

Bulletin

January 1990

Vol. 8, No. 1

OF THE SOCIETY FOR AMERICAN ARCHAEOLOGY

S. 1578, the Independent Historic Preservation Agency Act, and S. 1579, the National Historic Preservation Policy Act

William A. Lovis, Chair, SAA Government Affairs Committee
Jeremy A. Sabloff, SAA President

Senator Wyche Fowler (GA) has recently introduced a two bill package which will have implications for archaeology and historic preservation. Both the Government Affairs Committee and the Task Force on Reburial and Repatriation worked closely with Senator Fowler's staff over a period of 10 months to get the Society for American Archaeology's concerns in this legislation properly represented. While the final language of the bill is clearly a consensus, Senator Fowler and his staff were considerate of our societal views, and we believe that the form in which the bills were introduced is such that the SAA could endorse them. It would be useful for the SAA constituency to review the legislation and make their views known to their respective legislators.

S. 1578 sets up a modified historic preservation structure. Specifically, it creates an independent Historic Preservation Agency, a Preservation Advisory Committee, an Archaeology Advisory Committee, and a National Center for Preservation Technology. This transfers the functions and authorities of the Secretary of Interior and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation to the Preservation Agency, the Preservation Committee, and the Archaeology Advisory Committee. The Preservation Advisory Board acts to advise the Preservation Agency on policy and activities. Aside from departmental and agency, and public representation, experts from architecture, American history, archaeology, and anthropology, shall serve on the Committee for five year terms. The Archaeology Advisory Board advises the agency on policy and professional standards. Two prehistoric archaeologists, two historic archaeologists, two Native Americans, and one avocational representative serving four year terms comprise the committee. Finally, the National Center for Preservation Technology is established to develop and disseminate information on preservation and

conservation technologies. Part of their mandate is to develop Regional Preservation Technology Centers to further the purposes of the National Center.

S. 1579 amends the National Historic Preservation Act, the Historic Sites Act, the Archaeological Resources Protection Act, and the Abandoned Shipwreck Act, among others. The five major sections of the Act address several related issues. Title I, Federal Historic Preservation Programs, addresses the responsibilities of federal agencies. Specifically, it defines the requirements of management programs, compliance, recourse for unavoidable resources destruction, agreements for the performance of agency functions, information confidentiality, the leasing of historic property, international responsibilities, expansion of the National Register, National Historic Landmarks, and the protection of historic and archaeological resources of critical importance. Further, it provides several amendments to the definitions in the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA), proposes procedures for archaeology on both federal and tribally managed lands, and expands prohibitions on illicit archaeology and transactions involving archaeological resources on federal and tribal lands. Title I amends ARPA by expanding the definition of Archaeological Research Priorities, establishing an International Conference on Antiquities Trade, further defining archaeological professional standards, addressing the issue of archaeology on private land, redefining the treatment of human remains and associated grave goods, establishing an artifact registration system, and defining the role of the Archaeology Advisory Board relative to the Advisory Council.

Among the major contributions of Title I is Section 120, Human Remains and Associated Grave Goods. Language in this section represents a substantial compromise between the SAA, the Native American Rights Fund, and the National Congress of American Indians. It clearly balances rights of potential descendants with scientific interests, providing a range of alternative disposition options ranging from repatriation and reburial to curation in perpetuity (see sidebar).

Title II of the Act strengthens the State Historic Preservation Program system, and Title III establishes Tribal Historic Preservation Programs which largely parallel

those at the state level. Significantly, this section provides substantial autonomy and funding for tribal initiatives on historic and archaeological preservation issues, and establishes a structure for their implementation. Title IV attempts to strengthen the role of local preservation programs vis a vis the state and federal structures by establishing a system of local government certification for historic preservation programming through the SHPO, as well as local level assistance programs. Finally, Title V establishes a comprehensive preservation education and training program. This will incorporate training for federal employees, state, tribal and local workers, students, and avocational archaeologists, minority programs with historic preservation degree certification, curriculum establishment, and other forms of information dissemination.

This legislative package provides comprehensive reorganization of the Historic Preservation structure, clearly provides much needed remedies to deficiencies in several areas, strengthens the interaction of units of government at several different levels, and incorporates archaeology and the SAA into the historic preservation process far more directly than any existing legislation. At present, the House version of this package has been sponsored by Representative Bennett. Senator Fowler is polling his Senatorial colleagues for co-sponsors. Official public introduction of the bill will take place sometime in January 1990. The SAA has worked diligently to have these bills reflect the concerns of our profession, and we are satisfied that archaeology is well represented in the final version. We urge you to support them.

In This Issue:

Treatment of Human Remains	2
Job Placement	3
New Editors	4
Annual Meeting Notes	8

