional advancement and recognition that we offer to archaeologists working in governmental settings and for consulting firms in the private sector.

SAA is also working, in concert with the SHA and other organizations, to lobby against the looming threat to federal historic preservation laws and regulations, and to provide forums for reconsideration of the structure of doing public archaeology in this country.

In all of these ways, SAA is changing and expanding, while at the same time reaffirming a set of basic tenets. I believe that there are a primary set of strongly held beliefs that work to bind together archaeologists of many different kinds: a shared belief in the importance of protecting and illuminating the unwritten histories of the Americas and the need for careful curation of collections; the common fascination with discovery--finding and unraveling past patterns of human behavior; a mutual interest in fostering an open and ongoing debate on a wide range of issues; and a firm belief that whatever we as individuals happen to be doing at the moment must be close to the top in terms of what's interesting and important in archaeology today. I am interested, for example in developing CD-ROM discs of squash seed assemblages, and fully expect them to rocket to the top of the best-seller charts.

For 60 years the Society for American Archaeology has served archaeologists as individuals and as varied interest groups, and has, as a whole, provided organized forums for scholarly and professional interaction and worked for the general good of archaeology.

In closing, I want to express how much I have enjoyed working with Ralph Johnson and the SAA staff, and the officers, executive board members, and task force and committees of SAA. Thank you.

Bruce Smith

[To Top of Page](#)

Report of the President-elect

I want to personally thank Bruce Smith for his effective leadership of the society over the last several years, and for the enormous amount of work he has put into the Society's transition to its new office and staff structure.

And I want to thank him for introducing me to the many duties of the Presidency in a skillful and gradual way--raising the temperature of the water ever . . . so . . . slowly. . .

I'll echo Bruce's comments about the excellence and dedication of the SAA staff. The hard work of the past several years is paying off. We have an extremely effective and efficient staff that is able to offer more and better services to a growing society membership. I urge you to get to know Ralph Johnson and his staff, either here at the meetings, or if you visit Washington.

In a few minutes, I'll be starting my two-year term in a time of change, challenge, and opportunity for American archaeology. I'm confident we can meet the challenges and take advantage of the opportunities that are emerging. As an organization, SAA is the strongest it has ever been. This meeting is the largest we have ever had, both in terms of number of registrants and number of papers and events. And I confidently expect that we will set a new membership record as well this year.

Bruce and this past Executive Board committed themselves to a greater involvement of all segments of the membership in SAA. They ensured that existing committees and task forces were active, and new ones were established. Today, we have the Committee on the Status of Women in Archaeology, the Committee on Latin America, the Task Force on Consulting Archaeology, and the Committee on Student Affairs. I am firmly committed to continuing these efforts to promote the involvement of all the membership, and expect to see the Task Force on Consulting Archaeology converted to a regular continuing committee of the society. At our meeting tomorrow, I will ask the Board to consider establishing a Task Force on Archaeological Resource Management, so we can have better input from members working in federal and state agencies. And I believe

that we must work hard to revive existing mechanisms for the representation of avocational archaeologists in the society's work, or consider new mechanisms that will be more effective.

I'm sure many, and perhaps most of you, are aware of the discussions going on among SOPA, the SAA, and the SHA. There hasn't been a great deal of general publicity about the substance of these discussions, because the boards of the various societies haven't had a chance to take a position on them until this week in Minneapolis, and several of the boards have yet to vote on whether or not to go ahead with developing the proposal. I want to assure you that nothing will be concluded without full and open discussion of a proposal by the members of all the societies involved, and that proposed new structural arrangements will be submitted to a formal vote by the members.

Discussions regarding a new relationship between SOPA and other societies are still at an early stage. The concepts that are emerging would involve converting SOPA to a Register of Professional Archaeologists (ROPA) under the co-sponsorship of SAA, SHA, and perhaps other societies. On the basis of a meeting yesterday, it appears that the officers of the Archaeological Institute of America are very interested in exploring the possibility that AIA might also help sponsor ROPA. The concept envisions keeping SOPA's requirements for training and experience, code of ethics, standards of research performance, and grievance procedures (although these might continue to evolve to meet new requirements and circumstances). The Register would be governed by its own Board, as SOPA is now, but instead of being a separate society, the Register would be sponsored by SAA, SHA, and, possibly, AIA. Registration would remain voluntary, as SOPA certification is now.

These discussions were initiated by a joint meeting of the SAA and SOPA ethics committees in Anaheim, and have been carried forward by a joint SAA-SOPA Task Force. The report of the task force is being considered here in Minneapolis by the boards of SOPA, SAA, and SHA. If they all approve moving forward to fuller public discussion of these ideas, then you will see more about this in the *SAA Bulletin*.

You'll note that the concept I've just discussed originated with the ethics committees of SOPA and SAA, and was stimulated by the concerns over standards and ethics that have been building over some years. SOPA now provides, as the proposed Register would provide, a mechanism whereby archaeologists can voluntarily declare their adherence to a specific code of ethics and standards, and pledge to be accountable to that code by agreeing to participate in a grievance process if their qualifications or performance are challenged. This system of professional standards and accountability is of course only a partial solution to the larger set of questions of ethics in archaeology, but it does address some of these questions.

For a fuller discussions of ethics in archaeology, refer to the recent SAA special publication on this topic, assembled by Mark Lynott and Alison Wylie. These papers are intended to stimulate a dialog with, and among, the society's members, and I urge you to read this volume and provide your comments either directly to Mark or Alison, or to Ralph Johnson at the SAA office. These issues will need serious and continuing discussion in the coming years.

I've mentioned the efforts the society is making to ensure greater participation and input from all segments of its membership. I also am pledged to continue the efforts we are making in outreach to groups outside SAA as well. Wednesday, the Board received an excellent report from the Native American Relations Task Force, and voted to establish a continuing Committee on Native American Relations. The task force report has many good recommendations, and we are fully committed to working to build relationships with Native American communities, and to assist our members in doing so in their own areas.

The Society for American Archaeology's best success story in outreach is of course the work of the its Archaeology and Public Education Committee. Started as a result of the 1989 Taos "Save the Past" meeting, the committee now has a number of active subsections, and publishes the *Archaeology and Public Education* newsletter, with a circulation of over 8,500. A large percentage of the recipients are teachers in the K-12 school system. Assistance from the new SAA Foundation has enabled us to have several grant applications prepared that seek funds to support the work of the Public Education Committee. We have also placed the highest priority on assembling the funds necessary to add a staff member in the Washington office to support and help coordinate the committee's vital work in public education.

I know many, if not most of you are concerned over disturbing messages you hear from Washington, regarding possible attempts to dismantle or seriously weaken the existing national historic preservation system within which most cultural resource management archaeology is done. And those of you who follow such matters are aware that the regulations implementing Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act are currently back on the drawing table, and that new drafts are in process, probably even as we speak. I don't think the final outcomes of all of this can be predicted, but it is clear that the situation is unstable. It is also clear that SAA, along with other organizations committed to archaeology and historic preservation, must make every effort to influence those outcomes.

I'm here to assure you that the leadership of SAA is committed to doing just that. Donald Craib, the government affairs manager in the SAA office, is working well beyond full time to provide his technical expertise and support to our efforts in government affairs. I myself, as well as all the other officers of SAA, are fully committed to supporting the society's interests in the governmental arena. Further, we can expect strong leadership of the Government Affairs Committee as the chair passes from Dean Snow to Judy Bense.

