Regardless of our professional affiliations, methodological orientations, or research goals, one thing that all archaeologists have in common is the obligation to disseminate the results of our work. Most often this finds its form in the printed word. We provide written descriptions and analyses of artifacts, sites, and regional patterns, together with interpretations of their meanings in the context of contractual or theoretical questions.

Writings in archaeology take many forms. The paper deluge may include preliminary reports and monographs, prepared in-house and distributed informally, but invariably our more conclusive findings are published in journals and books. The latter are most often considered the more prestigious and influential media for archaeological reporting, and to archaeologists in academic positions it is often "the book" that is the key to coveted tenure and promotion.

The publication of a book assumes productive interaction between two interested parties, the author and the publisher. As Gregory McNamee, Senior Editor of the University of Arizona Press, suggests: "The happy truth...is that the author and the press are natural allies; the one could not exist without the other." Unfortunately, sometimes the happy truth can be lost in misconceptions about the perspectives, roles, and obligations of the individual partners.

On pages seven through ten of this issue we discuss of the press side of the "publish or perish" syndrome. Editors from four university presses known for their efforts in the publishing of archaeology—Arizona, Cambridge, New Mexico, and Texas—provide information and opinion about the current state of publishing archaeology. Here they discuss the current market for archaeological works, as well as their perspectives on manuscript preparation and review, and in so doing they invite a more open discussion of author-press relations, and the prospects for publishing book-length works in our discipline.
SURVEYING THE FIELD

ARCHAEOLOGY AND PUBLIC RELATIONS

Mark J. Lynott, SAA Executive Committee & Society of Professional Archaeologists, Guest Commentator

It was not so long ago that an archaeologist could count on getting a positive story in the local press. The public was fascinated with archaeology and reporters recognized the human interest angle of such stories. We did not usually seek out the media coverage, but if the reporters found us we would try to cooperate. Sure, we might cringe when they got some of the facts wrong. But the stories almost always presented archaeology and archaeologists in a favorable light. For years, archaeology has enjoyed immense popular support, without its practitioners having made any conscious effort to cultivate that support. Today, that seems to be changing.

Archaeology is now getting more widespread media attention, and much of the recent publicity is not positive. During the past few years, stories in local and national media have appeared that present archaeology and archaeologists in an unfavorable light. Some of this negative press is a product of the reburial controversy, and some of it is a product of the greatly increased sums of public funding which are being spent annually on archaeology. For whatever reason, the recent flurry of negative stories about archaeology threatens to undermine the good will and public support we have enjoyed for so many years.

Reversing this trend is essential, but it is not going to be easy. We simply do not have the skills needed to improve our damaged public image. Very few of us know how to prepare a press release, or design a publicity campaign. In a recent issue of American Antiquity (1988, Volume 53, No. 4) Gabriel DeCicco provided us with an excellent guide on public relations. But to be honest, very few of us have the knowledge, inclination, or time to become effective public relations experts. There is still much that we can do individually, but the time has come to seek professional help.

It is essential that archaeologists begin to develop a national and, eventually, international public relations campaign that will disseminate information about the professional objectives and good works produced by archaeology. Some efforts to achieve this have been made at the local level, but very few of us have the ability to transmit the concepts and interpretations of our work successfully to the public through the media. The ideas and concepts that we hope to convey are complex, and most news reporters lack the time to read our technical books, monographs, and papers. Archaeology has now reached the point where it is essential that we develop a professionally managed public relations program that can translate our technical information into a form the media can use.

On the basis of my experience of two years service on the Executive Board, and one year as President of the Society of Professional Archaeologists, I doubt that any single archaeological society has the funding needed to support a public relations program of the scope that is needed. Consequently, it is necessary that archaeologists, avocationalists, archaeological societies, and institutions work to build a public relations coalition. The coalition needs to be a partnership comprising everyone with an interest in promoting the values of archaeological research and cultural resource preservation.

President Sabloff and the Executive Board have expressed their support for this concept by directing the Public Relations Committee, chaired by Susan Bender, to develop an implementation plan and a cost estimate for this program. The Society’s commitment to public relations is also being expressed in the efforts of the Public Education Committee (Ed Friedman, Chair) and the Professional Relations Committee (Olga Soffer, Chair). The Society of Professional Archaeologists has pledged support for the campaign, and the presidents of several regional and state archaeological societies have also expressed support. To be successful, this program needs your ideas and support. If you have any ideas that might be useful in organizing this campaign, please contact Susan Bender, Ed Friedman, or Olga Soffer.
REACHING THE PUBLIC

Peter Young, Editor in Chief, Archaeology Magazine

The Writing workshop that Richard A Wertime and I conducted at the SAA’s annual meeting in Las Vegas appeared to go over well with the 50 or more archaeologists who attended. As one person put it, "Wherever we go these days, we’re told to start communicating with the public. But no one tells us how to do that. Your workshop was at least a start." She added that she would have preferred a full day of "hands-on" editing and writing practice. Wertime, who has conducted many such "hands-on" workshops in the past, would be more than willing to amend the format, but a fee would be required to secure his services.

This year, we settled for a simpler presentation, one designed both to sharpen archaeologist’s writing skills as well as to inform them of the needs of general-interest publications. We stress the human interest requirements of popular writing -- how to be interesting as well as entertaining, how to be personal without being egocentric, how to avoid the dramatic lead that slips into a site report by page two, how to blend the historical with the archaeological, and how to become jargon-free and in command of the written word.

Wertime and I drew from our experiences in explaining how the magazine goes about finding material, generating new ideas, and collaborating successfully with authors from the assignment stages to final page proofs. Wertime was also able to deal with the psychology of writing, noting ways in which successful writers deal with writer’s block, excessive self-criticism, and associated problems.

Archaeologists were also asked to consider themselves to be domestic or foreign correspondents, and encouraged to write or telephone editors of the magazine whenever they felt they had an article idea or even a suggestion. One of the objectives was to encourage a closer relationship between archaeologists and the editors of the magazine. "This is, after all, your magazine," they were told. Those who felt that their particular field was of no interest to the general public were told they were probably mistaken, that the general public is eager to learn about developments in all fields of archaeology.

1990 WINNER OF THE J.I. STALEY PRIZE

The J.I. Staley Prize, the largest cash award in anthropology, was presented at a ceremony at the School of American Research in Santa Fe, New Mexico, on Thursday, May 24th.

Dr. Douglas W. Schwartz, President of the School, presented the $5,000 prize to Caroline Humphrey for her 1983 book, Karl Marx Collective: Economy, Society and Religion in a Siberian Collective Farm. The winning book was chosen from among 27 works nominated by anthropologists from throughout the country.

Humphrey is a Lecturer in the Department of Social Anthropology at Cambridge University, and a Fellow at Kings College, Cambridge University.

The J.I. Staley Prize was established in 1988. It recognizes an imaginative, groundbreaking publication produced within the past 10 years which goes beyond traditional frontiers in anthropology and gives new insight into the understanding of humanity.

DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD TO FRED WENDORF

Fred Wendorf received his BA at the University of Arizona in 1948, followed by the MA and PhD at Harvard in 1953. Fred began his professional career at the Museum of New Mexico and went to Southern Methodist University in 1964 where he has served as chair of the Department of Anthropology from 1968-1974. At SMU he has played a leading role in building one of the finer archaeology programs in the country. His areas of interest include early peoples in the New World, the American Southwest, and North Africa. As leader of the Combined Prehistoric Expedition to Egypt since 1962, he has carried out one of the most remarkable long-term studies of archaeology ever to have been done. He is the most successful member of our discipline in obtaining funding from the National Science Foundation, holding awards almost continually since the inception of the program. In more than 40 years as a professional archaeologist, he has published over 100 articles, reports, and reviews, 18 books, and is co-editor of the Journal of World Prehistory. Wendorf was elected as a member of the National Academy of Science in 1987.
CONSTITUTIONALITY OF ABANDONED SHIPWRECKS ACT

(43 USC 2105) CHALLENGED IN U.S. DISTRICT COURT, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS, EASTERN DIVISION

William A. Louis
SAA Government Affairs Committee

Passage of the Abandoned Shipwrecks Act in 1988 culminated a multi-year effort on the part of several national organizations and numerous individuals. Paralleling and expanding upon provisions of other historic preservation legislation, the Shipwrecks Act reserves title to abandoned shipwrecks to the United States. It further specifies National Register and National Register eligibility criteria, and provides for the subsequent transfer of significant properties to individual States. Significant shipwrecks and other submerged resources can therefore be owned by states, thus affording them protection from salvors and others intent on disturbing these properties.

The constitutionality of the Abandoned Shipwrecks Act has recently been challenged by Harry Zych, a Chicago area salvor doing business as the American Diving and Salvage company. Two cases related to the historic 19th century shipwrecks have been filed in Federal District Court in Chicago by American Diving and Salvage company, the "Lady Elgin" (Case No. 89 C 6501) and the "Seabird" (Case No. 89 C 6502) suits. Zych invoked admiralty jurisdiction over these historic shipwrecks, questioning the constitutionality of the Abandoned Shipwrecks Act. Essentially, it is being argued by the salvors that with the Abandoned Shipwrecks Act Congress is excluding an entire class of maritime law from the federal courts' admiralty jurisdiction, thereby precluding salvors from making claims on historic wrecks in that forum.

The Justice Department is representing the interests of the United States in these cases. Given that both the Lady Elgin and the Seabird are in Illinois bottomlands, the Illinois Attorney General has intervened in the case by filing a motion on behalf of the Illinois Department of Transportation and the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency. The National Trust for Historic Preservation has joined as amicus curiae in this opposition motion, and an attempt by other societies to join in the amicus has been rejected by the presiding judge. Zych and his attorneys have since filed an objection to Illinois' motion to intervene, seeking to exclude them from the case.

These two cases are currently pending in Federal District Court. Unfortunately, a decision for either side will probably not see an end to the issue, since it is likely that the loser will appeal to a higher court. Given that the issues being argued are fundamentally legal, there is little that individual members can do to affect the outcome of the case.

announcements

CALL FOR NOMINATIONS

AAAS Philip Hauge Abelson Prize of $2,500 is annually awarded to either a public servant or a scientist in recognition of exceptional contributions distinguished both for scientific achievement and for other notable services to the scientific community. AAAS members are invited to submit nominations, seconded by at least two other AAAS members, for the 1990 prize. Nominations should be typed and should include the following information: nominee's name, institutional affiliation and title, address, and brief biographical resume; statement of justification for nomination; and names, identification, and signatures of the three or more AAAS member sponsors. Submit nominations by August 1, 1990 to Faye Adams, AAAS Directorate for Science and Policy Programs, 1333 H Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005.

The Society for American Archaeology Doctoral Dissertation Prize of lifetime membership in SAA, is awarded to an individual whose doctoral dissertation is judged particularly outstanding. Nominees must have defended their dissertations and received their PhD degrees within three years prior to the current deadline of September 15, 1990. A nominee need not already be a member of the SAA. Members (other than student members) of the SAA are encouraged to nominate those whose dissertations they consider to represent outstanding scholarship and originality. Based on the evaluation of the nomination letter, the committee will request the nominee to submit 3 copies of the dissertation. Letters of nomination should be addressed to: Janet Levy, Chair, SAA Dissertation Prize Committee, Department of Anthropology, University of North Carolina-Charlotte, UNCC Station, Charlotte, NC 28223.

Nominations requested 1991 Distinguished Service Award of the Society for American Archaeology. Nominations require one primary letter which provides in detail the background and record of the candidate along with the reasons that the individual is deserving of the Distinguished Service Award. This letter of nomination should be accompanied by two supporting letters of reference for the candidate along with a current copy of the curriculum vitae of the nominee. This packet of information is due on or before 1 January 1991. Please send the completed nomination packet to T. Douglas Price, Chair, Distinguished Service Award Committee, Department of Anthropology, University of Wisconsin, Madison WI 53706 608-262-2575.
SEDENTARIZATION AND NOMADIZATION: LONG-TERM CULTURAL CHANGES IN JORDAN

Oystein S. LaBianca, Andrews University

The Madaba Plateau to the east of the Dead Sea has proven to be a fruitful region for studying diachronically the phenomena of sedentarization and nomadization. When the former process prevailed, the intensity with which the land was cultivated increased as farmsteads, villages, and towns were either started, rebuilt, or expanded. When the latter process prevailed, most of these settlements were gradually deserted as people returned to more transhumant livelihoods.

These transformations in land use and settlement coincide with system-wide changes in other parts of the local food system, including methods of distributing, processing, preserving, storing, preparing, and consuming food. Furthermore, the Madaba region food system reached peaks of intensification during Iron I, Late Iron II, Roman, Mamluk and Modern times. With the exception of the last one, these periods of intensification were followed by centuries of abatement, the low-points occurring during the Early Hellenistic, Abbasid, and Ottoman periods.

Of the factors responsible for these oscillations, the most important appear to be historical. For example, during the Roman period, the main impetus for intensifying the local food system was provided by the Roman Empire which built roads and fortresses throughout Central Transjordan in order to make the land safe for grain and vine production and transport, and during Byzantine times, for pilgrim travel. Abatement at the end of the Byzantine period was caused by several cooperating factors, including weakening of military control over the agricultural hinterland, overtaxation of the rural population, and a series of extreme events including earthquakes, droughts, and pestilence. This, in turn, caused local inhabitants to gradually desert their farmsteads and villages and to adopt less conspicuous, more resilient lifestyles involving herding of sheep and goats, cultivating patches of wheat, and living in tents and caves. Such lifestyles minimized their exposure to predation by hostile tribesmen, transmitting armies, and tax authorities.

The evidence for these long-term cultural changes has, since 1969, been accumulated through excavations and surveys at Tell Hesban and vicinity by Andrews University archaeologists in cooperation with the Jordanian Department of Antiquities and the American Center for Oriental Research in Amman. While fieldwork at Tell Hesban and vicinity ended in 1981, it continues at nearby Tell el-Umeiri and hinterland. Here, during field seasons in 1984, 1985, and 1989, the conclusions reached as a result of work at the former site are being tested and refined through improved data collection and analysis techniques. Directors of the Madaba Plains Project are Larry Geraty (Atlantic Union College, Massachusetts), Larry Herr (Canadian Union College, Alberta), Oystein LaBianca (Andrews University, Michigan), Randy Younker (Andrews University, Michigan), and Doug Clark (Walla Walla College, Washington).

announcements

The SAA Nominating Committee requests suggestions of candidate's names for Treasurer-Elect and for two Executive Board members. The Nomination Committee is charged with preparing slates for the Executive Board positions (this has traditionally been done by creating 3-person slates), and with recruiting a single candidate for Treasurer-Elect. The SAA Treasurer is a person carefully selected from a small number of candidates willing to devote skill, time, and energy to managing the society's finances for a three year period. Once such a candidate is found, this person runs unopposed.

