

# BULLETIN

## OF THE SOCIETY FOR AMERICAN ARCHAEOLOGY

VOLUME I

MARCH 1983

NO. 1 & 2

### A BULLETIN FOR THE SOCIETY

R. E. W. Adams

The *BULLETIN*, which is launched with this issue, has been a dream of so many for so long, that it seems somewhat unlikely to be writing a forward for it. While experimental we hope that this venture will mature into a consistent and regular publication of the Society.

Communication is the lifeblood of a learned society. Journals and annual meetings traditionally take care of scientific interchange. When professionalism enters the equation, as it has increasingly in recent years for the Society, the need for a rapid form of communication becomes essential. This was foreseen by Society presidents at least as far back as McGimsey. The major problems were those of format and cost. Struever and Wendorf took on the task of attempting to raise money enough for a full-fledged newsletter, which would appear at least monthly and would be well enough produced to appeal to non-professionals as well as to archaeologists. This was jocularly named "the Cadillac model." Unfortunately, the funds raised were not sufficient to guarantee the long term (more than one year) viability of the newsletter as then conceived. We then stepped back to reconsider the whole matter and came up with what was called "the skateboard model." Because of administrative problems the potential editor encountered

at her home institution, this model did not roll either. Finally, and gratefully, we were able to find Alan Downer, who came in with a feasible and affordable proposal. The *BULLETIN* is the result. It is not quite what anybody expected (perhaps documenting once again the stochastic nature of life). However, it is with considerable satisfaction that the Executive Committee sees it launched and we hope that it will be received by the membership with equal enthusiasm. We must be grateful to Alan Downer and his staff for taking on this vital task. Undoubtedly there will be problems of growth, development and adjustment. There must be, if the *BULLETIN* is to become the vehicle of rapid communication meeting most of those needs of the profession. I ask that all of the readers give the editor their support and whatever constructive advice may occur to them. Meanwhile, I wish all involved the best of fortune.

### THE SOCIETY AND ITS ADMINISTRATION: NEW DIRECTIONS

R. E. W. Adams and  
George C. Frison

For the past ten years, the Society has increasingly shifted routine administration to the office of the American Anthropological Association. At present, the AAA performs services under contract for the Society, which include the following major areas.

Maintenance of membership lists.

Billing of members for annual dues.

Accounting and comptroller functions.

(Including preparation of quarterly statements, assisting the Executive Committee in budget preparation, arranging for an independent audit, filing of tax statements.)

Arranging for the annual meeting and coordinating with the Annual Meeting Chair.

(Hotel selection and negotiation in accord with Executive Committee directives, etc.)

Production of Society publications; *AMERICAN ANTIQUITY* and *SAA PAPERS*.

Financial management of invested funds.

A number of other, ad hoc, services are provided as needed. For example, when SAA representatives go to Washington to testify before Congress, AAA backs them up with staff, xeroxing, advice, contacts, phones, desk space, etc. Service from the AAA has been by and large, highly satisfactory, reasonable in cost, and timely.

These services are to be terminated by June 1, 1984. The immediate cause is that the U.S. Internal Revenue Service has pressed the AAA on the matter of "unrelated business income" (UBI).  
(continued on page 4).



*In order to better inform the Society membership, the BULLETIN presents the following statements by the candidates for President-elect. We urge you to read these carefully. In these exciting times, it is more important than ever that we maintain the quality of the Society's leadership--your informed vote is the best way to be assured of this. ad.*

DON D. FOWLER

goals toward which I would work in cooperation with the SAA Executive and other committees, SAA membership, and related societies and organizations.

MAMIE KLEBERG  
PROFESSOR OF HISTORIC  
PRESERVATION AND ANTHROPOLOGY  
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA-RENO

#### POSITION STATEMENT

My position is predicated on the following considerations:

1) The SAA faces a number of critical issues of both immediate and long-range importance given the current economic and political climates of the country. Archeology and numerous related disciplines are under strong critical attack nationally, and in some areas, regionally and locally. Such attack needs strong, active countermeasures to maintain the viability and utility of the disciplines.

2) The SAA membership includes individuals with a variety of (sometimes overlapping, sometimes separate) interests: academic, cultural resource management, contracting and avocational. These interests each need to be recognized and served.

3) Archeology should not be organizationally submerged. But, at the same time, theoretical and data-utilization interests of archeologists vis-a-vis sister disciplines should be fostered and encouraged.

The foregoing considerations underlie the following positions I would take and

1) The SAA should not participate in the proposed merger with the American Anthropological Association. While the proposed merger might solve the tax-status problem posed by the IRS ruling discussed at recent meetings and in the AAA Newsletter, I do not feel that it is in the best interests of the SAA or the archeological community to join in such a merger. The SAA stands to lose, a) its legal identity; b) possibly its ability to control its finances and investments; c) its ability to effectively represent the needs and concerns of archeology to legislators, other government officials, and the public; d) its ability to speak independently on public issues. The proposed merger has the potential of relegating archeology to a status similar to that of Section H of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

While I believe that the SAA should be legally and financially independent, I feel also that the SAA should seek the formation of a Council comprised of SAA and other anthropological organizations to address issues of general or mutual concern. Such a Council might be comprised of the Presidents, or elected delegates from the constituent organizations. SAA participation in such a Council should be sanctioned by a vote of the membership and reviewed periodically.