Treatment of Human Remains

The Society for American Archaeology Statement Concerning the Treatment of Human Remains notes that "Conflicting claims concerning the proper treatment and disposition of particular human remains must be resolved on a case-by-case basis through consideration of the scientific importance of the material, the cultural and religious values of the interested individuals or groups, and the strength of their relationship to the remains in question". Effecting this position in a legislative consensus is a process of negotiated dialogue between interested parties. The Fowler-Bennett legislation, while a consensus position, clearly recognizes the scientific importance of human remains and balances this against the claims of descendants on a case by case basis. Specifically, federal agencies, state, tribal, and local historic preservation programs receiving assistance under ARPA or the NHPA must have policies for the protection and disposition of human remains and associated grave goods. The act clearly specifies under what circumstances human remains may be disinterred (including archaeological research). It dictates that appropriate methods of recovery should be employed, and that in the case of disturbance both "descendants of the deceased represented by such remains" and archaeological and historic preservation authorities should be consulted. A range of disposition is itemized, ranging from "return of the remains to descendants" to "retention in perpetuity for study where the needs of scientific research clearly so requires". Where living descendants cannot be identified decisions regarding disposition "should be made by a commission or other entity whose composition and rules of procedures are such that it can give balanced consideration to a variety of factors influencing treatment of such remains and goods". Thus, consistent with the SAA position, no uniform standard for the disposition of all human remains is imposed, and decisions concerning disposition are clearly made on a case-by-case basis. Descendants, potential descendants, and scientific interests are considered as parties to a decision made by an independent commission. Archaeology and historic preservation are represented in a consultative role with descendants when excavation is undertaken. Finally, archaeological research is considered a legitimate reason for the disinterment of human remains.

Ad Hoc Education Committee of the SAA Anti-Looting Project

The participants of the Working Conference of the SAA Anti-Looting Project which met in Taos, NM in May 1989, unanimously passed a resolution to the SAA to become "THE Society FOR American Archaeology." This letter serves as a continuation of that strong call for action by asking the SAA to approve the formation of a Public Education Committee.

The primary conclusion of the Taos conference was that public education is the key to effective heritage resource protection. This is echoed by the latest amendments to ARPA which call for public education efforts by federal agencies. Similar conclusions have been reached by other professional organizations, including the SHA, AIA, and AAA, who have already established public education committees.

Before leaving Taos, participants in the Public Education Sub-committee of the "Preventing the Problem" working group volunteered to remain as a standing ad hoc committee with the goal of assisting the SAA in the implementation of our recommendations.

We reconvened on October 18, 1989, in Minneapolis for a day-long meeting preceding the Presenting the Past to the Public conference held at the University of Minnesota. During the meeting we agreed there is a pressing need to begin implementation now of the recommendations made by the Public Education Sub-committee. The most effective way to implement these recommendations is for the SAA to establish a committee charged with carrying them out.

Therefore, we recommend that the Executive Committee create a Public Education Committee to implement the recommendations of the Preventing the Problem Workshop of the May 1989 Taos conference. We also urge that this committee be provided a budget to assist in implementing some initial programs, such as networking and program evaluations. If the SAA is going to take a leading role and strong advocacy position in effecting positive changes in perceptions of archaeology, educating the public, and slowing the vandalism of archaeological sites, support for the creation of this committee with a budget is critical. We ask that you and the committee give serious consideration to the enclosed proposal.

We stress that there is an immediate need for this committee because of the continuing crisis threatening our heritage resources. The committee should be established in time to take full advantage of the Plenary Session scheduled for the 1990 SAA meeting in Las Vegas. This committee, once established, should be charged with developing additional funding sources and organizational structure.

We strongly urge the Executive Committee to take decisive action that will allow the momentum of the Taos Conference to continue.

Ad Hoc Education Committee,
SAA Anti-Looting Project

Correspondence to the committee may be directed to: Ed. Friedman, Bureau of Reclamation, Denver Federal Ctr., Bld. 67 D-5521, Denver, CO 80225-0007.

Proposal to Establish a Public Education Committee of the SAA

Problem Statement: Looting and vandalism have become so pervasive that they threaten the existence of the nation's heritage resources. Public education has been identified by the SAA Anti-Looting Project Working Conference and other organizations as the most effective long-range and broadly based solution to the problem.

Mission: Promote public education about archaeology and heritage resources in order to preserve and protect these resources, and to increase the understanding of them for current and future generations.

Goal: To establish a Public Education Committee of the SAA to implement the recommendations of the Preventing the Problem Workshop of the May 1989, SAA Anti-Looting Project Working Conference held in Taos, NM.

Objectives: See Taos Conference recommendations.

Submitted by: The Ad Hoc Education Committee of the SAA Anti-Looting Project Working Conference. Drafted on October 18, 1989, in Minneapolis, MN.

Nominations Sought for Distinguished Service Award

Nominations are requested for the Distinguished Service Award to be given by the SAA in 1990. This award is intended to recognize individuals who have provided extraordinary service to the Society and the field. Previous winners include Carl Chapman, Charles McGimsey III, Gordon Willey, Albert Spaulding, Jesse Jennings,

Hannah Marie Wormington, James Griffin, Emil Haury, Waldo Wedel, William Ritchie, and Richard and Natalie Woodbury.

Nominations should contain a two page statement of the service, activities, and qualifications of the nominee as well as a curriculum vita. Letters of recommendation from at least two individuals other than the primary nominator should be provided in the nomination package. The deadline for nominations is January 30, 1990. The award, a framed, inscribed citation, will be presented at the 1990 Annual Meeting of the SAA. Complete nomination packages (three letters, two-page statement, and curriculum vita) should be sent to T. Douglas Price, Chair, SAA Distinguished Service Award Committee, Department of Anthropology, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI 53706.

Job Placement

Summer Jobs in the Sierras

The Eldorado National forest is looking for at least 20 archaeological surveyors for the upcoming season. The work is between April and November, in the Sierra Nevadas not far from Lake Tahoe. Like other forests in California, the Eldorado will be salvage logging large areas of drought-stricken timber, and many surveyors are needed to cover the ground. The pay depends upon experience, from \$6 to \$8 per hour. Four years of college plus three months field experience is preferred. Good opportunity for training; housing available. For information on how to apply, write: Eldorado National Forest, 100 Fomi Rd., Placerville, CA 95667, or call Denise McLemore at (916) 622-5061.