The Society is especially concerned to represent its varied membership as adequately as possible, so please give your suggestions for any and all of the three positions to any member of the Nominating Committee soon. We must have final slates ready by mid-November 1990; hence the sooner we here from you the better. Jefferson Chapman, Frank H.H. McClung Museum, U of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37996; Charles Cheek, John Milner Associates, 5250 Cherokee Avenue, 4th Floor, Alexandria, VA 22312; Carol Kramer, Dept of Anthropology, U of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721; Francis McManamon, Chief and Supervisory Archaeologist, Archeological Assistance Division, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, P.O. Box #37127, Washington, D.C. 20013; Patty Jo Watson, Department of Anthropology, Campus Box 1114, Washington University, 1 Brookings Drive, St. Louis, MO 63130.

---continued page 6---
COMMENTS ON SHOVEL-TESTS IN ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Harry G. Scheele, National Park Service

Various recent articles in American Antiquity have focused on the use of shovel-tests in archaeological survey (Lightfoot 1986 and 1989; Nance and Ball 1986 and 1989; Shott 1989), a method commonly used during Federally-conducted and sponsored-archaeological projects. Several articles are positive and Lightfoot (1989:413) calls it "the most efficient discovery technique now available for detecting buried cultural remains on a regional scale."

By contrast, Shott (1989) sees shovel-testing as a survey technique once widely used, now in a state of discredit, and ready for future (or immediate) discard. He questions the method's effectiveness as a site discovery technique: "its use is predicated on the often-unstated assumption that it will discover most if not all sites within the survey region. In short, it is used as a discovery, not a sampling, technique and therein alone lies the problem." (396)

Since 1975 the Interagency Archaeological Services Division, National Park Service, Atlanta, has been involved in contract surveys in various parts of the eastern United States. Shovel-tests are commonly used as a site discovery method in most of the surveys, primarily in vegetated areas, because vegetation and other sorts of ground cover often obscure site surface evidence. Shovel-tests usually are not used when freshly plowed fields can be examined during "surface survey" walk-overs, but unfortunately, such optimal survey conditions usually are not available in undeveloped or remote areas.

Shovel-tests frequently are used to discover sites during survey projects, I disagree with the "assumption" that shovel-tests will result in the discovery of "most if not all sites within the survey region." I do not believe that most archaeological site surveyors make that assumption. While shovel tests often do miss sites, at the same time the method frequently results in the discovery of sites which otherwise would have gone undetected.

I predict that shovel-test surveys will continue to be used until viable alternatives are developed which are both reasonably effective and economical. In that regard, Shott claims (402) that he has proposed "other means of subsurface exposure" but they are not outlined in detail as alternatives. I suggest that instead of dwelling on shovel-test problems (the method certainly has problems) Shott should expend more energy usefully by systematically analyzing and comparing these "other means" with shovel testing and its cost effectiveness. If Shott is able to conclusively demonstrate the relative worth of some alternate survey method, I am sure Federal survey procedures would change accordingly. Until that time, however, the shovel-test method will continue to be used when site survey is done in vegetated areas.

announcements

The National Endowment for the Humanities Reference Materials Program supports projects that organize essential resources for scholarship and improve access to information and collections. Awards are made in two categories: Tools, and Access. Dictionaries, historical or linguistic atlases, encyclopedias, concordances, catalogues raisonnés, linguistic grammars, descriptive catalogues, and data bases are eligible in the Tools category. Archival arrangement and description projects, bibliographies, bibliographical data bases, records surveys, cataloguing projects, indexes, and guides to documentation are eligible in the Access category. The deadline for both categories is September 1, 1990 for projects beginning after July 1, 1991. For more information, write Reference Materials, Room 318, NEH, 1100 Pennsylvania Ave, NW, Washington, DC 20506.

The National Park Service Interagency Resources Division is beginning a project to update the Fall 1980 Special Issue of 11593, entitled "Legal Tools to Preserve Archaeological Sites" by Geoffrey M. Gyrisco. Archaeological protection needs and approaches have changed in the ten years since this article was written. So that the article's revision can be as up-to-date and comprehensive as possible, information is being requested on legal tools that are currently being used to protect archaeological sites: state laws; local government ordinances; innovative applications of state or local laws that are not normally associated with archaeological protection; and articles, case studies, and written program procedures that show how the laws actually work. Please send this information (actual copies of the documents are preferred) and a contact name, address, and phone number, to: Susan L. Henry, Interagency Resources Division (413), National Park Service, P.O. Box 37127, Washington, DC 20013-7127; 202/343-9505.

Funding for DeSoto Contract Research Pending legislative approval of funds, the Georgia DeSoto Trails Commission will award contracts to qualified persons for research on the De-Soto expedition and the aboriginal populations encountered by the expedition in Georgia. The deadline for receipt of proposals is Aug. 1, 1990 for the fiscal year from July 1, 1990 to Aug. 1, 1991. Interested persons should write to Mr. Billy Townsend, Parks, Recreation, and Historic Sites Division, Department of Natural Resources, 205 Butler St., SE, Twin Towers East 1352, Atlanta, GA 30334.
PUBLISH OR PERISH: THE PRESS VIEW

In an effort to learn something of the status of publishing books in archaeology, and the problems that publishing houses face in dealing with archaeologists and their manuscripts, the editors of the Bulletin interviewed four editors of university presses: Jeffrey Grathwohl, University of New Mexico Press; Jessica Kuper, Cambridge University Press; Gregory McNamee, University of Arizona Press; and Theresa May, University of Texas Press. By focusing on university (as opposed to commercial) press activities, it was our intent to provide information from comparable contexts, but we acknowledge that these four represent only a small sample of the business of publishing archaeology.

University of Arizona Press was founded in 1959 at the urging of Professors Emil W. Haury, the late Edward H. Spicer, and Raymond H. Thompson of the Department of Anthropology, and the Press has taken an active interest in publishing in anthropology ever since. At the center of Arizona’s publishing program are studies in the prehistory of Mexico and the Greater Southwestern United States, and the Press has published more than two hundred titles in the latter area since the house was founded.

Cambridge University Press has been publishing archaeology at least since the early 1900s, when archaeology titles appeared in a collection called the Cambridge Archaeological and Ethnological Series. Today the Press has the largest archaeology list in the English-speaking world, and commissions books from the United Kingdom, the United States, and elsewhere. Cambridge also has an active foreign rights department, with established links to all major academic publishers abroad.

University of New Mexico Press started its publishing enterprise in the 1930s. The Press’s efforts in the field of archaeology have been variable, however, often tied to the interests of respective editors. Grathwohl credits the School of American Research for bringing the Press back into the regular publication of archaeological materials some 20 years ago, and the emphasis has been strong since.

University of Texas Press began publishing in 1959 and in the field of archaeology it is best known for its New World concentration. The Press’s publication list has always been particularly strong in Maya and Middle American studies and they are now increasing their coverage of Andean topics. Texas is also interested in maintaining a Middle Eastern focus across a number of fields.