2) If the SAA is to be independent, it will have to establish appropriate mechanisms and relationships to carry on the business of the Society, especially publication of *AMERICAN ANTIQUITY* and other series, annual meetings, notification and collection of dues and investments. Careful consideration will have to be given to the mechanics and costs of conducting business. I fully realize the complexities and potential problems inherent in such a course and offer no panaceas. Rather, I propose a careful analysis of the various SAA business functions and how each might most effectively be handled. Publication functions might be contracted to a university press; other functions might be centered in a strengthened Secretary's or Secretary/Treasurer's office. Investment functions might be handled through investment councilors or mutual funds. The investment practices of other scholarly societies should be studied for possible models.

3) The internal organization of the Executive Committee should be strengthened by extending the at-large terms to three years. This would permit Committee members to learn their jobs in the first year and act more effectively over a longer time span.

4) The SAA should establish closer working ties with other archeological societies. Commonality of interests should be explored and determinations made as to whether the interests and aims of smaller "splinter" organizations could better be served by an SAA responsive to all archeological interests, or through some other coordinated effort. I feel that the SAA should support the ethical and professional aims of the Society of Professional Archeologists, but that SOPA should remain a legally independent entity.

5) The long-discussed archeological Newsletter should be actively pursued and means (continued on page 6)

*The BULLETIN of the Society for American Archaeology is a bimonthly publication of the Society for American Archaeology. Alan S. Downer, Editor. The BULLETIN is distributed free to all U.S. members of the SAA and all U.S. institutional subscribers to AMERICAN ANTIQUITY. Correspondence relating to subscriptions, address changes, claims for lost issues should be addressed to the American Anthropological Association, 1703 New Hampshire Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C. 20009. Information for inclusion in the BULLETIN, articles for publication, letters to the editor should be sent to SAA BULLETIN, P. O. Box 1505, Springfield, Illinois 62705.*



W. JAMES JUDGE

DIRECTOR, CHACO RESEARCH  
PROJECT, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE  
UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO  
ALBUQUERQUE

#### STATEMENT

As most members of the Society of American Archaeology are aware, substantial changes in the relationship between the SAA and the American Anthropological Association may take place in the near future. From the standpoint of SAA the choice seems to be for us to continue as an independent organization and seek management of our business affairs elsewhere (the AAA now provides these at cost), or to partially lose our identity through formal incorporation as a "division" of the AAA. Under the latter alternative, membership in the SAA could be achieved only through affiliation with the AAA, and most of the archeologists I have talked to object to this loss of independence. Currently, the Executive Committee of the SAA is exploring the possibility of seeking professional management elsewhere at an economical cost. As Treasurer of the SAA I have supported this effort, to insure that we as archaeologists can maintain a strong and independent professional society.

In the discussions I have had on this issue, I have been struck by the strong sentiment of unity that exists within the archeological community, even though we represent a variety of diverse elements. Conspicuously absent, however, is any concerted or organized effort to enhance this unity. Since we are currently being forced to re-examine the means by which the SAA conducts its business, I feel we should take advantage of this opportunity to re-examine what our Society does for its membership. We may now have the chance to develop a Society that would be more directly meaningful to each of us, regardless of specialty or interest. At the same time I feel we could make the diversity of our activities more readily

understandable to the public, to whom we are ultimately responsible.

If elected President I would pursue this goal through attempting to achieve a much higher degree of unity among all of us who have a deep and abiding interest in archeology, amateur and professional alike. Though much easier said than done, it should be possible nonetheless to effect changes in several aspects of the Society which would lead to a much stronger, more relevant organization. In particular, I think we could consider changes in the structure of the SAA, in the means by which it communicates to its membership and to others, and in its funding base. Some ideas on these issues, gathered through discussion with colleagues, are presented below:

#### STRUCTURE

I suggest that we consider the possibility of formally strengthening the bond between the SAA and regional or state organizations. Many state archeological councils and other organizations provide excellent services to their own constituencies and thus provide a vehicle for communication to "grass roots" archeologists, as well as a means for those individuals to actively participate in archeology at the national level. Alan Downer has noted the strength of local organizations in his most recent COPA COMMUNICATION. We should build on this strength and tap the potential of archeologists who are not currently participating in archeology beyond their local areas. The Society must recognize and serve this constituency, and in turn benefit from their ideas and opinions as to how our profession should develop in the future. Further, I think we should examine the possibility of forming a "federation" of existing (sometimes competing) specialized archeological organizations, in order to make more effective use of membership dues and the expertise of the members. I use the term "federation" in the conceptual sense, because I feel the SAA must not "take over" a more specialized society and in

the process destroy its contribution to its membership and to our profession. Societies such as ASCA and SOPA were formed to address specific needs, needs not fulfilled at the time by the SAA, and they continue to serve such needs. The intent in more effectively integrating such organizations should not be to wrest control from them, but to strengthen the functions they fulfill, and accomplish this more efficiently. At this point, it would be both presumptuous and premature to propose an explicit organizational structure to achieve these goals. I would establish a select committee to address these issues, and make recommendations to the membership about basic changes in structure to enhance our unity. Given the will to effect such change, and leadership by the Society's officers, a much stronger organization, more meaningful to all archeologists, would emerge.

#### COMMUNICATION

There are a number of aspects of communication which merit attention. First, it is imperative to keep *AMERICAN ANTIQUITY* and the *SAA PAPERS* highly professional and continually meaningful to the membership, through the selection of consistently outstanding editors. We must insure that this continues. In addition, the *BULLETIN* of which this is the first issue, must be continued and strengthened through our increased support. The lack of an archeological newsletter has been one of the primary causes in the breakdown of communication between the SAA and its members. As the *BULLETIN* grows, the relationship between it and the other newsletters should be examined to insure maximum effectiveness of all efforts.