Arthur Andersen & Co.

Arthur Andersen & Co. is an international professional service firm with over 245 offices located around the world. Services include audit, tax, information systems consulting, and change management consulting. The Firm operates a centralized training and development facility in St. Charles, IL, a suburb of Chicago, which develops and delivers training programs for its 45,000 worldwide professionals.

The Management Development section of this facility is seeking an Anthropologist with a specialty in organizations. The Firm offers competitive salary, an extensive training program, and a well defined career path. For more information, contact Cynthia J. Smith, Arthur Andersen & Co., Center for Professional Education, 1405 North Fifth Av, St. Charles, IL 60174. (312) 377-3100.

Opportunity of a Lifetime: The Arkansas Archeological Survey Has Two Openings

Tenure track Ph.D. archaeologist, full time, beginning July 1, 1990. This archaeologist will be assigned to a new Research Station at Parkin Indian Mound State Park, which is 35 miles west of Memphis. Experience in archaeological research in the Central or Lower Mississippi Valley preferred.

M.A. level archaeologist, full-time, starting July 1, 1990, also at the new Research Station at Parkin Indian Mound State Park. Lower or Central Mississippi Valley field experience; successful report writing, and field and lab supervisory experience are required. The position will be as Research Assistant to the Station Archeologist.

Applicants for both positions must meet SOPA Certification Standards. For either position, send detailed vita and names of three references to: Hester A. Davis, State Archaeologist, Arkansas Archeological Survey, P.O. Box 1249, Fayetteville, AR 72702-1249. The Arkansas Archeological Survey/University of Arkansas is an equal opportunity/affirmative action institution.

City Archaeologist Desired for St. Augustine, Florida

St. Augustine, FL seeks a City Archaeologist to provide professional skills, knowledge and judgement relative to the testing, salvage archaeology, and monitoring of disturbances and sites as required by the Archaeological Preservation Ordinance. This position reports directly to the Director of the Planning and Building Department and coordinates with other Division heads and personnel within the City organization. Provides technical expertise in the preparation of final reports on all archaeological projects, records archaeological sites, and is responsible for curation of artifacts. This person is responsible for the management, production, and administration of all Division activities.

A Master's Degree in Archaeology with a minimum of two years experience in historic and prehistoric archaeology is required, in addition to SOPA qualification or membership.

For more information, contact Troy Bunch, Director, Planning and Building Department, P.O. Drawer 210, 75 King St., St. Augustine, FL 32085-0210 for additional information. Applications will be accepted by the City's Personnel Division until the position is filled with a start date anticipated for October 1, 1989. St. Augustine is an Equal Opportunity Employer.

Washington State University

Washington State University, Department of Anthropology, seeks an archaeologist for a full-time (12 month) position. Duties include directing the department's CRM branch, research, and teaching. Salary is competitive. Initial appointment is for a two-year, temporary faculty position; possibility position may convert to tenure track. Requirements include Ph.D. with specialization in archaeology, fieldwork and publication in hunter/gatherer archaeology, and demonstrated abilities in teaching, research design, securing grants/contracts, directing projects, report writing, and lithic analysis. Primary research focus is sought on northwestern North America. Strong theoretical focus is desired, in addition to experience in Western North American archaeology, and skill in lithic replication. Send letter, vita, reprints, and names of four references by February 1, 1990, to Geoffrey Gamble, Department of Anthropology, Washington State University, Pullman, WA 99164-4910. WSU is an EEO/AA educator and employer. Protected group members are encouraged to apply.

Two Positions Available from Archaeological Services

Archaeological Services seeks field technicians for the 1990 work season: April 15 to October 15. Applicants must have appropriate academic training (B.A. in anthropology, geology, or geography) and at least two years of field experience. Additional experience may be used in lieu of a degree. Experience in stratigraphic hand excavation, recording soil stratigraphy, geological mapping, and cartography is desirable. Familiarity with computer cartographic applications (Autocad, Surfer) a plus. Salary is competitive. Interested individuals send resume and recommendations by March 15, 1990, to: Archaeological Services, 1308 West Robinhood Dr., Ste. 4B, Stockton, CA 95207.

Archaeological Services also seeks a field supervisor for the 1990 season from April 15 to October 15. Applicants must minimally have an M.A. and at least three years of supervisory field experience, including experience with survey equipment, burial excavation, and working with Native Americans. Membership in SOPA is a plus. Selection will be based on background and an interview. Salary is competitive. Interested individuals should send detailed resume and recommendations by February 15, 1990 to: ASI, 1308 West Robinhood Dr., Ste. 4B, Stockton, CA 95207.

California University of Pennsylvania

California University of Pennsylvania invites applications for the position of Assistant/Associate Professor of Anthropology (full-time, tenure track position). Doctorate required. Candidate must have a combined specialty in American archaeology and physical anthropology and be prepared to teach a local archaeology field school.

In addition, the candidate, at a minimum, needs to be qualified to teach an introductory level course in physical anthropology as well as a medical anthropology course and general courses on North American Indians, the Mesoamerican High Cultures, and Old World prehistory.

Candidates must have a demonstrated interest not only in teaching, but also in research and publication. Additional duties will include student advisement and departmental committee assignments. Salary commensurate with rank and experience. California University is one of the 14 state-owned members of the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education. It has an enrollment of approximately 6,000 undergraduate and graduate students and is located 40 miles south of Pittsburgh on the Monongahela River. Applicants must submit a letter of application, resume, names and telephone numbers of three professional references, and official transcripts of all undergraduate and graduate work by February 1, 1990, to James C. Wood, Chair, Department of Social Science, California University of Pennsylvania, California, PA 15419. Employment date: August 27, 1990. AA/EOE.