The Market

Each of the editors interviewed indicated that archaeology is considered a mature field in publishing, with a small but stable core of scholars and lay readers. At the same time, opinions varied on the current status of the overall market for publications in archaeology. Cambridge, for example, publishes many more titles now than they did ten years ago and Kuper says the increase is symptomatic of growth in the market for archaeological work. May, on the other hand, feels that the market has been flat in all fields for the past five to six years and Texas has compensated by publishing more books in archaeology.

Are is the book that wants to be born easily . . . . rarer still is the dissertation that warrants the trouble of being made into a book.

A third view of the archaeology market comes from McNamee, who feels it is declining. He believes the chief cause for the decline is the "twigging phenomenon" in archaeology, whereby scholarly activity has become increasingly specialized and publications have consequently addressed smaller audiences. In McNamee’s opinion, fewer archaeological publications seem intended for wide readership, even within the immediate discipline.

One indicator of market trends is a drop in library purchases, resulting both from cuts in federal funds to libraries and from libraries specializing in specific areas and increasing spending on collections conservation. May estimates that the library market has been cut in half over the past ten years; Texas now counts on selling approximately 450 volumes per book to libraries, whereas the total used to be 750-1000 volumes.

Readership

Issues of manuscript coverage and potential audience have variable influence on the publishing policies of these editors. Three presses—Texas, Arizona, and New Mexico—focus on particular culture areas, chiefly the Southwestern United States, Mexico, and Middle America, although they do so for slightly different reasons. Texas encourages area-specific works because their potential market is broader: they attract both anthropologists and historians, plus a large contingent of non-specialists or avocational readers. Manuscripts that are more research-oriented, particularly those that are site-specific, tend to focus on narrow questions and, while Texas will not ignore these, May does not feel that they hold promise for broad distribution.

New Mexico’s regional focus on the Southwest and Middle America is considered advantageous because work in both areas tends to be problem-oriented, tackling different methodological and theoretical debates and issues. In addition, these regions attract a large trade audience that is important to the Press; Southwest Indian culture does very well and "the sky’s the limit" for some things, like Anasazi. For New Mexico Press to consider publication of materials from other culture areas, the prospective manuscript has to have a compelling methodological or theoretical draw as well. Grathwohl feels that the audience for books dealing with archaeological method and theory is growing.

The publishing of more theoretically oriented works is variable among these four presses, with Cambridge perhaps having the greatest emphasis on this topic with their “New Studies in Archaeology” and “New Directions in Archaeology” series. While Arizona also publishes studies of archaeological method and theory, Texas does not publish many works that are strictly theoretical, in part because
they feel these have smaller and more specific audiences, and as a result are much harder to sell.

The presses also differ in the degree to which they court an audience of lay readers. Texas pays considerable attention to the non-specialist public, because avocational readers tend to be sophisticated consumers of archaeological information; they are book buyers and strong supporters of the Press. May indicates that she would appreciate seeing more synthetic works of general interest in archaeology.

Cambridge, on the other hand, is first and foremost an academic publisher, and while they are delighted when their books do find a general market, it is not a significant consideration when reviewing a manuscript's potential for publication. Similarly, while McNamee acknowledges "the larger the issue, the wider the readership," Arizona rarely publishes books in archaeology that are intended primarily for lay readers, and the question of general sales is seldom considered in reviewing archaeological studies.

Single vs. Multiple Authors

Consideration of the authorship, form, and content of manuscripts raises uniform concerns among the editors. All four presses will entertain the prospect of publishing edited volumes, provided they are tightly organized around a relevant and timely theme that is of sufficiently wide interest to sustain an edition, but the editors acknowledge problems with this type of authorship. Grathwohl suggests that there are often just "too many cooks" and that edited volumes are half-again as much headache as a singly-authored volume. Problems include systematizing terminology, coordinating the checking of galleys and proofs, and the negative impact that a single unreliable participant can cause for the collection.

Not only are edited volumes editorially hard to put together, May feels that they also don't sell well. Editors know that it is often only one to three chapters that may be of interest to any individual reader, and that it is easier to xerox single papers than to buy an entire volume.

Like the other university presses, New Mexico is open to consideration of all types of manuscripts, but Grathwohl notes the tendency for their regional titles to be edited volumes, while the more methodological or theoretical works tend to be single-authored. The pattern in Middle American topics, for example, is that everyone writes in edited volumes and together these seem to serve as something like a journal in this area. While the proliferation of anthropology and archaeology journals in recent years has not negatively affected the book publishing business, Grathwohl does wonder what the impact of the two new journals of Latin American archaeology--Ancient Mesoamerica and Latin American Antiquity--will have on the future submission rate of edited manuscripts.

If edited volumes are potentially problematic, there is a wide institutional bias against festschriften. Only Cambridge considers festschriften, and then only in honor of senior members of Cambridge University, or celebrating individuals with whom there are strong editorial relations. Even in these cases, however, the volume would have to be a proper book, with the dedicatory purpose secondary, rather than primary to the exer cise.

Manuscript Submissions

All four presses actively solicit book manuscripts from junior and senior scholars, and all will vet proposals, outlines for works in progress, and completed manuscripts. All offer advance contracts to develop books on the basis of a proposal, but sparingly, preferring instead to offer contracts on the basis of reviews of completed manuscripts. Intuitive decisions have to be made that depend on the editors' perceptions of the competition for a particular project, the publication record of the author(s), and the potential of a contract for facilitating the production process, such as motivating or obliging contributors to see an edited volume through to fruition.

Solicited manuscripts have a much better likelihood of publication than unsolicited. For example, an unsolicited manuscript stands about a 1 in 40 chance of being published under Arizona's imprint; a solicited manuscript, a one in four chance. Similarly, at Cambridge, perhaps one in four proposals prompts an invitation to submit a manuscript. Kuper receives few unsolicited manuscripts, however, as most people will send out proposals to publishers and await responses before sending an entire manuscript.

The number of manuscripts and proposals received and reviewed annually by these presses varies, but is generally on the order of several hundred; May estimates that Texas Press sees perhaps as many as 500 or 600 manuscripts per year in all fields. Of these only a small number actually reach publication: Arizona publishes approximately 40 books per year, while both Texas and New Mexico publish about 80. Of these totals, the number in archaeology is smaller still: both New Mexico and Texas estimate that they publish three to five books per year in archaeology, while Cambridge publishes 12 to 15. All of the presses have large numbers of books in various stages of the production process, the numbers varying from 11 (New Mexico) to 40 (Arizona).

Compatibility of a manuscript topic with the press's interests and current title list is a primary basis for an editor's refusal to pursue a proposed project, but several editors also acknowledge some recurring problems with proposed projects. There is an adage in publishing circles that "most people only publish one book in their lives, and that's their dissertation." McNamee suggests that "rare is the book that wants to be born easily . . .
rare is the dissertation that warrants the trouble of being made into a book. The perception of editors is that students tend to focus on "do-able" projects, resulting in dissertations that are often highly specialized and lacking an overarching view, and therefore that have low marketability.

Another problem noted by these editors is authors' misconceptions of the market for their products, in particular the potential use of their books in teaching. Many authors feel their book will have high visibility as a textbook in college and university courses, when that is at best true for the author's own classes. All of the editors expressed pleasure at having their books adopted in classes, as many are, but few of their books can be considered traditional textbooks. Textbooks are seldom used in British universities, for example, so it is a specialized branch of publishing in which Cambridge is not involved. Texas does not encourage submission of manuscripts in a textbook format; they'd sooner a format that is less off-putting to a broader audience.