Further, as members concerned about the future of our profession as well as the future conservation of archeological resources, both in the U.S. and other countries, we need a means to communicate the perceived needs of our discipline to Congress through organized lobbying efforts. The SAA currently has a lobbyist in Washington, and in the past (continued on page 4).



our lobbying efforts have been successful. What we lack, however, is an effective means to compile and articulate the desired information to our lobbyist in a timely manner, so that he may convey our message to Congress. The Society's recently formed Committee on Federal Archaeology and the revitalized COPA network can help this effort, but not without our support. Regardless of the diversity of interests, archeologists must speak with a unified voice if we wish to influence legislation on behalf of our membership and our research base.

As the number of regional, national, international, and specialized archeological journals grows, it becomes increasingly difficult to keep current with the theoretical, methodological, and empirical developments in our profession. I would suggest that we have reached the point where the SAA, as a service to its membership, should consider initiating the periodic publication of abstracts of articles published in all archeological journals, with key word cross-referencing, and, perhaps, a listing of all published book reviews. Finally in the realm of communication, we should undertake a positive outreach program to more effectively communicate our theories, methods, and findings to the general public. Ultimately, unless the public understands what we do and why we do it, our profession will deteriorate. No archeological program, public or private, can exist long in the absence of support from the general population.

#### FUNDING

None of these goals can be accomplished without adequate funding. As Treasurer, I know that the Society is in good financial condition, and that it has adequate investments to protect its functions in the case of an emergency. However, I also know that to provide better services to the membership will require more substantial funding than can be achieved through periodic dues increases. Therefore, I

suggest that a strong and positive effort be made to seek additional funds through the acquisition of major endowments, and if elected President I would initiate efforts to pursue this. Further, a very effective way to augment annual income is to increase membership, and I suggest that we develop new programs designed to reach new audiences, professional and avocational, domestic and foreign. Also, some of the Society's business could be made more efficient through the use of better management techniques, including such things as the delegation of responsibility to standing committees organized on a regional basis, which could then meet more frequently at minimal expense. Further, NSF or other such funding could be sought by the Society wherever possible to support specific projects of relevance to the membership as a whole.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, I feel the time has come for the Society to retain its own Executive Director, whose full efforts are devoted to administering the affairs of the SAA in the most efficient means possible. Again, I endorse the Executive Committee's current efforts in searching for such management.

I have outlined above a number of suggestions for change in our Society. They are just suggestions, nothing more. The questions facing us are; can we as archeologists organize more effectively to provide better services to our members and to speak with a stronger, more unified voice to those who control the resources comprising our research base? Can we communicate our needs more effectively, can we articulate our professional concerns more clearly, can we communicate the reason we do archeology more understandably to the public? And can we do all this without taxing our membership financially beyond our means? I believe we can. It most certainly will not be easy, nor will it take place rapidly, but I feel it can be done and should be tried.

In my view, we now have an excellent opportunity to revitalize the Society for American Archaeology. To attempt such a goal will take a great deal of personal time and effort on the part of

elected and appointed officials. I am willing to commit such time and effort in order to see more unity in our profession. I consider it an honor just to have been considered for nomination as President-elect. I urge all members to vote at this important juncture in your Society's history.

#### SAA ADMINISTRATION (continued from page 1)

Such income is defined as that which is derived from activities not directly related to the functions for which AAA was granted its tax-exempt status (technically Section 501(c)3 status). The income in question results from administrative fees paid to AAA by SAA and 13 other affiliates. For the fourth year in a row this income has reached a sum that is unacceptable to the I.R.S. and they have informed AAA that their tax-exempt status may be in jeopardy, if this situation continues. The Executive Committee of the AAA has solved the problem by terminating services to affiliated societies as of June 1, 1984; the latest date possible. Details on this and related actions can be found in the AAA NEWSLETTER for October, November and December 1982.

The AAA, feeling a responsibility for all anthropology, however, has grappled with several alternatives and has opted to offer legal merger as a means of continuing the administrative arrangements as they now exist. The details of the merger offer can also be read in the same NEWSLETTERS of the AAA referred to above. We outline the merger proposal here, and some of the alternatives that we see. A chronology of events is separately printed here for your information.

Briefly, the offer to merge as it affects the Society is as follows. The Society would become a part of the legal entity known as the American Anthropological Association and would cease to exist as an independent organization. The Society would become a division of the AAA with guarantees written into the merger (continued on page 6)



## EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION

The *BULLETIN* is conceived of as a vehicle for rapid and effective communication about the important non-scientific issues with which the Society and archaeologists must deal. This, the inaugural issue, focuses on Society business and the federal archaeology program. Given the importance of the federal programs to the discipline, this area will always receive emphasis.

But, as the *BULLETIN* evolves we will place increasing emphasis on the activities of coordinate archaeological and scientific societies, such as the Society for Historical Archaeology, the American Institute for Archaeology, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, etc.

We anticipate the development of a lively CORRESPONDENCE section, which will serve as a forum for debate and discussion about the issues of our times.

As a service to the membership, future issues will include a PLACEMENT SERVICE. Announcement of space availability and Society policy and fees should appear in the next issue.

The *BULLETIN* is a new publication. If it is to succeed, its evolution must meet the needs of the Society's membership. The only way we can be sure that it does, is through your participation, which we actively encourage.

We will publish articles of general interest and importance to the membership. Our editorial policy will be to limit editing as far as possible, and to print as much as we reasonably believe will be of interest and importance to the SAA.

With your help and support we will make the *BULLETIN* an important part of a stronger SAA.