Conservator/Curator Wanted

The Savannah River Archaeology Research Program invites applications for the anticipated position, pending approval of a state classified slot, of Archaeologist II (Conservator/Curator) to begin July 1, 1990, on the U.S. Department of Energy's Savannah River Site (SRS). M.A./M.S. is required and a working knowledge of Macintosh computers desirable. The full-time, permanent position involves the conservation and curation of archaeological materials to conform to proposed 36CFR79. Job duties include: curation/conservation of archaeological materials; curation/management of archaeological documents, records, and library; laboratory management and analyses; and archaeological research. Conditions for setting up this program are right; U.S. Department of Energy, SRS, wishes to see systematic and scientifically controlled work. Once program is operational, research opportunities are enormous, as up

to 50% of time can be devoted to research. Salary is somewhat negotiable, depending upon qualifications. Position will include all state benefits. Send resume, references, statement of interest, and request for application to Mark J. Brooks/ Richard D. Brooks, Savannah River Archaeological Research Program, Building 760-11G, P.O. Box A, Aiken, SC 29802. (803) 725-3724. Application deadline is April 15, 1990. The South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology and the University of South Carolina are Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employers. U.S. citizenship required.

New SAA Bulletin Editors

The SAA is pleased to announce that Stephen Plog (University of Virginia) and Don Rice (University of Virginia) will be the new SAA Bulletin editors beginning with the March 1990 issue. All future news items, correspondence, and articles should be sent to: Steve Plog or Don Rice, Department of Anthropology, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA 22903. (804) 924-7044.

Seventh Annual Visiting Scholar's Conference

The Seventh Annual Visiting Scholar's Conference, entitled "The Future of the Past: American Archaeology in A.D. 2001" and sponsored by the Center for Archaeological Investigations, will be held on May 4-5, 1990, at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. The conference will feature two full-day sessions that focus on specific aspects of the present and future state of American archaeology. The first day of the conference will be devoted to an examination of the technological, funding, social, and intellectual climate in which archaeology will be conducted in A.D. 2001. Presentations on the second day will consider methodological, conceptual, and theoretical issues which will affect the future complexion of archaeology. Individuals who would like to participate should submit a title and abstract (100-200 words) by January 19, 1990 (extended from original deadline of December 15, 1989). Advanced graduate students and professionals are invited to participate. Abstracts will be peer reviewed and authors will be notified of the acceptance of their papers by mid-February. A volume of selected papers will be published. For further information, contact LuAnn Wandsnider (BITNET: GA3784@SIUCVMB), Center for Archaeological Investigations, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, Carbondale, IL 62901. (618) 453-5031.

Archaeological Site Stabilization Workshop

The National Park Service, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the University of Mississippi will jointly sponsor a workshop on archaeological site stabilization. The objective of the workshop is to identify stabilization techniques appropriate when protection of threatened archaeological sites is necessary. Multidisciplinary cooperation will be emphasized as a mechanism for arriving at the best solutions to particular archaeological management problems. Innovative stabilization techniques will be discussed through lectures and hands-on field exercises on a stabilization project. Extensive references will be identified for technical assistance on local problems.

Site stabilization will be focused on as the appropriate choice in many cases, even when mitigation of an adverse impact is required. Examples studied in the classroom and field exercises will utilize prehistoric riverine sites along the Tennessee River.

The workshop is open to applicants from all government agencies and the private sector. Archaeological expertise is not required, but applicants should demonstrate responsibilities in the field of cultural resource management. Applicants should be prepared for extended field exercises during this course.

Applications must be received by February 5, 1990. There will be a workshop tuition fee payable upon participation registration. Applications should be in the form of requests to participate, on letterhead stationary, and sent to: Dave Dahlen, Program Coordinator, Mather Employee Development Ctr., P.O. Box 77, Harpers Ferry, WV 25425. (304) 535-6371 or FTS 925-6215.

Corn and Culture in the Prehistoric New World

A conference will be held May 12-13, 1990, at the University of Minnesota to provide a forum for exchange among paleoethnobotanists, botanists, archaeologists, geneticists, and anthropologists on the topic of prehistoric maize in the New World. Invited and contributed papers will address topics of analysis and interpretation of prehistoric maize, regional and pan-regional patterns in space and time, morphological variation and genetic relationships, and the meaning of maize in New World cultures. For more information please write: Christine A. Hastorf and Sissel Johannessen, Department of Anthropology, 215 Ford Hall, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55455. (Attn: Sissel Johannessen).

Lecture Opportunities for Anthropologists and Archaeologists

Crystal Cruise Lines, a newly founded luxury cruise line, is eager to develop a long-term working relationship with professional archaeologists and anthropologists, who would give public lectures on their ships. The first cruise is scheduled for July, 1990, with regular sailings thereafter in Alaskan waters, along the Mexican Riviera, and in the Caribbean. Future plans call for cruises in Mediterranean waters and in Northern Europe, including the Baltic Sea and North Cape.

Crystal will be awarding about 15 lecturing assignments a year, each for two back-to-back ten-day cruises. In exchange for two to three lectures during the cruise, they will give the lecturer a free cruise for two on full passenger status, gratuities included.

It is the intention of the company that the lectures delivered aboard their ships be of the highest quality, given by professional scholars and lecturers of distinguished standing in the profession. The subject matter is planned to bridge the gap between professional science and the informed general public, and will be designed to initiate a better dialogue between the public and the world of science.