Review and Reviewers

Once a manuscript is deemed suitable for consideration by a press, it undergoes both in-house and external peer review.

The presses surveyed here indicated that they commonly ask for two outside reviews, requesting additional referees if the initial reviews are mixed. McNamee has called on as many as six readers for opinions of a manuscript. At New Mexico a manuscript receives an in-house review before requesting peer review and Grathwohl usually relies on just one outside reader. At Cambridge manuscripts are in most cases referred to two outside readers and to the Series editor(s), part of whose brief is to read manuscripts and report on them. The length of time for the review process is highly variable, usually taking from one to eight months, depending on the nature and complexity of a given work, and on the willingness of the readers to respond quickly.

It is the individual reviewer who has the greatest impact on the review process and when it comes to the quality of peer review, these editors are unanimous in their concerns. Every product is different and the presses are constantly looking for new readers. It is often hard to find scholars who can bring to a project skills in all areas that need to be evaluated in a manuscript. The biggest problem expressed about reviewers is their unreliability. Timeliness is always an issue, for prompt refereeing depends on the willingness of scholars to make room in their schedules for expeditious evaluation of manuscripts.

There is also the issue of specificity. Some of the editors felt that reviewers provide superficial or unsubstantiated comments, without taking the time to get into the manuscript and give constructive criticisms. This is particularly a problem when the recommendation is against publication but the reviewer provides no specific reasons why and no advice to the author. May, for one, feels that such reviewers are taking advantage of a power situation, which is terribly unfair, particularly to young scholars. She keeps in mind that "every piece of paper is somebody's work," and she would like to keep publishing as humane a profession as possible.

A final problem with reviewers is largely political. McNamee suggests that architects tend, more than scholars in most other discipline, to form camps and to be hostile to scholars holding divergent theoretical positions. All of the editors agreed that the existence of unanticipated biases and invisible colleges or cliques negatively affects both the review process and the sale of books.

Roll the Presses

Each of the presses is governed by an editorial board or committee. While the number of members varies, each board is comprised of senior members of the faculty and administration of the respective universities. Every positively reviewed manuscript is presented to the press's editorial board, together with readers' reports and relevant correspondence. Normally, committee members do not read full manuscripts. The appraisal of the various boards is generally described as academically rigorous and the main criterion for acceptance is that a publication will make a contribution to the advancement of knowledge.

Once editorial board approval is secured, the copyediting and production of a given manuscript requires approximately 12-14 months from the first manuscript editor's reading to delivery of the bound books, regardless of the press. This period is rather standard time from book to book, although there is always the possibility of delays. Particularly troublesome for books in archaeology are long fieldwork trips, during which time the author is not available to read proofs, answer copy-editing queries, etc.

Other problems relate to the preparation of the final manuscripts themselves. All editors indicated that problems of excessive page length and an over-abundance of illustrations plague initial drafts. Authors tend not to generalize from their own experiences as a reader or reviewer and they are not willing to see their prose or data cut to manageable size. Unfortunately, as May says "for authors who consider their work sacrosanct, people will have to go to the shrine to get it, because presses can't afford to handle it."

All of the editors agreed with McNamee's statement that "authors must face unhappy truths: they must expect to revise their manuscripts thoroughly and conscientiously in order to accommodate the suggestions of the readers and of publishers' editors; they must learn to excise..."
marginal discussions and illustrations, to discard cherished phrases that do not advance the argument, to look at their work from the reader’s point of view. “They must endure long gestation periods in press, for their book is one of the fifty or hundred books awaiting the attention of a house editor, designer, and marketer; and, given the nature of most professional journals, they must then await months and even years of silence before their books are reviewed by their peers in print.”

Perhaps the most important thing to remember is that books almost certainly outlive their authors (and, of course, the editors who see them into print); our insistence on excellence, both of our authors and of ourselves, derives in large measure from our respect for readers a hundred years from now, not to mention our contemporaries.

Gregory McNamee

Each press generally publishes its first-run books in clothbound editions, although where a classroom or general audience is anticipated there may be a simultaneous printing of hard- and paper-cover. Hardback editions may be followed by a paperback printing as the market warrants. Paperback runs tend to be larger and Grathwohl suggests that the return is about one-third of what it might be for a clothbound edition.

Dollars and Sense

McNamee suggests that "the shorter and more vivid the manuscript, the better, both for the ease of the reader and for reasons of economy--every character typeset, every photograph or table reproduced, every page printed adds to the cost of making a book." Arizona favors manuscripts of no more than 300 double-spaced pages, inclusive of all illustrations and apparatus, while Texas recommends trying for a 350-page range. These limits result in a book of approximately 250-300 pages.

The problem of costs influences the production process in other important ways. Many first-time authors do not realize that they are responsible for all camera-ready copy illustrations, bibliographies, and indices. Each press copy-edits its volumes, either in-house or through free-lance copy-editors trained to work with particular topics or types of publications, and several of the presses have design-editors trained to work with the quality of some maps and tables. For the most part, however, the author will normally pay for all artistic or unusual editorial assistance that goes into the volume, and for all permissions fees for the use of reproducible artwork. Authors will occasionally be urged to seek subventions for particularly costly publication projects, but none of these presses makes the availability of subventions a condition of contract.

Each press determines its prices by the actual costs of manufacture of a book, and the cost will naturally vary according to size, number of illustrations, pressrun, and other considerations. None of the presses is attempting to realize a profit, but they all answer to university accountants and their pricing policies are set in order to insure the long-term stability of their operations. At Arizona, books are priced so that their breakeven point stands at about one-third of the pressrun; an edition of 1000 copies generally recovers the cost of its manufacture after about 300 copies have been sold. At Texas the general mark-up is about five times the unit costs.

The Hard Sell

All of the presses advertise their publications in the major anthropological and archaeological journals, and they each promote their titles in specialized catalogs. There is consensus, however, that advertising does not sell books. Rather, advertising attracts specialists to the presses and is effective in assisting the editors acquire new authors. It is positive reviews and word of mouth that sells books, particularly good reviews in journals such as Choice, which is read by acquisitions librarians. The common lament about book reviews today, however, is that they are so long in the making. More than one editor acknowledged having had excellent reviews appear for books that were already out-of-print.

Each of the presses interviewed sends representatives to national meetings, including the annual meeting of the Society for American Archaeology. Here again, though, the meetings are less a forum for advertising and selling books than they are for maintaining a presence in the field, keeping in touch with current authors, and meeting new authors, thus to start the process all over again.
1991 ANNUAL MEETING

Timothy A. Kohler, Program Chair

It’s not too early to start planning to attend the 56th Annual Meeting of the Society, to be held April 23-28, 1991 at the Clarion Hotel in New Orleans. General guidelines for contributors to this meeting were sent to all members in February 1990 with the election materials. Abstracts and registration materials are due at the Washington, D.C. office of the SAA no later than October 1, 1990. Earlier submissions are welcome! If you are planning on proposing a symposium, you should obtain an additional packet of materials from me that contains the necessary forms and guidelines.

About 275 of the some 1700 registered attendees at the Las Vegas meetings have returned the canary-colored questionnaire concerned with future directions for the annual meetings. Please return yours no later than August 15, 1990, if you wish to make your opinion count. I will be reporting on these in detail this coming fall.