## TRANSPORTATION CONSIDERING ASKING CHANGES IN NATIONAL REGISTER CRITERIA

Joseph Canny, U.S. Department of Transportation, Deputy Director for Environment and Policy Review, has recommended that the criteria for listing a site on the National Register of Historic Places

be changed so that only those sites of national significance will be protected. Current criteria allow the listing of sites of local and state significance.

Canny's recommendation was made in a memorandum to DOT's Preservation Review Steering Committee. The memo states that the principal advantages of the change would be to decrease the "section 106 workload" (section 106 is that portion of the National Historic Preservation Act requiring federal agencies to consider the impact of their activities on sites listed or eligible for listing on the National Register), reduce the "proliferation of sites added to the National Register," and that it would decrease "action at all levels of government as fewer sites of less than national significance must be reviewed at the nomination and project compliance stages with a substantial reduction in paperwork, state grants, project delays and costs."

Since listing on the National Register is the threshold a site must cross in order to be considered significant enough for protection from unnecessary destruction by federal activities or federally permitted activities, reducing the scope of the National Register in this fashion would significantly reduce the number of sites to which protection is afforded. The end result would be the destruction of countless archaeological sites as well as other sites of less than national significance.

Since the levels of significance are established in the law itself, the changes proposed by Canny would require an amendment to the law. As yet the DOT's Preservation Review Committee has made no recommendation as to whether to proceed with Canny's suggested change.

## PRESERVATION FUNDING SIGNED

On December 30, 1982, President Reagan signed the U.S. Department of the Interior Appropriation Bill for federal fiscal year 1983 (October 1, 1982 to September 30, 1983), which includes \$26 million dollars for the Historic Preservation Fund. Congress designated \$21.5 million for distribution to the states to run the indi-

vidual state historic preservation programs and \$4.5 million for the National Trust for Historic Preservation's programs. This level of funding should allow most states to continue to operate their state historic preservation programs at about the same level as this past year.

## MOSS-BENNETT ACT (PL 93-291)

Subsections 7b and c of the Moss-Bennett Act expire following fiscal year 1983. These sections authorize the appropriation of funds to the Department of the Interior for the purposes subsections 3(b) and 4(a) of the Act--to assist other agencies with necessary data recovery costs. In most cases, Federal agencies can and should provide funding for data recovery necessitated by their own programs. However, sometimes sufficient funds are not available, either because of the nature of the specific program, because the total project budget is too small, or because unexpected archeological resources are encountered during project implementation. In such cases, the Secretary of Interior is authorized to provide funds for data recovery.

Many people do not realize that the overall act does not require reauthorization. All other sections of the act relating to Federal agency requirements regarding the protection and recovery of important data continue in effect, whether or not section 7 is reauthorized. Reauthorization must be accomplished by amending the act. Because of the current political climate, the Executive Committee of the Society for American Archaeology has decided not to push for reauthorization of the act at this time.

Rather, the Society will seek appropriations under the act. When section 7 was reauthorized in 1978, a new subsection, 7(d), was added. This subsection states that, beginning with 1979, the sums appropriated for purposes of section 7 shall remain available until expended. The budgetary records are unclear (continued on page 8).



sought to implement it, possibly in cooperation with other archeological societies. The discipline sorely needs an effective and timely means to disseminate information and debate issues.

6) The SAA should seek to strengthen its representation in Washington. The need for effective, on-going representation, however achieved, is painfully evident and will likely remain so.

7) The SAA should strongly support the Committee on Archaeology of the National Academy of Sciences that is currently under discussion. The Academy's defined role is to advise the Government on scientific matters. A Committee on Archaeology would provide a strong, effective voice for the discipline and more dispassionate guidance to the Government on archeological matters.

8) The SAA membership should be polled, possibly every three years, as to its interests and concerns, so that the Executive Committee can better determine and coordinate its actions on behalf of the membership. This may be especially crucial as travel costs rise and prevent widespread attendance at annual meetings.

9) The SAA should actively seek a dialog with Native Americans on problems of mutual concern and interest. The Society cannot ethically ignore those concerns and interests or the search for solutions to problems.

10) A number of long-standing problems should continue to be addressed and solutions sought, especially for collections curation, antiquities looting and trafficking, and strengthening of training in field and laboratory research methods for students. Ways should be sought to develop continuing education programs for professionals, possibly through fee-supported (hence tax-deductible) workshops in specific subjects held regionally or before or after annual meetings, as is done by many other professions. More ways must continue to be sought to communicate archeological findings in comprehensible terms to the

public and to the entities supporting research.

11) On-going efforts to seek endowments from outside sources should continue to be actively pursued, possibly through corporate memberships and annual donations.

The foregoing issues, concerns and goals are, of course, not mine alone, but reflect the thinking of many in the archeological community. As President-elect and President I would work actively with the officers, the membership and other organizations toward their achievement.

#### SAA ADMINISTRATION (continued from page 4)

agreement assuring fiscal, governance, and operational autonomy as far as possible. New bylaws have been drafted and modified to try to assure practical autonomy. The Society would have proportional representation in the new, reconstituted AAA Council; 5 of a maximum of 32 (if all affiliated societies chose to merge). Two more of these 32 would be allotted to the Society for Historic Archaeology should it choose to come in. The SAA would continue to have a separate executive committee, a separate budget, separate accounts and funds, and separate annual meetings and publications. The AAA council would, however, have to approve the SAA budget. The AAA NEWS-LETTER would go to all SAA members and space as necessary would be allocated to archaeology. A reconstituted AAA Executive Board would consist of the designated representatives from each division, probably the serving President of the Society, in our case. Administrative costs are estimated to remain the same.