Crystal Lines is now accepting applications for lecturing assignments aboard their ships, with the intention of creating a data base of qualified lecturers for assignments in 1990 and beyond. Members of the Society are hereby invited to apply for a Crystal lectureship.

Applications should include the following:

1. A short curriculum vita, which outlines academic qualifications and background, and which spells out specific lecturing and public speaking experience that might be relevant to this application. If you have lectured on a cruise ship before, please so indicate on the application.
2. Letters of recommendation from two qualified people, who have first hand experience of your lecturing and public speaking experiences and abilities.
3. Some indication of which area (Alaska, Mexico, Caribbean, Mediterranean, North Europe), where you would be best qualified to lecture.
4. Titles and brief, one-paragraph summaries of four potential lectures that you might give on board. Lecture topics should be broadly relevant to the cruise area, be of wide popular appeal, and should be well illustrated.
5. A statement of times of year when you might be available to lecture. Successful applicants will be advised within a few weeks of the closing deadlines whether they

are being placed on the lecture data base. Assignments from the list will be made at regular intervals.

Younger and retired scholars are particularly encourage to apply. Applications should be addressed to: Pete Johnson, Manager, Product Development, Crystal Lines, 2121 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, CA 90067. No later than March 15, 1990.

Fieldschool in Flintknapping

Lithic Analysts, Pullman, Washington, will offer a month-long summer 1990 fieldschool in flintknapping and lithic technology under the direction of J. Jeffrey Flenniken. The fieldschool was established by the late Don E. Crabtree, and has been taught by Flenniken since 1976. The fieldschool provides practical instruction in lithic technology taught by Flenniken and Terry Ozbun of Lithic Analysts and Philip J. Wilke and Jeanne Day Binning of the University of California, Riverside. Visiting instructors will include Gene Titmus and James Woods, Herrett Museum, College of Southern Idaho.

The fieldschool is taught at a tent camp in the Sawtooth Mountains, Stanley Basin, Idaho. Participants must provide their sleeping bag and clothes suitable for outdoor work. Cost is \$950 and includes group and individualized instruction, lectures, fieldtrips, tool kit, raw materials, tent camp accommodations, prepared meals, and transportation during the fieldschool. The fieldschool will begin June 12, 1990, and end July 13, 1990. Application deadline is April 20, 1990.

A maximum of 10 participants will be selected. Applicants must be strongly committed students or practicing archaeologists. Professionals are encouraged to apply. Applicants should submit a letter detailing interest, a vita, and two letters of recommendation. Send applications to: Lithic Analysts, P.O. Box 684, Pullman, WA 99163.

Letter from the Editor

Over the last three and a half years it has been my pleasure to serve as the SAA Bulletin editor. It has been my belief that the SAA Bulletin provides an important function for its membership: directing news from the SAA leadership and individual members/institutions to the membership at large. In my capacity as editor, I have attempted to bring items of interest from the SAA Executive Board and the various subcommittees to the general readership, while at the same time balancing job placements and SAA business with current issues which would appeal to a broad audience.

Many energetic and talented people, within the SAA, at Memphis State, and at Bostrom Corporation, have contributed to the Bulletin production. In particular, I wish to thank Patty Jo Watson, who at that time was editor of *American Antiquity*, for her suggestion that I consider the Bulletin editorship; past Presidents Don Fowler and Dena Dincauze and President Jeremy Sabloff for their support; and those at Bostrom Corp., especially Rebecca Kaiser, Jerry Miller, and Julie Miller, who made the Bulletin possible with their hard work and cooperation.

It is my hope that the Bulletin will be supported to a greater degree by the membership if it is to survive as a vehicle for information exchange among New World archaeologists. My position in assuming the role of SAA Bulletin editor was to develop a low budget, but efficient newsletter during a transition period until the SAA evaluation and reorganization could take place. Now that the assessment has been accomplished and action is being taken based upon the recommendations, I look forward to an expanded Bulletin which will become a major voice for the SAA membership and the furtherance of New World archaeology.

David H. Dye, Department of Anthropology, Memphis State University, Memphis, TN 38152.

B2 or Not B2? Or, 1950 Forever?

I, for one, am growing tired of subtracting 1950 from radiocarbon "B.P." determinations, or vice versa, to arrive at a B.C. or A.D. equivalent. Has anyone else noticed that 1950 is receding into the past itself, and a much more congenially numbered (millennial!) year is rapidly approaching?

I suggest that, as soon as possible, radiocarbon labs and the archaeological literature should make a switch to a "B.P.2" or simply "B.2" (for 2000 A.D.) standard, and that we stay with it (and make things easy for ourselves) for the next several decades.

In retrospect, the "B.P. 1950" standard seems to have been a remarkably short-sighted choice by and for people dealing habitually with very long spans of time. Surely, a change from it must be made some day! Or, will our descendants (if any) in A.D. 2500 still be wrestling with "B.P. 1950"?

Marvin D. Jeter, Arkansas Archeological Survey, Box 3087, UAM, Monticello, AR 71655.