Two approaches dominate our strategy for gaining an effective voice in this national debate. The first is to find common interest with other organizations and to forge effective alliances with them for political representation. Donald Craib has been working extremely hard on this front, and we are coordinating very effectively with the Society for Historical Archaeology and the National Trust for Historic Preservation. A couple of weeks ago, Donna Seifert (president of SHA) and I met with Dick Moe, the president of the Trust, who assured us of his organization's strong commitment to working with our two societies in helping preserve historic preservation. Next week, Roger Anyon, one of our board members, will be attending a meeting of the Keepers of the Treasures, a Native American cultural preservation organization, to identify areas of common concern and interest on which SAA and Keepers might coordinate. We look forward to working closely with the newly formed American Cultural Resources Association.

A second approach that is even more critical is to reinvigorate our long tradition of effective grass-roots political action. For its size, SAA has historically been extremely effective in articulating the national interest in preserving America's archaeological resources and making information about them accessible to the public. As storm clouds have gathered in Washington, we perhaps have not been sufficiently prompt in calling upon the energy and expertise of those archaeologists of my generation who have served the society so well in the past. I pledge to make those calls. But we also need to energize and incorporate all the rest of you as well. In the current *SAA Bulletin*, Donald Craib has issued [a call for participants in a Government Affairs Network](#) oriented toward grass-roots activity. I strongly urge you to consider signing up and helping out.

I think that archaeology and the conservation of archaeological sites enjoy wide and increasing support among the American public. We need to communicate that interest and support in the political arena. We must also be prepared to understand that some aspects of the way public archaeology is being done are likely to have much less support from the American people. We must avoid displaying an entitlement mentality, we must avoid an unreflective defense of business as usual, and we must be prepared to support honest and well-designed attempts to make public archaeology more efficient and accountable.

In closing, I want to say how honored I am to have been selected as your next President. I look forward to sharing with you the struggles and triumphs that lie ahead. On to New Orleans!

William D. Lipe

[To Top of Page](#)

Report of the Treasurer

I am pleased to inform you that the society's finances remain strong and are improving. As you know, it was necessary to increase dues effective this year. This action followed six years without an increase and was necessary to simply keep up with inflation. The impact of inflation on the society's financial base is reflected by the fact that we completed the previous fiscal year, ending last June, with a net deficit of \$27,710 out of a total operating budget of \$756,682. The current year's budget, in contrast, projects a modest surplus of \$15,798 with a total operating budget of \$937,958.

These are challenging times, however, and we must be prepared to respond to developments in Washington and elsewhere. To that end, our budget planning includes the development of a reserve fund which can be rapidly used, if circumstances warrant, to help the society represent its members concern to Congress.

The society is very fortunate in having a superb professional staff. Those with particular contributions in the fiscal arena are, of course, our Executive Director Ralph Johnson, David Whitlock, director of finance and administration, and Elaine Talbott, manager of accounting services. Their efforts regularly go beyond the normal call of duty and all society members owe them a great debt of gratitude--as they also do the members of the Finance Committee, ably chaired by Dan Roberts.

Many members have made extraordinary contributions to this society throughout the years, but I must mention two in particular. As the society moved from the Bostrom administrative structure to today's superb professional staff, there have been many challenges. Whenever they arose and whatever they were, they were responded to and solved by Bruce Smith and Vin Steponaitis. The whole story may never be known, but we would not be here today without the Herculean efforts of these two people. My heartfelt thanks to both of you.

Fred Limp

[To Top of Page](#)

Report of the Secretary

Normal secretarial business, per the bylaws, has been conducted on a daily basis. Other activities included: the usual minutes from our Executive Board and Annual Meetings, various synopses for the *SAA Bulletin*, yet another enlarged set of administrative directories, various files of SAA business, and numerous interactions with members.

Report of the 1995 Elections. Having been nominated by Chair Lynne Goldstein and her Nominations Committee, and having been subjected to vote and elected by the members of SAA, and here at this meeting taking office, are:

Treasurer-Elect: Robert L. Bettinger

Board Position #3: Margaret C. Nelson

Board Position #4: George S. Smith

1996 Nominating Committee Member: Kathleen Deagan

1996 Nominating Committee Member: Deborah Nichols

A total of 1,501 SAA members voted with ballots postmarked on or before March 18, 1995, thus being valid. Only 21 ballots were invalid, having been received after that deadline. The total number of ballots received (1522) is 32 percent of the SAA membership as of March 18, 1995. It is a traditional secretarial courtesy not to state publicly the vote totals, but such information is a matter of record for any member so desiring to know. I thank Ralph Johnson and his staff for efficiently conducting the elections on behalf of the Secretary.

Report of the Ceremonial Resolutions. Resolutions of the 60th Annual Meeting were respectfully submitted by Chair of Ceremonial Resolutions Jon Muller, and, on his recommendation, these being adopted by the Annual Meeting, are:

(1) Be it resolved that appreciation and congratulations on a job well done be tendered

a) to retiring officers President Bruce Smith and Secretary Bruce Rippeteau, and retiring Board Members Roger Anyon and Diane Gifford-Gonzalez, and others who have served the society on its committees and in other ways;

b) to the staff who planned the meeting, and to all the volunteers who worked at registration and other tasks;

c) to the Program Committee, chaired by Paul E. Minnis, and Timothy R. Pauketat, Jennifer A. Brady, Suzanne K. Fish, John W. Ives, Adria LaViolette, Robert C. Mainfort, Jr., Linda Manzanilla, Ben A. Nelson, Paul R. Nickens, and Lynne P. Sullivan, and

d) to the Local Advisory Committee chaired by Phyllis Messenger, and Ken Liss, with Scott Anfinson, Bettina Arnold, Carl Blair, Robert Clouse, Clark Dobbs, Thomas H. Hruby, Deborah Morse-Kahn, James Myster, Stephanie Pomonis, Eduardo Romo, Orrin Shane, and Tom Trow.

(2) And be it further resolved that thanks again be given to those who inform us of the deaths of colleagues, and finally,

(3) A Resolution of Sympathy to the families and friends of Sandor Bokonyi, Sterling Dow, Donald Collier, Bertha Pauline Dutton, Walter Fairservis, Alison Frantz, Elizabeth M. Garrett, Percy Dauelsberg Hahmann, Frederick Johnson, Timothy Mooney, Robert McCorkle Netting, Marshall T. Newman, Philip Phillips, Marcel Ravidat, Gerardo Reichel-Dolmatoff, Doris Zemurray Stone, William E. Taylor, Sol Tax, Bruce Trickey, Linda Ward-Williams, A. Helene Warren, Howard Dalton Winters, Daniel Wolfman, H. Marie Wormington, and John M. Young.

The members arose for a moment of silence in honor of our departed colleagues.

This is my final Annual Business Meeting serving as Secretary, and I thank the SAA Board, especially President Bruce Smith, immediate past Treasurer Vin Steponaitis and current Treasurer Fred Limp, and particularly SAA Executive Director Ralph Johnson and our SAA staff, for their great support and friendship.

Once again, I call specific attention to the outstanding service of the SAA committee chairs and members for creating our strong committee structure and all their hard work this past year.

As past Secretary Sherry Lerner did for me, I have passed on to my successor Keith Kintigh the "Ceremonial Good Word" and I wish him the best! I'm glad to have been of this service to our society and I thank you all for your many kindnesses.