The above matters were discussed with the AAA Executive Director, Mr. Edward Lehman, at a special meeting of the SAA Executive Committee in St. Louis on August 4, 1982. The Society Executive Committee was divided into two study groups at St. Louis. Judge and Cheek (as Treasurer and Treasurer-

elect) assisted by Dee Green and John Speth were designated as a finance sub-committee. The task of the group is to explore the costs and fiscal implications of merger and of any other options that we may consider. The options sub-committee is headed by Adams and Frison assisted by Whallon and Watson and is concerned with structural options to merger and exploration of merger itself. Both groups were at work immediately after St. Louis. A meeting of 14 AAA affiliate presidents was held in San Francisco on November 12, 1982 and attended by Adams and Frison. This meeting discussed the merger in detail, bylaws in draft and related matters such as dues structures. A special meeting of the Executive Committee of the Society was called at the AAA annual convention in December. At that meeting and for a great deal of the regularly scheduled meetings on two days following, all information thus far gathered was examined.

As we now see things, it appears that the Society has three principal options. The first is to merge with the AAA as briefly described above. The second is to seek an "independent" solution, either through setting up an independent office, or by contracting with a private firm or another learned society for administrative services. The third option is to become, once again, only a learned society. The latter would mean that we would revert to publishing our journal and having an annual meeting and that the Society would be run essentially with volunteer labor combined with a few contracted services (accounting).

The Executive Committee has chosen to reject the third option. It is clear that American archaeology is no longer the esoteric study it once was. Professional activities are an integral part of our function. With so many of our members in CRM and all of us in some way impinged upon by or involved in "Federal Archaeology," it would be irresponsible to back away from the lobbying, liaison, monitoring, consultation, and related activities in which we have increasingly engaged during the past ten years.

The second option is being explored in several modes. (continued on page 7)



Thus far, the costs of the purely independent solution seem beyond our financial means. To maintain an office in Washington (the most desirable place) with sufficient staff to make it effective would cost the Society about \$80,000 or more per year. At present, the Society is in a membership decline, down 4 percent last year, and that means declining income. Dues generate, at present, only about \$120,000 per year; AMERICAN ANTIQUITY alone costs about \$134,000 to edit and produce per year. We make up the deficit with income from subscriptions (ca. \$55,000). Income from invested funds produce another \$49,000 for other purposes such as officers' expenses, lobbying, COPA and the BULLETIN.

Another variation of the independent option is that of contracting with another learned society for administrative services. Thus far, we have talked to two societies. One has rejected the idea, and the other has responded enthusiastically. Because negotiations are still in progress, details cannot be specified here at this time. However, they will be given to the membership later.

Still another variation on the independent option is that of hiring a firm to do the administrative duties now performed by AAA. We have one preliminary proposal in hand and two more promised. A Request-for-Proposals is now being finished and will be published and sent out to known likely parties soon, and it is hoped, will generate other credible proposals. A tentative judgment at this time is that the costs and feasibility of such an arrangement are both good. Again, because negotiations are already in progress, we cannot be more specific in print, but we will inform the membership fully later.

The merger with AAA has certain advantages. It retains and strengthens the existing administrative ties with the AAA. A newsletter, greatly desired by the SAA membership, would be provided. Expert financial management would continue (averaging 18-22 percent return over the past six years). Autonomy is to be guaranteed as much as

possible. Anthropology as a whole would be strengthened and all of its parts would speak with more authority.

There are disadvantages. The Society would dissolve as a legal and independent entity. The SAA budget would be subject to review and conceivably change by the AAA council. All SAA members would have also to be members of AAA. Should the arrangement not work well, it would be difficult to extricate ourselves. There are dangers of policy and political conflict between SAA and the AAA. We urge the membership to read the AAA NEWSLETTERS referred to above and to think about the proposal.

All of these and other related matters will be communicated to the membership along with the ballot material, and later at the annual meeting in Pittsburgh, April 27-29. Adams has solicited opinions on these matters from the past preceding presidents, most of whom have responded. The Executive Committee will meet for a special one and a half day session at Pittsburgh preceding the convention to finally sift and analyze all data in hand, and to reach conclusions and recommendations. A special business meeting is scheduled for the morning of Friday the 28th of April at which time we will make a presentation of the situation to that point, and then allow for questions and discussion. No action will be taken at that meeting. At the regular business meeting, should the merger with AAA option be recommended and accepted, then a referendum will be held as soon as possible (probably September, 1983). Should a solution be recommended and accepted that involves a contractual arrangement with a firm or learned society, then no referendum will be necessary.

The purpose of this essay is to lay before the membership the major features of the administrative crisis that confronts us, to report on the Executive Committee's work and actions in that regard, and to suggest some solutions. We hope that you, our colleagues, will think seriously about these matters, and give us the benefit of your advice as and when you see fit. As the Society Secretary, Leslie Wildesen, points out, the Chinese ideogram for change

is made up of two parts, one of which means danger and the other, opportunity.

## CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS

### April, 1982

AAA makes formal joint annual meeting proposal to SAA. Executive Committee agrees to consider at a Special Meeting in Summer, 1982.

### May-June, 1982

IRS audits AAA and gives an opinion that the administrative fees charged affiliated societies are "unrelated business income", and are at such a level as to imperil AAA's tax exempt status.

### June, 1982

Lehman briefs Adams on IRS situation and on probable consequences.

### August, 1982

St. Louis special meeting of SAA XCOM. First consideration of AAA dilemma and of options open to SAA; merger, reductionism, independent contracting for services. Formation of sub-committees to study alternatives and costs. AAA meeting proposal tabled.