[Reply to Jeter]

Regarding the letter from M.D. Jeter, who is "growing tired of subtracting 1950

from radiocarbon 'BP' determinations...": I must point out that neither Mr. Jeter, nor anyone else confronted with a "B.P." radiocarbon date should subtract or add 1950 if the desired result is a B.C. or A.D. date which corresponds to calendar years. Until recently, this was the only way to convert time scales. But now, we know that such an operation would probably produce an erroneous and deceptive "date" which is uncorrected for errors associated with changes in the atmospheric carbon-14 content in the past; yet because the 'date' is associated with "B.C." or "A.D.", it appears to be corrected. Consumers of radiocarbon dates must deal with two time scales: "radiocarbon years" and "calendar years". A large body of research in the past two decades has produced calibration schemes

that, for the past 9000 years, allow the conversion of one to the other. Radiocarbon years are a mathematical artifact calculated according to protocol agreed upon by convention. This time scale bears only an approximate relationship to astronomical (sidereal) years. The year zero, A.D. 1950 ("present" in terms of radiocarbon years), is also a conventional establishment, and is in deference to the approximate date of the first radiocarbon date ever measured (Libby et al. 1949) (see note 1).

Most archaeologists prefer to deal with calendar years, which are based on established tree-ring chronologies, the corrected curves of which are called calibrations, and the corrected dates referred to as cal A.D. or cal BC or even cal BP (Mook 1986). One need not wrestle with difficult numbers like 1950, or even worse, 1949, to convert from radiocarbon years to calendar years, as graphical schemes are available which allow us to convert without tiresome subtractions and additions (Stuiver and Kra 1986). For those comfortable with personal computers, various calibration programs are even faster, easier, and less subject to the perplexities of parallax (Stuiver and Reimer 1987). To change the radiocarbon dating year zero would be mathematically simple but operationally difficult - imagine the confusion of three time scales - and unnecessary since the end product in most archaeological cases is calendar years.

Notes: 1) Certainly the present is not what it used to be. Some think of B.P. more appropriately representing "before physics," or "before perspicuity." Perhaps, to avoid misinterpretation, "B.P." should be changed to "B.L." for "Before Libby;" but for the present, past conventions lacking prescience, as well as precedent, we have inherited B.P. References Cited

Libby, W.F., E.C. Anderson, and J.R. Arnold,

1949 Age Determination by Radiocarbon Content: World-wide Assay of Natural Radiocarbon. *Science* 109:227-228.

Mook, W.G.

1986 Business Meeting: Recommendations/Resolutions Adopted by the Twelfth International Radiocarbon Conference. *Radiocarbon* 28(2A):799.

Stuiver, M., and Kra, R. (editors)

1986 Calibration Issue, *Radiocarbon* 28(2B):855-1030.

Stuiver, M., and Reimer, P.J.

1987 CALIB and DISPLAY, Rev. 2.1, A Fortran program available from Quaternary Isotope Laboratory, University of Washington, Seattle.

Austin Long, Editor of *Radiocarbon*, Department of Geosciences, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721.

A 1937 Winged Liberty Head U.S. Dime from 410 Windsor St., Silver Spring, MD

In 1986, when my wife and I achieved the American Dream and bought a house in the suburbs, we undertook some landscaping in the back yard. The work required excavating an area about 12 m by 2.5 m, oriented NE-SW, to a depth of between 30 and 60 cm. Believing that some 25 years in archaeology had surely taught me something, I did the shovel work myself, and screened the excavated soil.

The results of the excavation were on the whole negative--a few tools attributable to the previous owner's do-it-yourself auto repairs, some construction debris, and a modest assemblage of "GI Joe" plastic weaponry, ca. 1986, confidently identified by its 7-year old owner as intrusive. However, I did find a dime.

The dime, located in the upper 10 cm of the south-central portion of the excavation, was a Winged Liberty Head or "Mercury" type, designed by Adolph A. Weinman, dated 1937, and minted in Philadelphia, PA (Yeoman 1981:110). It was in very good condition.

Having examined the dime carefully, and recorded the above information about it, I took it to Bonanza Coin and Stamp in downtown Silver Spring, MD, and sold it for thirty-eight cents (\$0.38). We added these proceeds to my wife's annual contribution to the Archaeological Conservancy.

My action in selling the dime raises a fundamental question about my ethics as a properly decreed and certified archaeologist -- to wit, do I have any?

Calvin Cummings (1983) has conveniently summarized the ethical standards of the nation's various

archaeological societies regarding the selling of artifacts. Review of Cummings' paper indicates the following:

*The Society for American Archaeology (SAA), of which I am a member, pledges itself in its by-laws to "discourage commercialism in the archaeological field and to work for its elimination." It goes on to declare the "selling (of) archaeological materials for the sole purpose of personal satisfaction or financial gain" to be "contrary to the ideals and objectives of the Society."

*The Society of Professional Archaeologists (SOPA), of which I am a founding member and which has certified me to be a professional, declares in its "Canons of Professionalism" that a professional archaeologist has the responsibility to "(d)iscourage, and if possible prevent, destruction of archaeological sites, or portions of sites for the purpose of acquiring materials for other than scientific purposes."

*The Society for California Archaeology (SCA), which may have little jurisdiction in Maryland but to whose views I, as a founding member and onetime President, should attend, flatly declares in its by-laws that the "gathering of archaeological specimens...for the purposes of selling artifacts...shall in all instances be forbidden."

*The Society for Historical Archaeology (SHA), which does not count me among its members but whose views on the subject would seem to be relevant given the chronological context of my excavation, declares in its by-laws that the "selling of archaeological artifacts...for the purpose of personal satisfaction or financial gain...(is)...contrary to the purposes of the Society."

The SHA takes these strictures so seriously that it denies its members the opportunity to share the scholarly results of their work with their peers at Society meetings if that work has been sponsored by someone who intends to sell all or some of the resulting artifacts (cf. Hamilton 1988).