Cursory examination of the ranks given the various proposed methods for handling growth in the annual meeting shows that “encouraging poster sessions” is the most popular alternative. Many positive comments were received from those who displayed (and viewed) posters at the Las Vegas meetings. I strongly urge the membership to consider preparing posters for New Orleans, where registration might break the 2000 barrier for the first time. I will give posters equal emphasis in the program and attempt to find prominent locations for their display.

If you are considering a poster, I have assembled a packet of guidelines that you will find useful for poster planning. This packet, and the symposium packets, can be obtained by writing me at: Program Chair, 1991 SAA Annual Meeting, Department of Anthropology, Washington State University, Pullman, WA 99164-4910.

1. Compile and publish an inventory of known archival sources for the history of archaeological activities in the United States, a catalog with aspirations to definitiveness.

2. Develop and institute a systematic program to seek out additional archival materials and, as necessary, facilitate their disposition in appropriate facilities.

The committee does not wish to pre-empt private or institutional wishes regarding the disposition of documentary sources related to the history of archaeology in the United States. It only wishes to identify documentary sources from all quarters and to facilitate the disposition of material if assistance is sought or required.

The committee would welcome comments, suggestions, and information relating to the location and condition of archival sources in the history of United States archaeology. Of utmost concern is the preservation of documentary sources such as personal papers, field notes, video recordings, audiotape recordings, and computer generated materials. Correspondence should be sent to: Professor Douglas Givens, Department of Anthropology, Saint Louis Community College-Meramec, 11333 Big Bend Boulevard, Saint Louis, MO 63122.

SAA ASSISTS MAKAH TRIBAL PRESERVATION PROGRAM

During hearings in the House of Representatives for fiscal 1991 appropriations, SAA’s Washington Representative, Loretta Neumann, requested a special add-on of $400,000 in the Bureau of Indian Affairs budget for the Makah Tribe. The Makah, in Washington state, need to construct a cultural facility for research, education, curation, interpretation and storage for outstanding prehistoric collections recovered by the National Park Service in the 1970s. In recognition of the SAA’s support, the Makah sent a letter of thanks and a beautiful handcrafted basket made by Irene Ward, a 77-year old Makah elder who has limited vision. She makes all of her baskets by touch and is the daughter of one of the tribe’s hereditary chiefs. Ms. Ward served on the Makah Cultural and Research Center Board of Trustees until her retirement in 1987. The SAA Washington Office sent a letter of thanks to the tribe and continues to work to obtain this important funding.

COMMITTEE ON THE HISTORY OF ARCHAEOLOGY

The Society for American Archaeology on 20 December 1989 established its Committee on the History of Archaeology. The Committee is responding to concerns that the documentary sources relating to the growth and development of archaeology in the United States may be in danger of becoming lost or unintentionally destroyed. The charge of the committee is twofold:

1. Compile and publish an inventory of known archival sources for the history of archaeological activities in the United States, a catalog with aspirations to definitiveness.

2. Develop and institute a systematic program to seek out additional archival materials and, as necessary, facilitate their disposition in appropriate facilities.

The committee does not wish to pre-empt private or institutional wishes regarding the disposition of documentary sources related to the history of archaeology in the United States. It only wishes to identify documentary sources from all quarters and to facilitate the disposition of material if assistance is sought or required.

The committee would welcome comments, suggestions, and information relating to the location and condition of archival sources in the history of United States archaeology. Of utmost concern is the preservation of documentary sources such as personal papers, field notes, video recordings, audiotape recordings, and computer generated materials. Correspondence should be sent to: Professor Douglas Givens, Department of Anthropology, Saint Louis Community College-Meramec, 11333 Big Bend Boulevard, Saint Louis, MO 63122.
Over the last six years, the Office of the State Archaeologist (OSA) of Texas has used the services of a group of dedicated avocational archaeologists around the state to respond to calls for assistance, provide in-the-field evaluations of reported endangered sites, document private collections of archaeological materials, conduct salvage excavations where significant materials (such as burials) cannot be adequately protected and, in general, promote the conservation of historic and prehistoric sites throughout the state. These individuals are given the title of Archaeological Steward with the OSA and are responsible for their county or region of the state. This "Stewardship Network" has proven to be an exceptionally efficient way to accomplish many of the activities the OSA should provide but which are difficult to accomplish with the limited professional staff of just four individuals; the Stewards magnify the impact and influence of the OSA through the volunteer program.

The success of this program has been documented in terms of significant increases in the number of sites reported, collections documented, materials salvaged, and talks presented to local schools or civic groups. Another indication of its success is its recent expansion from the original 10 individuals to a network of over 30 Stewards as of April 1990. In addition, each Steward is recruiting local "helpers" to assist in their activities and to coordinate their efforts with regional and local archaeological societies. The Stewards Advisory Panel includes a number of professional archaeologists, senior avocationalists, and the President of the Texas Archaeological Society.

Some of the Stewards (and Advisory Panel members) actively support the development of regional planning efforts which will eventually be integrated into the state Cultural Resources Protection Plan. Stewards also host regional conclaves (locally referred to as a "Palaver") for the central and lower coastal area and for south Texas. Stewards have published Proceedings of such conferences with the help of private funds or funds from the Friends of Archaeology or the University of Texas at San Antonio. Six of these conferences met to agree on geographic subregions, identify significant threatened sites, and outline scientific issues which need to be addressed within the region. Professional archaeologists who plan work in the region are encouraged to study the issues outlined, contact the local Steward for up-to-date information, and actively seek out the assistance of local archaeological groups to help with any surveys or testing.

Through this Stewards Network, and with the assistance of local avocational groups, any professional archaeologists working in various areas around the state can accomplish their goals much more efficiently and effectively. The Stewards and local groups can, in turn, participate in significant projects which focus on key archaeological problems and can contribute to the progress of Texas archaeology.

LATIN AMERICAN ANTIQUITY

The first issue of the Society's newest journal, LATIN AMERICAN ANTIQUITY, has recently been published and was mailed to subscribers in mid-April. This first issue, 92 pages in length, contained four articles and one report. The editorial office continues to receive a steady stream of manuscripts reporting varied research topics and approaches applied throughout Latin America and, happily, many of these contributions have been submitted in Spanish. The second issue of LATIN AMERICAN ANTIQUITY is currently in production, due out in June, and the third issue has almost been filled.

We continue to seek high quality manuscripts, written in English or Spanish, that report the best of the work being done today in Latin American archaeology. We offer authors a relatively short turn-around time between manuscript receipt and publication, and a sizeable circulation: the journal had over 600 subscribers in the U.S. and abroad before the first issue was even published!

The response to the new journal from authors, reviewers, and above all subscribers has been very enthusiastic, and if the quality and volume of manuscripts continues, we plan to expand future volumes of LATIN AMERICAN ANTIQUITY to include more pages and add a section on book reviews.

For subscription information write to The Society for American Archaeology, 808 17th St NW, Suite 200, Washington, DC 20006.
**ACTIONS FOR THE '90s**

The Save the Past for the Future Project  
Kathleen Reinburg, Project Director

After more than two years of behind the scenes work and planning, a special session at the SAA meeting in Atlanta and a major working conference in Taos, New Mexico, the results of the Save the Past for the Future project were released during the SAA's annual meeting in Las Vegas. *Actions for the '90s* contains the findings and recommendations of the Taos conference and excerpts from selected papers by conference participants. These include the following:

**INFORMATION MUST REACH THE PUBLIC.** Americans need—indeed, deserve—to know about their heritage and the history and prehistory of the nation. Professional archaeologists in government, private practice and academia must explain in articulate and compelling terms why archaeology is important, how the public benefits from archaeology and how looting and vandalism damage that public benefit.