### September-November, 1982

Consultation by Adams with five SAA past presidents.

### November, 1982

Meeting with 14 AAA affiliate Presidents, San Francisco.

### December, 1982

AAA Annual Meeting. 2½ days of SAA XCOM meetings. Consideration of alternatives, interview of independent management firm, consultations with another learned society. Meeting with AAA affiliate Presidents at AAA Meeting.

### January, 1983

Preparation of Request-for-Proposals, copy for SAA BULLETIN, consultation with colleagues.



PHILIP SPESER  
WASHINGTON REPRESENTATIVE

on whether any funds have been appropriated since 1979; certainly, the majority of the funds for years '79 through '83, totaling 17 million dollars, remains available to implement the Secretary's responsibilities under the act. The Executive Committee has decided that it is more critical--and safer--to obtain funds to implement the act and to encourage the Department of the Interior to fulfill its responsibilities to assist other agencies than it is to obtain reauthorization. The Executive Committee believes that if the Secretary were to take a more active role in this regard, not only would loss of important data be reduced, but project delays resulting from the need for agencies to obtain last minute funding for archeology would be avoided. We can push for reauthorization of the act after the available funds are appropriated and used.

This is a matter that can affect all archeologists involved in any way in public archeology or cultural resource management. Future editions of the *BULLETIN* will advise you when to call your Senators and Congressmen to encourage them to support our push for an appropriation.

#### CORRESPONDENCE

Beginning with the next issue of the *BULLETIN* we will publish correspondence relating to the *BULLETIN*, articles that appear in the *BULLETIN*, and issues of general interest or importance to the membership of the Society.

Letters intended for publication in the Correspondence section must be typed double spaced on one side of non-erasable paper. They must be clearly identified as intended for publication by being addressed to the "Correspondence Section" or to "Letters to the Editor." Normally Letters that exceed 500 words will not be considered for publication. The editor will, however, waive this rule for letters dealing with unusually important, interesting, difficult, or complex issues. The Editor

will reserve the right to reject or edit any letter received.

#### AMERICAN ANTIQUITY SOLICITING MANUSCRIPTS

AMERICAN ANTIQUITY editor Dena Dincauze reports that she has succeeded in eliminating the backlog of manuscripts. Manuscripts are now actively sought. Papers for consideration for publication should be sent to Dena Dincauze, Department of Anthropology, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA 01003.

#### CALL FOR SYMPOSIA AND PAPERS AAAS ANNUAL MEETING

In an effort to heighten the profile of archaeology within Section H (Anthropology) of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Patty Jo Watson is actively soliciting proposals for symposia and papers for the 1984 meeting, which will be held in Detroit, Michigan. Symposia organizers must be AAAS members but papers may be given by non-members. For assistance in setting up symposia or if you have a proposal to submit contact Patty Jo Watson, Department of Anthropology, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri 63130.

#### CULTURAL PROPERTY IMPLEMENTATION ACT PASSES

The Cultural Property Implementation Act, which incorporates the UNESCO convention controlling illicit trafficking in antiquities was passed as part of the Miscellaneous Tariff Bill (H.R. 4566) in the waning hours of the last session of Congress. It was recently signed into law by President Reagan, thus ending the decade long fight to pass the law.

In this first newsletter report, I want to give you an overview of what it is we do for the Society and what we can expect out of Congress during the next few months.

In understanding a lobbyist's activities, it is useful to remember that there are almost an unlimited number of issues in which Members can take a leadership role. It would be irresponsible for elected officials to take a leadership role in areas where there was no constituency interest. Otherwise, why bother having elections?

For a lobbyist, Congress may be viewed as a large barter system. A variety of goods can be "traded" in this marketplace, but the most commonly utilized ones are votes, information, and money. Votes are the most important item of trade. Almost every Member of Congress would like to be re-elected or move on to higher office, and the only way they can accomplish that goal is to develop a constituency.

The second most important item of trade is information. As in most large organizations, Congress manages information very poorly. Most Senators and Representatives truly want to serve the common good and their districts, but they need information to identify what that good is in any specific instance and to determine how best to serve it. There is no way that they can be experts on all the issues that Congress handles, so they tend to specialize in one or two areas. (A quick way to get some idea of the areas in which your Senators and Representatives specialize is to look at which Committees and Subcommittees they serve on.) Even staffs are incredibly overburdened. As a result, Members of Congress and their staffs frequently rely upon lobbies to keep them informed about what is going on in other parts of the Congress, the Federal government, the nation, and the world. Of course, most Members have an ideological perspective, and they rely most heavily on lobbies that share that perspective. (continued on page 9)



Money is probably the most talked about--and most over-rated--item of political trade. Money is useful because of what it can buy: votes and information. But money per se is of only limited political utility. The recent elections demonstrated that large PAC contributions do not ensure success at the polls. Money is most helpful (or dangerous) in politics when it is used to buy "high-powered" experts, speaking engagements for Members before constituent groups, and so on.

Our job in Washington is to assist the SAA in providing information to Congress and to make Members of Congress aware of the existence of a strong, organized, archaeological constituency. Lobbyists are basically knowledge and information brokers. During our campaign to pass the Cultural Property Implementation Act, for example, we were able to move the legislation rapidly because of the existence of the COPA network and because of the willingness of SAA members in key districts to contact their Senators and Representatives.

Our experience over the last few months is proof that archaeologists can have significant political clout if we remember the importance of votes and information. There are Members of Congress who are sensitive to the importance of archaeology and willing to expend precious political influence speaking out on our behalf. Special mention should be given to the leadership displayed by Senator Matsunaga (D-Ha) and Congressman Pease (D-Oh) during the successful drive to pass the Cultural Property Implementation Act during the last Congress. They deserve letters of thanks.