Bruce Rippeteau

[To Top of Page](#)

Report of the Executive Director

At a time when the prospect of externally imposed change threatens archaeology, I hope that SAA can provide a measure of constancy and dependability in your professional life. SAA is committed to providing attentive service to members, delivering timely information, and energetically advocating for the protection of archaeological resources.

I am personally delighted to work for you and with the leadership you have elected. Similarly, I find myself privileged to work with an extraordinary staff who are dedicated to serving you and implementing the society's programs and initiatives--which seem to grow almost daily in breadth and depth.

I am also thankful for and invigorated by the high levels of energy, enthusiasm, and insight that are displayed by the many individuals who volunteer their time to further the society's mission. Your contributions are both essential and highly valued.

I join you in celebrating the society's 60th anniversary, and have every confidence that the vital organization that has emerged since 1934 will continue to engage you, provide value to you, and sustain your efforts to enhance knowledge about the past.

Ralph Johnson

[To Top of Page](#)

Report of the Editor, *SAA Bulletin*

I recall standing before this body about a year ago and making a number of promises about future directions for the *SAA Bulletin*. As every politician (or editor) knows, reviewing one's record of promises kept and promises broken can be a dangerous thing, but in this instance, I'm happy to report that I've been able to accomplish all the promises I made to you last year. At least as far as I remember them that is!

One of our most important accomplishments has been the inauguration of a new column on cultural resources management. It was launched in the [March/April/May 1995 issue, and is called "Insights: The Many Faces of CRM."](#) It is edited by W. Kevin Pape of Gray and Pape, Inc. The goal of the column is to provide news and commentary of interest to the large community of CRM archaeologists in SAA.

We have also continued to develop two columns begun in years previous. "Exchanges," our column on recent developments in Latin American archaeology, continues under my direction, but our "Working Together" column on Native American-archaeologists relations has a new Associate Editor, Kurt Dongoske of the Hopi tribe. Kurt made a number of suggestions for changes in the column, and I was so grateful for them that I appointed him editor.

We have expanded our coverage of SAA news and business in a number of ways. Ralph Johnson, our Executive Director, prepares his "Briefings" column for every issue, and Donald Craib, SAA counsel, has turned the previously sporadic updates on governmental activities into a fine, regular column. His work will be especially important as archaeology and historic preservation begin to respond to the challenges posed by the new Congress as [reported in the March/April/May issue of the *SAA Bulletin*](#). We continue to publish, as received, updates on a host of SAA committees, task forces, and other entities engaged in SAA business.

While content continues to be of greatest importance to us, we hope you have noticed we have not neglected the appearance and the design of the *Bulletin*. We have created logos for almost every column and feature, and, like the journals, we have taken on standard SAA logos and formats to provide a sense of continuity across our publications.

Finally, one of our most important achievements has been the development of an electronic *SAA Bulletin*. Beginning with the November/December 1994 issue, we have provided a gopher version of the *Bulletin* and I'm happy to report, that a World Wide Web version is now available as well. I must say I was quite worried about the Web version. However, two graduate students in archaeology at UCSB--John Kantner and Doug Kennett--got tired of hearing me worry about it and simply did it. I have them to thank for helping me keep one of my greatest promises.

What about the future? I have yet another batch of promises for you for the coming year, and I hope to have the same success in achieving them. Archaeologists have always been fascinated by and have successfully used a wide variety of technological tools in their research. I'd like to launch a new column on promising technologies of value to our field, and I'm actively casting about for yet another associate editor to take charge of this enterprise. I hope you'll be able to read the first installment of this column before the next annual meeting.

I also want to expand the *Bulletin's* offerings to our Latin American colleagues. The SAA Task Force on Latin America has recommended that the *Bulletin* make an effort to provide information of interest to these colleagues, and to that end, I plan to appoint two new associate editors: one from Argentina and the other from Mexico. These two countries have the largest SAA memberships in Latin America, and they are a logical place to begin. I hope this will make the beginning of a long and productive involvement of Latin American archaeologists in the affairs of SAA.

I am also looking at ways to expand our coverage of SAA business, and this year I hope to develop regular contact with committee and task force chairs to encourage them to publish, when appropriate, news of their activities. These committees are anonymous to many of us, yet many important things happen within them. A broader knowledge of committees will also encourage broader participation in SAA business.

Finally, I hope to continue to develop the electronic versions of the *Bulletin* to keep abreast of the incredibly rapid changes in information technology. Those of you who have browsed the pages of the gopher *Bulletin* know that you get text only. The Web version offers expanded presentation of graphics, but it is still not the paper version of the *Bulletin*. We'll be looking at ways to give you a complete identical electronic version of the *Bulletin* over this year.

I enjoyed editing the *Bulletin* over the past year, and I am proud of what my staff and I have accomplished. We are looking forward to another year of challenges, and I hope by the next meeting, we'll be able to report a similar string of accomplishments and yet another batch of promises for the future.

Mark Aldenderfer

[To Top of Page](#)

Report of the Editor, *American Antiquity*

This has been a year of change for *American Antiquity*. Perhaps the most noticeable, the appearance of the journal has been altered. The cover looks the most different, and it is true we have gone to a new set of colors (matching those used in the Executive Office and by the Board), and a different typeface for the journal's title. The illustrations we use are now professionally developed for each cover, based on archaeological materials. This change has given the journal a new identify, one which is designed to convey the new level of organizational maturity represented in the Society for American Archaeology and our recognition that the major journal for professional archaeologists deserved an eye-catching and high-quality cover.

The interior of *American Antiquity* has also been transformed over the past two years. Part of this was already under way last year when I spoke to you. Perhaps the most notable change is that more of the space in the journal is devoted to the publication of archaeological research. This, of course, has meant that other material which we formerly published in the journal has been shortened or placed in other society publications. At the same time, we have made a number of changes to improve the readability of the journal. The size of print is larger; double columns are now used. Two columns also give us more flexibility with respect to the printing of tables and illustrations in the journal. I think they are easier to read.

Throughout this process, my first objective has been to keep the journal on its publication schedule, and in this, we have been more or less successful (despite some delays caused by the switch to the new format). The April 1995 issue should appear in the next couple of weeks and by the end of the year the journal will be back on its

regular schedule. For much of this success, I must thank Janet Walker who is the new managing editor of *American Antiquity*, as well as director of all the publications issued by the society. The transition to a new managing editor has gone relatively smoothly.

The papers published in *American Antiquity* represent a good mix of topics and areas, including a few that pertain to localities outside North America, including Latin America (an area of concern to the Task Force on Latin America). I am especially pleased to have published a number of papers which report research undertaken as a result of historic preservation compliance by archaeologists employed as consultants. As always, the number of papers we can publish in *American Antiquity* falls well below the number we receive as submissions, and it makes for some hard decisions regarding what to accept (especially since I would like to avoid leaving my successor with a large backlog of papers to publish under her editorship).

Although I have been relatively successful in the past two years in bringing the journal back on schedule, I have been notably less effective at managing the editorial office in Hawaii. This has led to a considerable slowdown in the rate at which I have been able to process manuscripts; it can still take much too long to reach a decision on manuscripts. It is for this reason that I have suggested we begin exploring the idea of moving the front end of the editorial functions for the journal to the Washington, D.C., office. I suspect that Janet Walker and her assistants can effectively track manuscripts, answer author queries, and remind the editor that decisions need to be completed in a timely fashion.