**EDUCATION AND TRAINING MUST BE IMPROVED.** Educational outreach programs must be developed to inform and sensitize the public, targeted to members of such special groups as Native Americans, attorneys and law enforcement personnel, students and the media. Training for government employees must emphasize archaeological values and ethics, proper methods, legal requirements and enforcement procedures.

**LAWS MUST BE STRENGTHENED.** Existing laws, regulations and government programs must be revised both to increase penalties against professional looters and to provide effective deterrents to hobbyists. Appropriate federal, state, tribal and local laws must be enacted to improve protection for burials, submerged sites and sites on private lands. Tax incentives and conservation easement programs must be provided for site protection on private lands.

**PROTECTION EFFORTS MUST BE INCREASED.** Archaeological resources on federal, state and local government lands are not adequately protected. New mechanisms and substantially more money and staff are needed to improve protection efforts by federal land managing agencies. Agencies at all government levels must enlist the general public, professional societies, and Native Americans in archaeological resource protection. Cooperative agreements must be negotiated among federal land managing agencies and between agencies and tribal and local governments. New mechanisms and substantially more money and staff are needed to improve protection efforts by federal land managing agencies. Agencies at all government levels must enlist the general public, professional societies, and Native Americans in archaeological resource protection. Cooperative agreements must be negotiated among federal land managing agencies and between agencies and tribal and local governments. 

**ALTERNATIVES MUST BE PROVIDED.** The interested public must be provided with alternative ways—ethical and legal—to participate in archaeology. These include opportunities to participate in local avocational societies, volunteer projects or "Earthwatch"-type study activities, site steward programs and opportunities to make financial contributions that aid archaeological research and protection.

*Action for the '90s* is an opportunity for all archaeologists. Copies of the complete *Actions for the '90s* are available for $6 (including postage and handling) from the SAA Office of Government Relations, P.O. Box 18364, Washington, DC 20036.

---

**THE PUBLIC EDUCATION INITIATIVE AND THE SAA**

Edward Friedman & Phyllis Messenger

The SAA Committee on Public Education, established by the SAA Executive Committee at the annual meeting in Las Vegas, needs your help in creating a network of active, committed, and energetic individuals throughout North America (and reaching out to interested colleagues abroad, as well). We will work together to develop, coordinate, and promote public education strategies related to archaeology and the preservation of cultural heritage resources.

The importance of public education as the most effective long-range solution to the problem of site destruction was an overriding conclusion of each working group of the May 1989 Taos conference of the SAA Save the Past project. "Actions for the 90s," the executive summary of the project, lists among its seven major findings that "Information must reach the public," and "Education and training must be improved." A positive message about what we can learn about other cultures and ourselves from careful archaeological research, as well as about why we should care about preservation of cultural heritage, must be conveyed in a targeted way to a variety of special interest groups, from school children to collectors.

Those of us who study culture history through archaeology have a responsibility to share information about our findings and our methods. We must not appear to shut the majority of the population out of the process with the inferred negative message, "Don't touch. Archaeological resources must be protected for the professional archaeologists." Rather, we must emphasize the natural curiosity of children and adults to learn about and preserve things past and different, yet connected. We want to foster a better understanding of why research is important. We need to convey the nonrenewable nature of the resources, while exploring ways to allow greater enjoyment of them by everyone. We want to contribute to a fostering of respect for one's own cultural heritage and for the heritage of others.

We need your financial backing. This can most effectively be achieved through your continued membership in the SAA, whether regular or associate member. We hope that the new SAA avocational membership of $25 will attract our colleagues interested in public education about cultural heritage resources.

If you want to become involved, write to Ed Friedman, Chair of the Committee on Public Education, and let him know how you want to help (Bureau of Reclamation, Denver Federal Center, P.O. Box 25007, Denver, CO 80225-0007, Attention: D-5530).
SOFTWARE REVIEWS

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATABASES, PART I

Michael Adler, University of Michigan
Alex Barker, University of Michigan

While the archaeology of the last few decades has forced us to come to terms with the computerization of data analysis and text editing, the associated explosion of data and publications often threatens to overwhelm our file cabinets and often antiquated bibliographic capabilities. A trip to the periodicals section of the library can be a daunting experience, a never-ending climb up a constantly growing mountain of literature. Fortunately, several bibliographic databases are available to assist in controlling this information boom.

In this issue and the September issue of the Bulletin, we review three software packages to familiarize archaeologists with the range of options available for kicking the 3-by-5 index card habit. These reviews are limited to those packages with which we are most familiar, and does not cover all of the bibliographic software available. The opinions expressed are from a user point of view. Each database is assessed based upon its applicability, general bibliographic requirements, flexibility in entering and printing various bibliographic formats, and compatibility with different hardware and word processing packages.

Notebook II (version 3.02a), by Pro-Tern Software, costs $189 (or $299 for Notebook II, Bibliography, and Convert). It requires 2 floppy disk drives or 1 floppy and a hard drive, 256K RAM, and DOS 2+. No McIntosh version is available; neither academic discounts nor site licenses are available.

Pro-Tern began marketing Notebook several years ago and the package has now been widely adopted in academia for bibliographic database management. Overall, the package offers an exciting range of pre-set formats, and is exceptional in terms of flexibility and customizing options.

Notebook II can be configured to use both a short-(author, title, date, etc.) and a long-entry format (special series, collected papers, etc.) for creating a bibliographic database. The search and organize tasks can be handled through the use of Boolean operators that work on keywords as well as text entries. Notebook II allows use of unlimited keywords with each bibliographic entry. One can browse, edit, search, print and employ various utilities to arrange and compact the data. Of particular interest is Notebook’s capabilities to handle unlimited text. Annotations, excerpts from texts, and pertinent lecture notes can all fit into a single bibliographic entry. Although the package can be used for academic research, it also is valuable for maintaining inventories, address files, and a variety of other data listings.

Printing out bibliographies in Notebook II can be approached two ways. First, Notebook is supplied with several formats, including Chicago A and B, Turabian, APA and MLA. Sophisticated capabilities for creating custom formats are also available, but the custom formats have to be constructed from the ground up. The second option is to purchase nbCitation from Oberon Resources ($99 separately or $275 as a package with Notebook, Bibliography, and Convert). nbCitation includes automatic formatting for over 700 journal styles, including all major anthropological journals and presses. Both Notebook II and nbCitation work with the popular word processing programs.

Pro-Tern also includes two utility packages along with Notebook. Bibliography is a utility to search prepared textfiles for flagged bibliographic references. The program compiles a bibliography to accompany the text, pulling the appropriate references from any one of the available Notebook databases. Convert is a utility for transforming bibliographic data imported from such on-line databases as Medline, BRS and Dialog into Notebook format. Convert was not tested for this review. The documentation for Notebook II, Bibliography and Convert is presented in a single, thorough volume.

There are advantages and disadvantages to Notebook II. Among the advantages is Notebook’s ability to append limited amounts of text to each data entry record. This is particularly useful for keeping annotations or reviews with the bibliographic reference. Another advantage of the package is its capacity to alter the bibliographic database format. A variety of categories can be used in any one database, making the custom entry form quite flexible.