The vital role played by Congressman Donald Pease in the enactment of this legislation by the House of Representatives demonstrates the best kind of lobbying. Compared with the more pressing issues of our times--massive unemployment, multi-billion-dollar programs and the threat of nuclear war--the pillage of archaeological and ethnological materials can appear to be a relatively minor issue. Linda Grimm, an SAA member at Oberlin, visited the Congressman in

their district. Dr. Grimm's visit provided Representative Pease, just as letters from SAA members to Senators and Representatives provided those elected officials, with the information he needed to appreciate the significance of the legislation and an awareness that leadership on this issue would also be constituency service.

It is a particular strength of scientific societies that Members of Congress view them as knowledgeable and informed. Members look to the SAA and to other societies to help them find solutions to the problems facing the government. During the next few months, we shall be facilitating communication between Members of Congress and the SAA members over ways in which the cost-efficiency of Federal archaeological efforts can be improved. Improved cost-efficiency is a pressing issue for a Congress facing an approximately \$200 billion deficit.

We believe the primary task will be to demonstrate where modest increases in funding can lead to either significant advances in our understanding of archaeological data or to a better use of existing resources devoted to archaeology. The precise areas where funding increases are appropriate or the means by which the cost-efficiency of Federal archaeological efforts can be increased can only be determined through normal SAA channels. We will assist SAA members by gathering information on the Federal archaeological budget and other matters. And we shall work to present Members of Congress with the appropriate information on archaeological budgets at the appropriate time in the appropriate manner.

As with the campaign to pass the Cultural Property Implementation Act, the ultimate success or failure of these efforts rest with the SAA membership--with the constituents of the Senators and Representatives. In order to assist you in contacting your elected officials on issues of concern to you, we are concluding this report by reprinting three aids developed by the Consortium of Social Science Associations, an umbrella group of all social and behavioral scientific associations. (The SAA is a COSSA affiliate.) We hope that these will be useful to you.

We are here to assist you in any way we can with governmental relations issues. Of course, our role is not to set SAA policy. If you are interested in seeing specific legislative initiatives pursued, we urge you to contact the SAA Executive Committee directly.

#### SUGGESTIONS FOR WRITING A MEMBER OF CONGRESS

Your Representative and Senator want to know your views, particularly on legislation that is coming up in Congress. Every constituent letter is read and then assigned to a staff member for reply. The receipt of as few as ten letters on a particular issue will often start an office investigating the topic in depth.

1. Write your letter by hand or type it. A letter that is individually written is more likely to receive attention than a preprinted postcard or a mimeographed letter. Be certain that your name is legible and that you have included your address in the body of the letter; envelopes are thrown away.
2. Identify your subject clearly, giving the name of the legislation you are writing about and the bill number, if you know it.
3. Be brief, but be personal. Tell how the issue will affect you directly.
4. Ask your legislator to state his or her opinion on the issue for you.
5. Be sure to thank your legislator if he or she has done something of which you approve. Congressional offices expect to receive letters that complain or ask support; they are often remarkably delighted by expressions of thanks.

Letters to Members of Congress should be addressed as follows:

(continued on page 10)



### Representatives

The Honorable \_\_\_\_\_  
U.S. House of Representatives  
Washington, D. C. 20515

Dear Representative \_\_\_\_\_:

### Senators

The Honorable \_\_\_\_\_  
U.S. Senate  
Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Senator \_\_\_\_\_:

### SUGGESTIONS FOR TELEPHONING A MEMBER OF CONGRESS

There is no need to feel intimidated about calling a Washington congressional office. Most are quite open and responsive to calls from constituents. The following guidelines offer suggestions for contacting your Senator or Representative by telephone:

1. Call 202/224-3121 and ask to be connected to your Representative's or Senator's office.
2. Once connected, ask to speak with "the staff person who handles science and technology issues for the Congressman (or Senator)."
3. If for some reason no one has been assigned to this issue, ask to speak with the Administrative Assistant.
4. Once connected to the right person, identify yourself first as a constituent, then as a professional. Try to say something positive about the Member or Senator before asking for his or her support on a specific issue.
5. Follow up your phone call with a short note to the staff member you spoke with, emphasizing both your original point and your appreciation of his or her attention to this issue.

### SUGGESTIONS FOR VISITING A MEMBER OF CONGRESS

Senators and Representatives want to talk with voters, although it will be easier to see your Representative than your Senator, especially if you live in a populous state. You need not feel awed by the surroundings and manner of your Representative or Senator. Remember that he or she probably knows less about the issue that concerns you than you do.

You can arrange to visit either the home district or the Washington, D. C. office of your Senator or Representative. Visits with the Members themselves may be somewhat easier to arrange in their district offices. If, however, the reason for your visit is to discuss pending or proposed legislation, you are probably better off arranging to meet with the appropriate staff member in your Senator's or Representative's Washington, D. C. office.

To arrange a visit to a congressional office:

1. Call either the district office (it will be listed in your local phone directory) or the Washington office (dial 202/224-3121) and ask to be connected to the office of your Senator or Representative.
2. If you want to talk with the Member, ask for the appointment secretary and arrange a mutually convenient time for your visit. If you would prefer to meet with a staff member, ask to speak "with the staff person who handles science and technology issues," explain who you are, what it is that you would like to meet about, and arrange your appointment directly with the staffer.
3. Prepare a clear and concise typewritten summary of your views that you can leave with the Member or staffer. It should be typed on letterhead stationery and include your name, address and telephone number. The statement should be brief--preferably one page and not more than two or three pages at the maximum. Organize it by using headings and underlining your main points.