By selling the dime I found I surely violated the above ethical standards; yet I feel no guilt. The question I pose to the reader is, should I feel guilt? If not, why not, and what does my absence of guilt say about the ethical codes cited above?

One reason not to feel guilt might be that because of its age, my dime was not an "archaeological artifact." There is some statutory basis for this excuse: the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) defines an "archaeological resource" as including only "material remains of past human life or activities" which are "at least 100 years of age" (ARPA 1979:Sec. 3[1]).

I am uncomfortable with this excuse. Historical archaeologists regularly and correctly complain about the 100-year rule. William Rathje and his colleagues have brilliantly demonstrated the applicability of archaeology to quite contemporary phenomena, and there is growing scholarly interest in the archaeology of such recent historical events as World War II.

Clearly there must be temporal limits on an archaeologist's exercise of ethical responsibility toward the care of artifacts, or we would be unable to take out yesterday's trash. But 100 years is far too distant a limit. If we accept 50 years as a threshold of antiquity, following the criteria of the National Register of Historic Places (36 CFR Sec. 60.4; NPS 1981), then my dime was old enough to qualify as a possible *archaeological resource*. If we deny the usefulness of arbitrary age limits in general, as I believe is preferable, then chronology by itself gives my guilt no assuagement.

Perhaps I am guiltless because the dime was not found in an archaeological site? But what is an archaeological site? In the distant undergraduate days when I had to ponder this question, a site was defined either as the locus of past human activity that had left some remains amenable to study, or as the locus of an archaeologist's excavation. By either definition my homesite qualifies. People have lived there for several decades at least, and it was obviously the location of my excavation. True, it is not listed in Maryland's archaeological inventory, but many perfectly good archaeological sites, historic and prehistoric, share that distinction. True, it didn't produce much of an artifact assemblage, but as a colleague of my youth correctly used to put it, "negative data are positive data." More significantly, in recent years we as a profession have come more and more to recognize the research utility of "isolated occurrences" and the importance of addressing "nonsite archaeology" (cf. Thomas 1975). So it doesn't really matter whether the dime was in a site or not. It was at least an isolated occurrence, used by someone in the past, which I dug up and sold.

Of course I donated the proceeds to a worthy cause that advances the purposes of archaeology, so arguably I did not sell the dime "for the sole purpose of personal satisfaction or financial gain" (cf. SAA by-laws, in Cummings 1983). The "purpose" caveat in the SAA and SHA by-laws raises some intriguing possibilities, but in terms of the way our professional ethics are commonly interpreted it hardly seems material. If the plunderer of a Mayan tomb sold its contents and donated the proceeds to the SAA, it would doubtless raise eyebrows. The fact that a heroin merchant uses his gains to support a home for abused urchins makes those gains no less ill-gotten.

The fact that these examples involve substantial amounts of money while my dime only brought in thirty-eight cents also seems to me irrelevant; to paraphrase the old joke, we've established what sort of archaeologist I am; we're just haggling about the price.

Perhaps I feel no guilt because I take the dime, like my daily garbage, to have no research significance. After all, what can we learn from the fact that sometime during or after 1937, someone discarded, hid, or lost a dime in the back yard of a then-new home in Sliver Spring? The fact tells us nothing of importance about the past; ergo my disposal of the dime is of no archaeological concern.

But was the dime really worthless for research? What if next year or in the next decade someone develops a technique for determining, from the surface chemistry of a coin, the age, economic status, sexual preferences, and political affiliations of its last three users? Won't it be unfortunate, and reprehensible, that I failed to retain a source of such data for analysis?

Obviously in deciding to sell the dime I made a judgement -- judging that nobody is likely to come up with a technique that will allow us to elicit much data from an isolated 1937 coin, and that even if someone did, the data we would thus be able to glean would probably be trivial.

Allowing me to make and act on such a judgement leads us onto some rather shaky ground. Where do we draw the line on the legitimacy of such judgments? What if the dime had been dated 1837 rather than 1937? What if there had been five together instead of one in isolation? What if it had been a 1537 doubloon? A Clovis point? A retouched flake? A Hohokam potsherd? Three Hohokam potsherds?

There might be a high level of agreement among archaeologists that I would not be justified in selling, say, a Clovis point found in my backyard. I suspect however, that reasonable people could differ about one or more 1837 coins, and isolated flake, a doubloon, or a few potsherds of Arizona origin in the disturbed backyard deposits of a twentieth century residence in Maryland. If this is true, then can reasonable people not differ about, say, the cargo of a treasure ship or the contents of a bottle dump? Is a chest full of doubloons, or a cargo of silver ingots scattered on the seabed, likely to yield data of sufficient import to justify retaining it forever in a curatorial institution? Assuming we can recover the stuff using proper techniques, and weigh, measure, photograph, and fondle every coin or bar before it is sold, have we really lost significant data and behaved unethically if we sell it? What about 400 identical vaseline jars from the privy pits of a nineteenth-century house of ill repute?

How about two complete Anasazi pots from a site that produces fifty thousand sherds representing similar vessels? If we save the sherds but sell the pots after their full recordation, have we discarded data? What data? If I can legitimately judge that the dime I found is of little enough research significance that it need not be preserved for future use, and if I can act on that judgement without scandalizing my comrades-in-ethics, then surely I can make and act on similar judgments about doubloons, ingots, vaseline jars, and Anasazi pots. If not, why not?