The major disadvantages of using the package stem in large part from its general flexibility. If pre-set bibliographic formats are a necessity, creating custom formats can be complex and time-consuming. Because Notebook II was created to be a generalized database manager, it does require significant time investment to learn the finer points of the package. Overall, however, after a certain level of familiarity with the package is reached, it is a powerful bibliographic manager.

In the September issue of the Bulletin, we will review two additional bibliographic databases, Bib and Pro-Cite.
ARCHAEOLOGIST-Willamette National Forest Tired of VOLUNTEERING your time? How about a paid summer job in the Cascades? The Detroit Ranger District on the Willamette National Forest expects to fill about five archaeological survey positions for the upcoming field season. The work will entail intensive ground coverage in support of the timber sale program prescribed by Congress in the Northwest Timber Compromise. Starting dates will range from May through June. The pay depends on experience, from $6 to $8 per hour; limited housing is available. For information on how to apply, contact: District Archaeologist, Detroit Ranger District, Willamette National Forest, HC 73, Box 320, Mill City, OR 97360. (503) 854-3366.

ARCHAEOLOGIST-Bishop Museum The Bishop Museum in Honolulu is seeking professional archaeologists to work on Hawaiian contract archaeological survey and excavation projects. Work is available immediately and pay is commensurate with education and experience; advancement in responsibility and salary is possible. Interested persons should send resumes and letter of interest to: Applied Research Group, Bishop Museum, P.O. Box 19, 000-A, Honolulu, HI 96817.

ARCHAEOLOGIST-3D Environmental Services Inc. Principal investigator positions open in the cultural resource management group of 3D Environmental Services, Inc., in Cincinnati. Placement in Washington D.C. a possibility. Concentrations in both historic and prehistoric archaeology, and architectural history are of interest. Graduate degree and relevant experience required. 3D/ESI conducts projects across the east, south, and midwest. Salaries and benefits are competitive. Send letter and vita to Dr. David Rue, 3D/ESI, 781 Neeb Road, Suite 5, Cincinnati, OH 45223.

PROJECT SUPERVISOR-Desert Research Institute to direct and manage archaeological investigations under the general direction of project principal investigators; to conduct and coordinate laboratory analyses of recovered data; and to prepare reports. Requires advanced degree in anthropology, archaeology, or related discipline; at least one year experience directing field projects including excavations and surface collections; and demonstrated ability to produce publishable quality reports in timely fashion. Experience in Great Basin archaeology preferred. Starting salary approximately $25,000, depending upon qualifications. Excellent benefits. Position located in Las Vegas. Applications accepted until June 15 or position is filled. Send resume, letter of interest, and names of three references to: Personnel Office, Desert Research Institute, P.O. Box 60220, Reno, NV 89506. An Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer.

CULTURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT (CRM) POSITION-Chambers Group, Inc., an Orange County-based environmental consulting firm seeks a Senior Archaeologist who shares our high standards of professionalism to join our Cultural Resources Management group. The firm offers a stable work environment, professional challenges, and the opportunity to work with scientists that provide studies of the highest technical quality. This is a full-time permanent position with company-paid benefits plus a liberal incentive program. We require a scientist with an advanced degree (Ph.D. preferred) with extensive experience in Cultural Resources Management. Specialization in Historical Archaeology or Lithic Analysis is preferred. Please send resume to: Chambers Group, Inc., 1761-A East Garry Avenue, Santa Ana, CA 92705.
June 21-Jan 1991 A GIFT FROM THE HEART: TWO POMO ARTISTS, exhibition at The Museum of the American Indian, Broadway at 155th St, New York, NY. The exhibit presents a unique assemblage of more than 80 exquisite baskets as well as ethnographic models of traditional objects, all created by California Pomo artists William Benson (1862-1937) and his wife, Mary (1876-1930). Highlights of the exhibit will include finely coiled baskets adorned with brilliantly-colored feathers and shell beads, miniature baskets, as well as feathered headaddresses.

Aug 16-19 HUMAN BEHAVIOR AND EVOLUTION SOCIETY, second annual meeting, Los Angeles, CA. Interdisciplinary research and communication on the use of evolutionary theory to understand human behavior. Deadline for abstracts: April 1, 1990. Contact Michael McGuire, UCLA Neuropsychiatric Institute and Hospital, 760 Westwood Plaza, Box 33, Los Angeles, CA 90024-1759; 213/825-0705.

Sept 23-28 V, GORDON CHILDE CENTENARY CONFERENCE, Australia. Theme "His Intellectual and Political History." The conference seeks to capture some of the range and variety of Childe's interest and achievements. Conference papers should focus on three major aspects: Childe as a theorist and critic of labor politics, the meaning and significance of Childe's achievement as an archaeologist and historian, and the Australian background to Childe's intellectual outlook. Contact Dr. Don Castan, Director of Australian Studies Centre, U of Queensland, St. Lucia, Australia, QLD 4067; 61-7/377-2733.

Sept 26-29 NORTH AMERICAN FUR TRADE, 6th conference, hosted by The Mackinac State Historic Parks, Grand Hotel, Mackinac Island, MI. Conference papers are encouraged which highlight the following: The Mackinac-based fur trade; Native Americans and the North American fur trade; and, Euro-Americans and the North American fur trade. Deadline for 1-page abstracts and a curriculum vitae: Aug 1, 1990. Contact Dr. Donald P. Heldman, P.O. Box 515, Mackinac City, MI 48701.

Oct 10-14 MUSEUM COMPUTER NETWORK, Richmond, VA. Theme: Integrated Computer Systems. Proposals are sought for papers, panel discussions, and demonstrations which focus on overall planning efforts for automation; information architecture studies and use of CASE technology; linking of museum, archival, and library systems; data sharing and information access; and use of image related technologies in a museum context. Contact Deirdre Stain, Executive Director of the Museum Computer Network at the School of Information Studies, Syracuse U, Syracuse, NY 13244-2340; 315/443-5612.

Oct 14-21 LUBBOCK LAKE LANDMARK CELEBRATION WEEK, Lubbock, TX. Theme: The integration of the geological and biological sciences in archaeology as a driving force behind the current era of Quaternary research. Scholars from around the world will gather in Lubbock to celebrate a half-century of investigation at the Landmark and to participate in an international symposium, a series of public lectures, and panel discussions on topics germane to the Landmark record within an international perspective. Contact Dr. Eileen Johnson, Museum of Texas Tech U, Lubbock, TX 79409; 806/742-2481.

Oct 17-20 FIFTH ANNUAL NAVAJO STUDIES CONFERENCE, Shiprock, NM. Theme: "The People Have Survived—Ahalaho Naashaa." Deadline for abstracts: April 15, 1990. Contact James McNeely or Herbert Benally, Fifth Annual Navajo Studies Conference, Navajo Community College, PO Box 580, Shiprock (Navajo Nation), NM 87420; 305/368-5291.


Oct 31-Nov 3 PLAINS ANTHROPOLOGICAL CONFERENCE, 8th annual conference, Sheraton Century Center Hotel, Oklahoma City, OK. Deadline for papers, research report, and symposia: Sept 15. Contact Susan C. Vehik, Morris W. Foster, or Jack L. Hofman, Dept of Anthro and the Oklahoma Archaeological Survey, U of Oklahoma, Norman, OK 73019.