4. When you meet your Senator, Representative or staff member be sure to say something positive about actions the Member has taken. Being an elected representative can be a thankless task at times. A kind word of appreciation goes a long way.

5. Do not overstay your welcome. Both Members and staffers, although they will be genuinely pleased to visit with you, cannot spare much time. Plan to stay not more than 10 to 15 minutes with a Member and 30 minutes, at most, with a member of his or her staff.

6. Follow up your visit with a short letter expressing your appreciation for being heard and offering your assistance should more information be needed.

### PROGRAMMATIC MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT FOR THE FEDERAL COAL MANAGEMENT TO BE DISCUSSED IN PITTSBURG

During the past year the Federal Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the Interior Department's Office of Surface Mining (OSM) have been working on revisions to the Programmatic Memorandum of Agreement (PMOA). The PMOA governs the way in which cultural resources, including archaeological sites, will be treated in the impact area of a surface (strip) coal mine or within the surface impact area of an underground mine, on lands leased from the federal government. (Surface mining on non-federal lands is governed by state mining regulatory programs consistent with OSM's Permanent Regulatory Program, Title 30 Code of Federal Regulations Chapter VII, Part 700.)

The central feature of the current draft of this revised PMOA is the Preservation Plan. The Preservation Plan is based on an overview of the mine impact area's cultural resources. It predicts the types and varieties of cultural resources in the impact area and their potential locations and predicts classes of sites that will be potentially significant. Based on these predictions the Plan lays out a strategy for actually identifying specific resources, for evaluating the

(continued on page 11)



predications, and "correcting" the models in an reiterative process, methods for evaluating the significance classes, plans for the treatment of sites encountered that fall into the significant classes, and methods for dealing with sites that do not fall into one of the predicted classes. All of this plan development and its implementation would be supervised by OSM or the federal land managing agency (for example, Bureau of Land Management, Forest Service-- if it is a signatory on the PMOA), the Advisory Council and the State Historic Preservation Office of the state(s) in which the mine area is located.

The PMOA is very important for two reasons. First, it is national policy to encourage conversion from fuel oils and natural gas to coal. So that, barring a major breakthrough in some "alternative technology" energy system, coal will become increasingly important as a source of energy in the U.S. Consequently, ever increasing numbers of sites will be destroyed or disturbed by coal mining activities. The methods the federal government chooses to "protect" the sites effected by mining is crucial to determining what will be known about the archaeology of major portions of the U.S.

The PMOA is doubly important because it embodies the current thinking of both OSM and the Advisory Council on how cultural resources should be treated. Of particular note is the fact that the Advisory Council views this PMOA as the model for PMOA that it will develop to cover other routine and repetitive federal permitting and licensing activities and programs.

The PMOA has sparked considerable controversy among archaeologists and historic preservationists, particularly in the western states where most of the federal coal lands are located. There are three major sources of controversy. The least serious concern raised is that the PMOA is highly qualified, it is full of phrases that are perceived as readily interpreted as weakening the intent of the PMOA, the federal rules it

is written under, and the national policy that it implements.

The more serious issues are that most of the archaeologists involved feel that too little is known about the archaeology of most areas of the U.S. to allow for any sort of reliable prediction of what kinds of sites will be encountered in an area, where they will be located, and what their potential significance may be.

Also of considerable concern is the fact that the PMOA relies heavily on sample surveys to test the predictions and locate properties. Many feel that this compounds the uncertainties of the predictive approach embodied in the PMOA. There is also a feeling that an unacceptably large number of sites might be "written off" in the unsurveyed portions of a mine area.

In order to address these issues the SAA Executive Committee charged the Committee on Federal Archaeology with examining the PMOA, establishing a position on it for the Society.

On January 11-13 the Committee on Federal Archaeology, Chyntia Irwin-Williams, Chair, Don Fowler, Shirley Powell (alternating for George Gumerman), Lonnie Pippin (SAA staff assistant), and Bruce Rippeteau, met to develop the Society's position on the PMOA. After outlining the position, the Committee met with representatives of the coal industry to see if a commonly acceptable position could be established.

The result of the January meeting is a set of recommendations for revising the preservation plan. These were submitted to the Advisory Council on January 25, 1983. The key recommendations are that the plan will not be completed until after the inventory survey has been performed, and that, except in certain special cases, for instance, where an acceptable survey has been completed, or the area already has been extensively disturbed, an intensive, large sample size survey would be undertaken. It was agreed by both the coal industry representatives and the Committee on Federal Archaeology that this would provide better protection to the resources and, in the long run, be more economical to the coal mine operator.

We have recently learned that the Advisory Council will not agree to either of the proposed changes. The PMOA is still in draft form, but the Advisory Council is not prepared to consider substantive changes to it.

The Committee on Federal Archaeology will probably bring the PMOA issue to the business meeting in Pittsburg and offer a formal resolution embodying the Society's position on it. Copies of the most recent draft of the PMOA are on file with each state's Committee on Public Archaeology representative.

#### COOPERATION COLUMN

Mark J. Wagner and Alan Downer are preparing a paper on the scientific, legal, and ethical issues involved in the excavation, analysis, curation and/or reburial of human skeletal remains. They would appreciate receiving copies of any state laws and agency, or organization policies dealing directly or indirectly with these issues. Wagner's address is:

c/o American Resources Group  
127 North Washington St.  
Carbondale, IL 62901