Finally, I note that the incoming editor-designate may not be prepared to assume her duties until later this year--that is when her departmental and university support will kick in. Yet, in order to have her first issue ready by July 1996 and if we expect that issue to be product of her editorial review process, it would be necessary for Lynne to begin her duties in the next month or so. While I am prepared to continue to receive papers and send them out for review until this fall, in the future the Executive Board may want to consider shifting the issues of the journal (currently April and July) during which the editors hand off and begin their respective duties.

Michael W. Graves

[To Top of Page](#)

Report of the Editor, *Latin American Antiquity*

Although the submission rate to *Latin American Antiquity* for this year just past is not what it was in earlier years, all of the journal's other vital signs indicate continuing good health. We have survived the transition in managing editors from Arizona to Washington, although not without some measure of trauma, and the journal has retained its subscribers at a level that is still, after five years, well above the projections made when *LAA* was created. It would be a mistake, however, to believe on the basis of what I have said that all is right with the *LAA* world. We still have two major areas of concern, of which only one has some current and forthcoming possible solutions.

LAA remains the only journal that truly attempts to serve as a medium of communication throughout the Americas, in all three of the major languages of this hemisphere. It falls far short, however, of success in the attempt because we cannot place the journal in the hands of enough of our impoverished Latin American colleagues. One potentially helpful initiative, already mentioned in the Editor's Corner, is the "Adopt-A-Scholar" program, and I urge you to read about it in Vol. 5 No. 3. A second helpful step will come with changes in membership arrangements that will take place this fall. A third, which came into being just this morning, is an effort to attract Latin American advertisers to *LAA*--a step that will surely convince more readers in Latin America that the journal is relevant to their lives.

Our second problem is one of language. *LAA* accepts manuscripts in English, Spanish, and now in Portuguese as well, but far too many of our Latin American colleagues choose to submit their work in English. This not only

costs them more in both time and money, but also conveys the message that Spanish is the second language for communication in this hemisphere's archaeological world. We face several forthcoming issues without a single Spanish article, a fact that underscores the importance of convincing our Latin American colleagues that we can--as indeed we must--read their language with as much facility as they show in reading ours. I have yet to find a fully effective way to go about such convincing, and I would welcome your suggestions.

Finally, I want to express my appreciation for Janet Walker's efforts in taking on the post of managing editor in our Washington office. Her learning curve in the arcane realm of archaeology has been exceedingly steep, and yet her pace up that formidable hill has been remarkably quick. What is far more important, though, is that she has managed to maintain her sense of humor throughout her learning time. It is clear that she knows, as do I, that in the publishing game if you do not keep laughing you will soon be crying.

David M. Pendergast

[To Top of Page](#)

Report of the Government Affairs Committee

The most significant change this past year has been the addition of Donald Craib to the Washington staff and the bringing of government affairs in-house has shifted locus of details from Albany to Washington. Donald's presence and expertise enable SAA to become a more active participant in public policy.

The Governmental Affairs Committee membership currently includes Judith Bense, Greg Bowen, Janet Brashler, Stephen Claggett, Gary Feinman, Gwynn Henderson, Shereen Lerner, Bruce McMillan, Gordon Peters, and myself. William Lipe assumed the role of ex-officio member of the committee with his election to the presidency. The term of Judith Bense expired last April, but I was able to persuade her to continue, and President Lipe has recently asked her to take over as chair.

Contacts with members of the committee have become less frequent and members are less involved with action steps now that government affairs has a staff member in Washington. Discussions last February with Bruce Smith, Bill Lipe, Ralph Johnson, and Donald Craib led us to conclude that the development of staff capabilities required an evolution of the committee's role from the day-to-day management of information and needed action to that of a policy-recommending body for government affairs, and in fact it already has assumed this role. As issues arise, issue groups are formed to deal with them under the general guidance of the committee. However, the issue groups are ad hoc and include the committee chair, the government affairs staffer, a committee member or two with expertise in the issue at hand, and other appropriate SAA members who have expertise and time necessary for whatever action is needed.

The year has been a busy one. We have been operating with the following list of priorities, approved by the board last September: federal agency coordination, curation, ecosystem initiatives, NHPA regulations and implementation, 1995 Farm Bill, DOD Legacy program, NSF and NEH appropriations, repatriation and NAGPRA, UNIDROIT, and extinguishing fires as necessary. Of these, one issue requiring a good deal of our attention has been the threat to the Section 106 review process and the National Historic Preservation Act. SAA must focus particular attention on the need to preserve the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the protections that Section 106 affords archaeological resources, and advertise the public benefits that have flowed from archaeological projects carried out under 106. This is a very important issue that was not identified as a high priority before the 1994 national elections.

We remain vigilant, watching federal reorganization, especially as it affects the Bureau of Land Management. While trying to flatten very hierarchical organizations within that agency, reorganizers may lose archaeology from the mix. We cannot predict outcomes and there is anxiety among rank and file archaeologists across the agencies.

Michael Kaczor alerted us to the current development of the 1995 Farm Bill, which will set farm programs for the next five years. The bill might give us an opportunity to target agricultural land with archaeological resources. The Environmental Easement Program of the earlier 1990 Farm Bill allows for the acquisition of easements on private lands that are environmentally sensitive. The inclusion of archaeological and historic sites among other sensitive resources would give us a new tool in their protection.

Also in the last year we heard of a BLM plan to allow construction of a pipeline through South Pass in Wyoming, a historically sensitive area. In addition, Wyoming has been designated a test state for streamlining Section 106 procedures. This is according to an agreement reached between the Advisory Council and the Wyoming SHPO. These two events require some careful attention. Bill Lipe met with BLM state directors in April, and Donald Craib is following the situation closely. While streamlining the 106 process is a good idea, we don't want it to lead to compliance avoidance.

We are moving incrementally in the area of Heritage Areas, following progress toward this concept of public land management. SAA has joined the National Coalition of Heritage Areas. Archaeology has much to gain from the development of heritage areas, no longer seen as second-rate substitutes for new national parks. We have also been more active recently in National Science Foundation and National Endowment for the Humanities affairs. We follow the Society for Historical Archaeology's lead with regard to NEH matters, and it would be beneficial to coordinate more closely with the American Anthropological Association if we can resolve our differences over NSF policy.

Other issues of abiding concern include:

Establishing alliances with organizations of like interests. One of these is the National Trust for Historic Preservation. In October 1994, Donald Craib attended a Trust meeting in Boston at which archaeology was a featured topic. Sherry Lerner chaired one of the sessions. This participation advanced our goal of making archaeology an important part of the Trust's agenda. And the relationship continues. On April 17, Bill Lipe, with Donna Seifert, SHA president, met with Richard Moe, Trust president.

Curation--an important high-priority issue. An issue paper emanating from a meeting organized by Bruce McMillan will be used to argue for, among other things, a grants program similar to the one in place for NAGPRA.

Keepers of the Treasures. We are exploring ways to cooperate with this Native American group.

Given the changes in Washington and our ability to be more reactive with Donald on board, we have set the following priorities for the next six months: extinguish fires as necessary, Section 106 and NHPA regulations, federal agency coordination, curation, ecosystem initiatives, 1995 Farm Bill, NSF and NEH appropriations, DOD Legacy, Repatriation and NAGPRA, UNIDROIT.