I have led the reader though this lengthy exposition to suggest that we behave illogically when we adopt rigid ethical strictures against things like the sale of artifacts. I suggest that the question of what it is and is not legitimate for an archeologist or the sponsor of an archaeological project to sell would benefit more from dispassionate analysis than from the adoption and enforcement of rigid ethical codes. I suggest that we try to establish by consensus a system for distinguishing between those artifacts whose long range research potential demands their permanent curation and those that most likely lack such potential, and then seek curation of the former (see Note 1) but readily accept, even encourage, traffic in the latter, provided they are obtained in ways that do not destroy significant data. If we could reach and act on a consensus regarding what should and should not be sold, we might be able to create a rational legal system to protect archaeological sites and data, discouraging pothunting on lands both public and private while satisfying the market forces, aesthetic values, and plain curiosity that make pothunting a growth industry today. We might be able to strike up some mutually beneficial partnerships with treasure salvors, art dealers, and collectors who today go about their businesses in blissful ignorance of, or perhaps with amusement for, such hand-wringing exercises in ethical etheria as the SHA's decision not to allow archaeologists employed by salvors to present papers at its annual meeting. We might even generate contributions of more than thirty-eight cents to such worthy causes as the Archaeological Conservancy.

Responsible replies are welcome, as are volunteers for my next backyard excavation.

Acknowledgement: I am grateful to John M. Fowler, Esq., Deputy Executive Director of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation for technical advice in preparation of this paper.

Notes: 1) Where other legitimate public interests, for example the need to rebury human remains and grave goods, do not render curation inappropriate.

References Cited

ARPA (Archaeological Resources Protection Act)

1979 Public Law 96-95; 16 U.S.C. 470aa-II

Cummings, Calvin

1983 A matter of Ethics. Introduction to the Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual Conference on Underwater Archaeology. Council on Underwater Archaeology, Denver.

Hamilton, Christopher E.

1988 Reply to the Executive Committee, SHA, Concerning the Presentation of the Paper "Results of Archaeological Testing at WFL-HA-1, the Whydah Site." ms. submitted to the Society for Historical Archaeology.

NPS (NATIONAL PARK SERVICE)

1981 National Register of Historic Places (Regulations); 36 CFR Part 60; 46 FR 56183-95.

Thomas, David H.

1975 Nonsite Sampling in Archaeology: Up the Creek Without a Site. In *Sampling in Archaeology*, edited by J.W. Mueller, pp. 45-60. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

Yeoman, R.S.

1981 A Guidebook of United States Coins. 34th Edition. Whitman Coin Products. Western Publishing, Racine.

Foundation for Field Research Announces Grant Awards

The following grants have been awarded for 1990 in archaeology by the Foundation for Field Research: Stanton Green (University of South Carolina) and Marek Zvelebil (University of Sheffield), Survey of the Area Around Aihy, Ireland for Mesolithic and Neolithic Sites; Eloise Barter (California Department of Parks and Recreation), Survey of Sheep Canyon, Anza Borrego State Park, California for archaeological sites; William Keegan (Florida Museum of Natural History) and Annie K. Cody (San Diego State University), Excavation of the Pearl's Site, Grenada, Caribbean; Ken Feder (Central Connecticut State University), Excavation of the Lighthouse Village Site, Connecticut; Paolo Visona (University of Notre Dame), Excavation of the Third to Late First Century Site of Contrada Mella in Southern Italy; Alison Stenger (Institute of Archaeological Studies), Excavation of a Fifteenth Century Vessel, Oregon; Cheryl Classen (Appalachian State University), Excavation of the Dogan Point Site, New York; Consuelo Mater (University of Valencia), Excavation of the Los Villares Site, Spain; Chris DeCorse (University of California at Los Angeles), Excavation of the Elmina Site, Ghana; and Hans Nuber (University of Freiburg), Excavation of a Roman Burial Ground, Germany.

Funding/Granting Resource Database

Douglas Givens has initiated an on-going program of creating and updating a database for funding/granting sources for supporting research in the history of archaeology. Copies of the database are available upon request. Contributions to the database would also be greatly appreciated. Contributions and requests for copies of the database should be sent to: Douglas Givens, Department of Behavioral Sciences, Saint Louis Community College-Meramec, 11333 Big Bend Blvd, St. Louis, Mo 63122.

Annual Meeting Notes

- The 1990 meeting is being held at the Riviera Hotel, Las Vegas, April 18-22.
- Room reservations should be made directly with the hotel. Rates are \$75.00 single or double; \$85.00 triple; and \$95.00 quadruple.
- One night's deposit is required with reservation. Payment must be made by personal check, money order or American Express card.
- Make reservation by March 18, or run the risk of facing a sold out situation.
- Anyone wishing a copy of the Preliminary Program by first class mail should send a self-addressed 9x12 envelope to SAA office with U.S. postage as follows:
U.S. and Mexico: 65c
Canada: 74c
Other countries: \$2.64

The Bulletin of the Society for American Archaeology, ISSN 1741-5672, is published six times a year. Stephen Plog and Don Rice are the Editors, and they ask that all articles, announcements, letters to the editor, or other information for inclusion in the Bulletin be sent to them at the Department of Anthropology, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA 22903. (804) 924-7044. All advertising and placement ads should be sent to the Advertising Director, Suite 200, 808 17th St., NW, Washington, DC 20006, by the first of the month prior to the month of issue. The Bulletin is provided free to members and institutional subscribers to American Antiquity in the US and Canada. The newsletter is published in January, March, May, July, September, and November. Items published reflect the views of the authors and their publication does not imply endorsement of those views.

Society for American Archaeology
808 17th St NW Suite 200
Washington DC 20006

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
Washington, DC
Permit No. 4832