Dean Snow

[To Top of Page](#)

LAST PAGE TABLE OF CONTENTS NEXT PAGE

NEWS AND NOTES

The H. John Heinz III Charitable Trust announces its grant program for archaeological fieldwork in Latin America for 1996. This program will fund four to six scholars to conduct archaeological research in Latin America. Applications for dissertation research will not be considered. The maximum amount of the award is \$8,000. The deadline for submission is November 15, 1995, and notification of the award will be made by March, 1996. For complete information, write to Rose Gibson, H. John Heinz III Charitable Trust, 32 CNG Tower, 625 Liberty Ave., Pittsburgh, PA 15219. If you have questions, contact James B. Richardson III, Chairman, Division of Anthropology, Carnegie Museum of Natural History, (412) 665-2601, fax (412) 665-2751.

The National Endowment for the Humanities Reference Materials Program supports projects to prepare reference works that will improve access to information and resources. Support is available for the creation of dictionaries, historical or linguistic atlases, encyclopedias, catalogues raisonnés, other descriptive catalogs, grammars, databases, textbases, and other projects that will provide essential scholarly tools for the advancement of research or for general reference. Support is also available for projects that address important issues related to the design or accessibility of reference works. The application deadline is November 1, 1995, for projects beginning after September 1, 1996. For more information, contact Reference Materials, Room 318, NEH, Washington, DC 20506, e-mail jserventi@neh.fed.us.

After 30 years out-of-print, *Archeological Excavations at Jamestown, Virginia*, by John L. Cotter has been republished by the Archeological Society of Virginia with 38 additional pages of historical summary of the first permanent English settlement in America, and a history of the archaeological investigations up to 1958 and a summary of archaeological evidence from Virginia and Maryland tidewater sites since 1958. The additional material is by the author. The renewed availability of this volume, with its original base map, represents a basis for the current extensive investigations being carried out by a consortium of William and Mary and Colonial Williamsburg researchers for the National Park Service, and by William Kelso for the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities in its 22-acre inholding on Jamestown Island National Historical Site. Jamestown represents the pioneering archaeological study of an entire American community. The Jamestown volume reissue may be acquired by writing to the Archeological Society of Virginia, P.O. Box 70395, Richmond, VA 23255-0395. The price is \$34.95; add \$2.50 postage and handling.

The National Institute for the Conservation of Cultural Property (NIC) announces the availability of grants for the Conservation Assessment Program (CAP), contingent upon congressional appropriations for FY 1996. CAP is funded by the Institute of Museum Services (IMS) and administered by NIC. CAP provides funds for a professional conservation assessment of a museum's collections, environmental conditions, and sites. Conservation priorities are identified by professional conservators who spend two days on site and three days writing a report. Reports produced by conservators help museums develop strategies for improved collections care management that can be used for long-range planning and fund raising. A maximum of two assessors per institution are funded through CAP. Most museums are awarded an objects conservator to assess the museum's collections. Museums located in historic structures --buildings more than 50 years old--are awarded an architectural assessor. CAP is designed to serve museums --with small- to medium-sized collections and sites that can be surveyed in two days. Larger institutions are encouraged to contact IMS for information on the Conservation Project Support (CP) grant. CP grants fund conservation projects, including general conservation surveys by professional conservators that can be designed for more than two days on-site. Applications will be mailed to museums on NIC's CAP mailing list on October 6, 1995. Applications must be postmarked on or before December 1, 1995. To be added to NIC's CAP mailing list, institutions are encouraged to contact NIC. Sample applications are available to museums not already on our mailing list. Applicants from last year's waiting list will automatically receive a 1996 application. Since CAP grants are awarded on a first-come, first-served basis,

museums are advised to submit their application materials promptly. CAP is a one-time grant awarded to eligible museums on a noncompetitive basis. To request an application or receive further information, contact CAP, National Institute for the Conservation of Cultural Property, 3299 K St. N.W., Suite 602, Washington, DC 20007, (202) 625-1495, fax (202) 625-1485

The National Center for Preservation Technology and Training announces its 1996 Preservation Technology and Training Grants in historic preservation. The center is a National Park Service initiative to advance the practice of historic preservation in the fields of archaeology, architecture, landscape architecture, materials conservation, and interpretation. Grants will be awarded in three program areas: research, training, and information management. All proposals that seek to develop and distribute preservation skills and technologies for the identification, evaluation, conservation, and interpretation of cultural resources will be considered. Grants will be awarded on a competitive basis, pending the availability of funds. Only government agencies and not-for-profit institutions may apply for a grant. The proposal deadline is December 15, 1995. To request an application or receive further information, please contact the National Center for Preservation Technology and Training, NSU Box 5682, Natchitoches, LA 71497, e-mail acptt@alpha.nsula.edu.

The Architectural Conservation Laboratory of the Graduate Program in Historic Preservation at the University of Pennsylvania is pleased to announce that the Getty Grant Program has awarded a matching \$42,350 Project Preparation Grant to the National Park Service to work with the Architectural Conservation Laboratory at Mesa Verde National Park, Colo., during 1995-1996. The full funding of \$84,750 will be used to develop a conservation master plan for the survey, analysis, stabilization, and interpretation of the prehistoric mud plasters of Mug House at Mesa Verde National Park, which is listed as a World Cultural Heritage Site. Phase 1 of the work has been underway since summer 1994 with funding from the National Park Service through a cooperative agreement with the University of Pennsylvania. The initial phase has included the assembly of archival reports on past stabilization of the site and bibliographic research on North American prehistoric plasters and mural paintings. Selected sample plasters have been analyzed to determine their composition, properties, and sources of the components and finishes. The Getty grant now funds Phase 2, which will develop and implement a model documentation and survey program for the existing conditions of the plaster and masonry. An environmental monitoring plan will also be established. A third phase will implement a pilot conservation treatment program, including stabilization and presentation of the plasters. The Mug House plaster stabilization project will involve the disciplines of archaeology, architecture, and conservation to preserve a unique cultural resource. This project will be one of the first to develop comprehensive, long-range, conservation techniques for extant plasters in a ruined North American site using computer-aided documentation and graphic recordation and materials analysis. The project will bring together archaeologists, conservators, and architects under the direction of Frank G. Matero, associate professor of architecture and director of the Architectural Conservation Laboratory at the University of Pennsylvania, and Kathleen Fiero, archaeologist at Mesa Verde National Park. The Getty Grant Program and the cooperative agreement between the National Park Service and the university also provide field and laboratory training and academic fellowships for graduate students in the Historic Preservation Program at the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

The Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission invites applications for its 1996-1997 Scholars in Residence Program. The program provides support for full-time research and study at any commission facility, including the state archives, the state museum, and 26 historical sites. Residences are available for four to twelve consecutive weeks between May 1, 1996, and April 30, 1997, at the rate of \$1,200 per month. The program is open to all who are conducting research on Pennsylvania history, including academic scholars, public sector professionals, independent scholars, graduate students, writers, filmmakers, and others. For further information and application materials, contact Division of History, Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, P.O. Box 1026, Harrisburg, PA 17108, (717) 787-3034. Deadline is January 12, 1996.

The School of American Research has opened its 1996-1997 Fellowship Application Process. Resident Scholar fellowships are awarded each year by SAR to six scholars who need time to think and write about topics important to our understanding of the human condition. These fellowships provide apartments and offices on the school's campus in Santa Fe, N.M., as well as stipends, library assistance, and other benefits during the nine-month tenure. Books written by scholars may be considered for publication by SAR Press. The fellowships offer

their recipients time and facilities essential for creative intellectual pursuits. SAR's unique campus provides an atmosphere that nourishes the scholarly spirit by combining solitude and freedom from academic responsibilities with the lively exchange of ideas found in a stimulating community of scholars. Funding for the Resident Scholar Program is provided by the Weatherhead Foundation, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Katrin H. Lamon Endowment for Native American Art and Education. For application guidelines and more information, contact Resident Scholar Program, School of American Research, P.O. Box 2188, Santa Fe, NM 87504, (505) 982-3583, fax (505)989-9809.

The American Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works announces the availability of two new publications. The *1995 AIC Abstracts* contains abstracts for more than 100 papers presented at AIC's 23rd Annual Meeting in St. Paul, Minn., June 4-11, 1995. Lengthy, substantive abstracts from the general session on ethics in conservation, as well as abstracts from the specialty groups sessions and the poster session, are included. General session topics in *AIC Abstracts* focus on ethical investigations into the antiquities trade, UNESCO, large-scale disaster recovery, aircraft restoration, care and treatment of human skeletal remains, conservation of natural science collections, maintenance of outdoor sculpture, and architectural conservation. Abstracts are arranged by session topics such as ownership and the theft of cultural objects, professional responsibilities, preservation of collections in an uncontrolled environment, ethics and the conservation of archaeological materials, ethics and the conservation of scientific and industrial collections, and responsibilities in the management and preservation of diverse and large-scale collections. Specialty group papers focus on recent conservation projects in architecture, book and paper, photographic materials, objects and sculpture, wooden artifacts, paintings, and textiles. The *Gilded Metal Surfaces Symposium Abstracts* includes 19 detailed abstracts from this highly acclaimed symposium. AIC is the national membership organization of conservation professionals that advances the practice and promotes the importance of the conservation of cultural property. Prices for *1995 Abstracts* (116 pages): \$10/members, \$15/non-members. For *Gilded Metal Surfaces Symposium Abstracts* (33 pages): \$5/members, \$10/non-members. Add \$3 postage and handling for each publication. Orders must be prepaid by check or money order made out to AIC. Foreign orders must be paid in U.S. dollars drawn on a U.S. bank. Contact AIC, 1717 K St. N.W., Suite 301, Washington, DC 20006, (202) 452-9545.

[To Top of Page](#)

LAST PAGE TABLE OF CONTENTS NEXT PAGE

POSITIONS OPEN

The American Center of Oriental Research (Amman, Jordan): ACOR seeks personnel for numerous excavations and restoration projects anticipated over the next few years. Professionals are needed in the areas of conservation and restoration of monuments, historical architecture, architectural documentation, cultural resource management, excavation, archaeological drafting, photography, and project management. Dates and terms of employment as yet to be determined. Send resume and the names, addresses, and telephone numbers of three references to ACOR Office, c/o ASOR, 3301 North Charles St., Baltimore, MD 21218.

Archaeological and Historical Consultants, Inc. (AHC) is accepting applications for the position of Principal Investigator for CRM projects. Responsibilities include client/agency coordination, supervision of fieldwork, analysis, and report/proposal preparation. Requirements include an M.A. (Ph.D. preferred) with an archaeological focus, at least one year of experience in the supervision of archaeological fieldwork, and a demonstrated ability to produce quality reports in a timely fashion. Knowledge of eastern U.S. prehistory and strong specialization in lithic analysis (backed by publication) preferred. Competitive salary and benefits package is offered, including health insurance and retirement plan. AHC is located in central Pennsylvania, near Pennsylvania State University. Submit vitae, letter of application, and references to Dr. David Rue, Program Manager, Archaeological and Historical Consultants, Inc., P.O. Box 482, Centre Hall, PA 16828, (814) 364-2135, EOE.

Professor of Archaeology, (Level E1), Department of Archaeology and Anthropology, Faculty of Arts, The Australian National University. Applications are invited from suitably qualified candidates with a distinguished record of research and publication for appointment to the position of Professor of Archaeology in the Department of Archaeology and Anthropology in the Faculties. The University is seeking a scholar of international standing, with an active research program and a good teaching record in Archaeology, who will provide academic leadership. Regional and topical specializations are open, but the successful candidate will be expected to engage in and foster development in existing focal areas of student and staff research and to maintain the department's strength in the archaeology of Australia and its region. Teaching and research in Archaeology within the Department have been actively pursued since 1970, mainly focusing on the prehistory of Australia and its immediate region. Current staff and graduate students undertake research in Australia, East and Southeast Asia, Oceania and South America. The Department offers a broad range of undergraduate courses on regional, theoretical and practical aspects of Archaeology. Undergraduate Archaeology is taught to honours level and a range of postgraduate degrees are offered to the PhD level, with a large postgraduate student enrollment from a wide range of international backgrounds. The Department is committed to the highest level of training for its students and to maintaining a position in the forefront of research and teaching in Archaeology. The Department is multistreamed and currently has a full-time staff of five archaeologists, eight social/cultural anthropologists, and two biological anthropologists. Candidates must have a commitment to and demonstrated excellence in teaching. Administrative aptitude and willingness is important as the appointee will be expected to serve substantial terms as Head of Department on a rotating basis with the Professor of Anthropology. Contact: Professor F.C. Merlan, Head, Department of Archaeology and Anthropology, (61 6) 249-3498, fax (61 6) 249-2711. The position is available from January 1966. Further particulars and selection criteria are available from the Secretary, (61 6) 249-4566, fax (61 6) 249-5011. Ref: FA21.6.2. Annual salary: A\$ 80,176. Appointment: Continuing. Applications should be submitted in duplicate to the Secretary, The Australian National University, Canberra ACT 0200, Australia, quoting reference number and including a curriculum vitae, list of publications, and the names, addresses and fax numbers of three references. The University has a "no-smoking" policy in all University buildings and vehicles. The University is an Equal Opportunity Employer.

PHRI seeks Projects Supervisors and a Lab Supervisor for archaeological work in Guam. Graduate degree in Archaeology and excellent writing, organizational, and communication skills required. Previous Pacific Basin and/or CRM experience preferred. Applicants must document at least two years supervisory experience in either field or lab setting. Send vita plus four references to Human Resources, PHRI, 204 Waianuenue Ave., Hilo, HI 96720.

Kent State University seeks an Archaeologist, Ph.D. completed. Theoretical interests in site formation processes, technological organization, and/or human ecology, with particular expertise in geoarchaeology, physio-chemical analysis, or GIS. Geographic area open, but preference for eastern North America or east Africa. Commitment to fundable research and student training required. Candidate must show broad teaching capabilities and is expected to enhance a general M.A. program or Ph.D. in Biological Anthropology. Beginning January or August 1996, Asst Prof, tenure-track. Women and minorities are particularly encouraged to apply. Deadline: October 15, 1995. Send vita, letter of application, evidence of teaching excellence, and names of three references to Mark Seeman, Chair, Archaeology Search Committee, Department of Anthropology, P.O. Box 5190, KSU, Kent, OH 44240. EOE/AAE.

East Carolina University seeks a North American archaeologist, assistant professor, tenure-track position starting August 19, 1996. Preference is for those with expertise in the prehistory of the Southeast and Middle Atlantic subareas. Teaching includes introductory and graduate level anthropology/archaeology courses and regional culture area courses. Must demonstrate potential for research, publication, and obtaining grants and contracts. Send vita and references by November 30 to Linda D. Wolfe, Anthropology, Brewster A-215, East Carolina University, Greenville, NC 27858-4353. An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action University. Accommodates individuals with disabilities. Applicants must comply with the Immigration Reform and Control Act. Official transcripts are required upon employment.

Poverty Point Station Archaeologist applications are being accepted for a joint program of Northeast Louisiana University, the Louisiana Division of Archaeology, and the Louisiana Office of State Parks. The archaeologist will define research priorities and objectives for the Poverty Point site, a National Historic Landmark site located in northeastern Louisiana; survey and test portions of the site; collaborate on preservation, interpretation, and development plans for Poverty Point State Commemorative Area; and share information about archaeology and archaeological preservation with governmental representatives and with the public. The archaeologist in the Poverty Point position will be part of the Regional and Station Archaeology Program coordinated by the Division of Archaeology. This highly visible program has strong public support and offers the opportunity to develop research interests. This position does not involve fieldwork related to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. The archaeologist will be an adjunct on the faculty of Northeast Louisiana University in Monroe and will have office and lab space at Poverty Point State Commemorative Area northeast of Monroe, operated by the Louisiana Office of State Parks. A master's degree in anthropology with a specialization in archaeology is required; a Ph.D. is preferred. Completion of a prehistoric archaeological field, lab, and analysis project must be evidenced by a thesis, dissertation, or equivalent report. Experience in prehistoric archaeology of the Southeast is highly desirable. Also helpful is experience in organizing independent research, word processing, public speaking, report writing, and experience working with governmental representatives. Salary: \$27,500. Applications will be accepted until November 15, 1995, or until a suitable candidate is found. Send letter, vita, and names of three references to Dr. Thomas H. Eubanks, State Archaeologist, Division of Archaeology, P.O. Box 44247, Baton Rouge, LA 70804, (504) 342-8170. EOE/AA/ADA.

City of Corpus Christi, Corpus Christi Museum of Science and History is accepting application for an archaeologist. Duties include being directly responsible for the operation of archaeology programs, exhibits, and archival holdings as they relate to the Museum's archaeological collections. Also responsible for cataloguing, curating, and conserving the "1554 Shipwreck Collection" and marine and terrestrial archaeological collections. Conducts and oversees research on marine and terrestrial archaeological collections. Publish and disseminate information pertaining to the collections through scholarly venues, academic presentations, and public programs, including school groups. Responsible for dividing duties on a part-time basis as an instructor at Texas A&M University, Corpus Christi. May need to participate in underwater archaeological projects. Minimum

qualifications include a Doctor of Philosophy degree in Anthropology or another related field, and a minimum of five years professional experience in a museum or comparable facility and/or five years teaching experience at the college or university level; or any equivalent combination of training, education or experience. Some marine archaeology experience preferred, but not required. Must be able to pass underwater scuba training/certification. Send vitae to Human Resources Department, City of Corpus Christi, 1201 Leopard, Corpus Christi, TX 78401, EOE. Selection process will include a panel interview. Salary Range: \$2,401-\$3,375 monthly, based on experience.

The Documentarion Program of The Getty Conservation Institute comprises the Institute's comprehensive Library, *Art and Archaeology Technical Abstracts*, and the Research and Applications Section (R&A). R&A undertakes research in and application of innovative applications of technology, information management, effective approaches to condition reporting, systematic strategies for tracking the progress of field interventions, models for planning documentation campaigns. The Program seeks one highly qualified manager for the R&A Section and Deputy Director over all three sections of the Program. He/she will work under supervision of the Program Director; will coordinate three sections and supervise ten staff plus occasional Fellows; set policies and priorities for the "Research and Applications" sections of the Program; will implement documentation strategies in heritage conservation; will assist with budgeting, management, and advocacy for the Program; might do research, teach, write for publication, organize conferences. Qualifications: graduate degree in conservation, archaeology, or architecture; concentration in field recording planning/implementation; project management experience; five to seven years experience at the highest level of competence. Fluency in at least one foreign language. Excellent administrative and English writing skills are required. Must be free to travel. Salary and benefits commensurate with qualifications. The J. Paul Getty Trust is an equal opportunity employer. Please send a cover letter and resume to (or contact for more information) Yvonne Bradshaw, Human Resources (DDD), J. Paul Getty Trust, 401 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 900, Santa Monica, CA 90401, (310) 395-0388.

Espey, Huston & Associates, Inc. (EH&A) announces an open position for a project archaeologist/Principal Investigator in our Williamsburg, Virginia office. An M.A. or Ph.D. in archaeology/anthropology or historical archaeology is required in addition to two years of experience in a supervisory CRM role. Duties will include all aspects of CRM work including proposal and budget preparation, supervision of fieldwork, analysis of data, and report preparation. The primary emphasis will be in the Virginia area in support of our Williamsburg office, although some travel to other eastern states may be required. EH&A is a full service environmental firm with over 400 employees. The offered salary will be commensurate with experience. The position also provides vacation, holiday and sick leave, medical and dental insurance, a 401K plan, and profit sharing. Contact Clell Bond, Espey, Huston & Associates, Inc., P.O. Box 519, Austin, TX 78767, fax (512) 327-2453.

ASM Affiliates, Inc., a southern California CRM firm, invites applications for a permanent full-time Associate Archaeologist position as Lab Director. Responsibilities include directing the laboratory analysis and interpretation of archaeological data for technical reports. Prior computer experience with data entry, management, and analysis are needed. Demonstrated writing skills are a must. Expertise in lithic or faunal analysis (vertebrates and/or invertebrates) are preferred and opportunities to pursue own research interests exist. M.A. in anthropology/archaeology is strongly preferred. Competitive salary and benefit packages are commensurate with experience and qualifications. Send application letter, resume, and names of three references by Nov. 1, 1995 to ASM Affiliates, Inc. (Attn. Dr. Seetha N. Reddy), P.O. Box 2476, Leucadia, CA 92023, fax (619) 794-9176. ASM Affiliates, Inc. is an equal opportunity employer.

Position Wanted

Registered Land Surveyor seeks position/assignment with archaeological team for surveying, mapping, and excavation of foreign or domestic sites. Self employed, 25 years varied experience, AutoCAD literate, A.S. Civil Engineering, own equipment. Keen interest without formal education in archaeology. Contact James E. Franklin, 173 Deerfield Rd., Candia, NH 03034, (603) 483-8808.

CALENDAR

September 29 - October 1, 1995

THE SECOND ANNUAL MEETING OF THE MIDWEST BIOARCHAEOLOGY AND FORENSIC ANTHROPOLOGY ASSOCIATION will be held at the Holmes Student Center on the campus of Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, Ill. Informal paper and poster presentations on current research, methodological advances, and case studies are invited. For information, please contact Maria O. Smith or Denise C. Hodges, Department of Anthropology, Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, IL 60115, (815) 753-0246.

October 11 - 15, 1995

THE 49TH NATIONAL PRESERVATION CONFERENCE will be held in Fort Worth, Tex., with the theme "Strategies and Partnerships for a New Era." For registration information, call (800) 944-6847.

October 18 - 22, 1995

THE 53RD ANNUAL PLAINS ANTHROPOLOGICAL CONFERENCE will be held in Laramie, Wyo. Paper abstracts were due by September 8, 1995. For more information about the conference and for local arrangements, contact Sue Powell, Plains Conference, Conferences and Institutes, Box 3972, University Station, Laramie, WY 82071, (307) 766-2124, email plnconf@uwyo.edu. For more information about the program, contact Marcel Kornfeld or Charles Reher (307) 766-5136, email plnconf@uwyo.edu.

October 21 - 22, 1995

THE 14TH ANNUAL NORTHEAST CONFERENCE ON ANDEAN ARCHAEOLOGY AND ETHNOHISTORY will be hosted by Rhode Island School of Design in Providence, R. I. Send titles for papers and abstracts to Elisabeth Bonnier and Edward Dwyer, Division of Liberal Arts, Rhode Island School of Design, 2 College St., Providence, RI 02903, (401) 454-6570, fax (401) 454-6586, email edwyer@risd.edu. Feel free to request a formal letter of invitation to solicit travel funds, if needed.

October 25 - 29, 1995

THE MIDWEST ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONFERENCE will hold its annual meeting and celebration of the 100th anniversary of the Logan Museum of Anthropology. For more information, contact Robert J. Salzer, Department of Anthropology, Beloit College, 700 College, Beloit, WI 53511, (608) 363-2616, fax (608) 363-2718.

October 26 - 29, 1995

THE EASTERN STATES ARCHAEOLOGICAL FEDERATION will hold its 62nd Annual Meeting at the Radisson Hotel in Wilmington, Del. Abstracts of proposed papers and/or symposia were due by June 1, 1995. For local arrangements, contact Ronald A. Thomas, MAAR Associates, Inc., P.O. Box 655, Newark, DE 19715, (302) 368-5777.

November 2 - 5, 1995

THE AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR ETHNOHISTORY will hold its annual meeting at the Radisson Plaza Hotel at Kalamazoo Center, Kalamazoo, Mich. Preregistration fees and abstracts were due by June 2, 1995. Limited travel funds will be available on a competitive basis for students presenting papers. For more information, contact ASE 1995 Meeting Chair, Donald L. Fixico, Department of History, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI 49008-5020, (616) 387-4629, fax (616) 387-3999.

November 8 - 11, 1995

THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE SOUTHEASTERN ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONFERENCE will be

held at the Hilton Hotel in Knoxville, Tenn. For local arrangements contact Jefferson Chapman, and for program arrangements contact Gerald Schroedl at SEAC Conference, Department of Anthropology, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37996-0720, (615) 974-4408, fax (615) 974-2686.

November 10 - 12, 1995

THE 1995 CHACMOOL CONFERENCE will be held at the University of Calgary. Its theme is "Archaeology into the New Millennium: Public or Perish." For further information, please contact Department of Archaeology, c/o 1995 Conference Committee, 8th Floor, Earth Sciences, University of Calgary, 2500 University Dr. N.W., Calgary, Alberta, Canada T2N 1N4, fax (403) 282-9567, email 13042@ucdasvm1.admin.ucalgary.ca.

November 17 - 18, 1995

THE 4TH OHIO ARCHAEOLOGICAL COUNCIL CONFERENCE will synthesize archaeological research on the Archaic stage in Ohio and surrounding areas, including the mid- and upper Ohio River valley and the Lake Erie Basin, at its meetings at Cleveland State University, Cleveland, Ohio. For information, contact Kent Vickery, OAC Conference Coordinator, Department of Anthropology, University of Cincinnati, P.O. Box 210380, Cincinnati, OH 45221, (513) 556-5787, fax (513) 556-2778.

January 2 - 7, 1996

THE 1996 SOCIETY FOR HISTORICAL ARCHAEOLOGY CONFERENCE ON HISTORICAL AND UNDERWATER ARCHAEOLOGY will be held at the Omni Netherland Plaza, Cincinnati, Ohio. The themes are "Bridging Distances: Recent Approaches to Immigration, Migration, and Ethnic Identity," and "Forging Partnerships in Outreach and Education." For further information, please contact Marcy Gray, Conference Chair, Gray and Pape, 1318 Main St., Cincinnati, OH 45210, (513) 665-6707, email 76554.3313@compuserve.com, or Kim A. McBride, Program Coordinator, Department of Anthropology, 211 Lafferty Hall, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY 40506-0024, (606) 257-1944, email kamcbr00@ukcc.uky.edu.

March 27 - 30, 1996

THE 19TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE SOCIETY OF ETHNOBIOLOGY will be held at the Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History. For information, contact Jan Timbrook, Department of Anthropology, Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History, 2559 Puesta del Sol Rd., Santa Barbara, CA 93105, (805) 682-4711 ext. 307, fax (805) 569-3170.

April 10 - 14, 1996

THE 61ST ANNUAL MEETING OF THE SOCIETY FOR AMERICAN ARCHAEOLOGY will be held at the Marriott Hotel in New Orleans, La.

April 15, 1996

HISTORY AND PREHISTORY OF CERAMIC KILNS SYMPOSIUM will be held in Indianapolis, Ind., at the annual meeting of the American Ceramic Society, sponsored by the Committee on Ceramic History. The focus will be on kiln and kiln-firing technologies across a wide cultural area and span of time. For further information, please contact Prudence M. Rice, Department of Anthropology, Mailcode 4502, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL 62901; or contact W. David Kingery, MSE-338E Mines Building, #12, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721.

May 20 - 24, 1996

THE INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM ON ARCHAEOOMETRY will be held at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. For further information, contact Sarah Wisseman, ATAM Program, University of Illinois, 116 Observatory, 901 S. Mathews, Urbana, IL 61801, (217) 333 6629, fax (217) 244-0466, email wisarc@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu.

May 24 - 26, 1996

THE 3RD EASTERN STATES ROCK ART CONFERENCE will be held at the University of Maine at Machias. The conference will include participants from eastern and central United States and from Canada. Guided tours of prehistoric Algonkian petroglyph sites on Machias Bay are planned for Friday afternoon, May 24, and for Sunday morning, May 26. Saturday, May 25, will be given to presentations on rock art research with

informal meetings and discussions Friday and Saturday evenings. Papers or poster exhibits on rock art in central or eastern North America are due by December 31, 1995. For further information, please contact Mark Hedden, Maine Historic Preservation Commission, 55 Capitol St., Augusta, ME 04333.

June 12 - 15, 1996

THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR CONSERVATION OF HISTORIC AND ARTISTIC WORKS will address the topic of "Collaboration in the Visual Arts" in its general session. The intent of the session is to explore the necessity of identifying and understanding the range of materials and complex techniques of fabrication employed in the creation of significant objects and works of art. Presentations should focus on historical and/or modern case studies and emphasize how an understanding of the collaborative efforts employed in making an object inform the conservator's decisions about care and treatment. Abstracts should present a detailed summary of the subject matter to permit an evaluation of the paper's quality and significance. Abstracts are due October 2, 1995, and should be double-spaced and no more than two pages. Send to Jay Krueger, AIC Vice-president and Program Chair, National Gallery of Art, DCL, 6th St. and Constitution Ave. N.W., Washington, DC 20005, (202) 452-9545, fax (202) 452-9545.

September 8 - 14, 1996

THE XIII INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF THE UNION OF PREHISTORIC AND PROTOHISTORIC SCIENCES will take place in Forli, Italy. For more information, please contact Sarah Milliken, c/o Segreteria XIII Congresso U.I.S.P.P., Via Marchesi, 1, 47100 Forli, Italy, fax 39.543.35805.

[To Top of Page](#)

LAST PAGE TABLE OF CONTENTS
