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On the cover: The Bears Ears from a ruin  
atop Cedar Mesa. Photo by Josh Ewing.
This month we have no special section, but offer instead a collection of very special articles. Contributions in the November 2017 issue consider a wide range of topics spanning general disciplinary concerns to personal reflections on the field.

First, R. E. Burrillo provides a succinct introduction to the archaeology of Bears Ears National Monument. It is a sad sign of the times that Bears Ears has become controversial; thus, it is important that our membership gain some appreciation for what is at stake. Meanwhile, archaeology continues to benefit from advances in computing technology. Toward that end, Peter J. Cobb introduces practical applications of virtual desktops. With or without updates to computers, archaeology offers insights into human and not-so-human curiosities. Stephen H. Lekson’s article on a Mimbres “jackalope” highlights a particularly fascinating case study into ancient imaginings!

Paul E. Minnis and colleagues next report on a workshop held at the Amerind Foundation in which participants developed recommendations for sustaining our discipline in a challenging federal political environment. This is worth a close read as, ultimately, we are all participants. Bryon Schroeder returns us to our ongoing discussion regarding the challenges of deriving information from looted contexts. This thoughtful case study will warrant consideration by professionals and students alike. Finally, the careful reader might note that I skipped one article from the table of contents, and this would be accurate, as I purposely saved mention of Don Holly Jr.’s contribution for last. Holly reminds us that when the discussions and debates end what still matters most are the ones we love.

Don’t miss our Volunteer Profile by Chip Colwell, and finally, check out columns by SAA President Susan Chandler, SAA Executive Director Tobi Brimsek, and Local Advisory Committee Chair Torben Rick regarding committee nominations, SAAweb development, and the 83rd Annual Meeting in Washington, DC.
By now, you may have received the annual call for SAA Committee Service. I hope you will consider applying to become an active member of one of the many committees that do the important work of the Society. Any SAA member in good standing is eligible to serve as an SAA committee member.

SAA has 44 committees in all, most of which are open to volunteer membership; most also require that there be two student members. The Members’ Only section of SAAweb (http://saa.org/ForMembers/tabid/55/Default.aspx) contains a list of all committees with their Board-designated charge and committee composition.

Four committees are specified in SAA’s bylaws (Nominations, Bylaws, Ethics, and Publications). The Nominating Committee comprises two members who are elected by the SAA membership, two members who are appointed by the SAA Board of Directors, and a chair who is a past officer of the Society.

The 18 committees listed below are advisory to the Board. The purpose of advisory committees is to do background research related to their committee charge to make policy recommendations to the Board. Some committees also perform public outreach, and two do the critical behind-the-scenes tasks required for the Annual Meeting. Many committees present the results of their work at the Annual Meeting.

- Committee on the Americas
- 2018 Annual Meeting Local Advisory Committee
- 2018 Annual Meeting Program Committee
- 2019 Annual Meeting Local Advisory Committee
- 2019 Annual Meeting Program Committee
- Committee on Climate Change Strategies and Archaeological Resources
- Committee on Curriculum
- Fundraising Committee
- Government Affairs Committee
- International Government Affairs Committee
- Investment and Finance Committee
- Media Relations Committee
- Committee on Museums, Collections, and Curation
- Committee on Native American Relations
- Public Education Committee
- Committee on Repatriation
- Committee on the Status of Women in Archaeology
- Student Affairs Committee

The Awards Committee oversees another 15 committees that are devoted to selecting recipients for the following awards:

- Award for Excellence in Archaeological Analysis
- Book Award
- Crabtree Award
- Award for Excellence in Cultural Resource Management
- Award for Excellence in Curation, Collections Management, and Collections-based Research and Education
- Award for Excellence in Latin American and Caribbean Archaeology
- Award for Excellence in Public Education
- Dissertation Award
- Fryxell Award for Interdisciplinary Research
- Gene S. Stuart Award
FROM THE PRESIDENT

- Geoarchaeology Awards (includes Goldberg Award and Kellogg Fellowship)
- Institute for Field Research (IFR) Undergraduate Student Awards
- Lifetime Achievement Award
- Student Paper Award
- Student Poster Award

Five committees select recipients for SAA scholarships (Cheryl L. Wase Memorial Scholarship Committee, Dienje Kenyon Fellowship Committee, Fred Plog Memorial Fellowship Committee, Minority Scholarships Committee [HUGS], and Native American Scholarships Committee). Finally, the Ceremonial Resolutions Committee is unique in that it is usually a one-person committee.

In addition to the above committees, the SAA Board appoints members to subcommittees. Standing subcommittees include the Survey Project Oversight subcommittee and the Executive Committee, which is made up of the elected SAA officers and officers-elect and is the only committee besides Nominations whose members are elected rather than appointed.

All of these committees perform work that is essential to SAA’s programs. It is my sincere hope that you will devote your talents and energies to committee service. Serving on a committee is an excellent way to network with your colleagues and to provide leadership to the Society. Committee chairs and the SAA Board select committee members on the basis of their statement of qualifications and interest. Those appointed to fill committee vacancies will be notified in early 2018 and will begin their terms at the close of the Annual Business Meeting in Washington, DC, on April 13, 2018. If you are one of the hundreds of members who are already serving on a committee—Thank you! If you are already a committee member and want to serve a second term, please remember that you must apply to be reappointed; however, please note that Awards Committee members cannot be reappointed.
IN BRIEF

Tobi A. Brimsek

Tobi A. Brimsek is the executive director of the Society for American Archaeology.

SAA 83rd Annual Meeting:
Washington, DC, April 11—April 15, 2018

Have you made your reservations yet for the 83rd Annual Meeting in Washington, DC? The meeting will be self-contained at the Washington Marriott Wardman Park. There are special rates for all SAA attendees. Government and student rates are available on a first-come, first-served basis.

Washington Marriott Wardman Park
2660 Woodley Road NW
Washington, DC 20008
+1 (202) 328-2000

Reservations:
Three separate reservations links for the Washington Marriott Wardman Park have been established: one for regular attendees, one for government employees, and one for students.

The cut-off date for reservations at the Washington Marriott Wardman Park is 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, March 19, 2018.

Regular Attendees Reservation Link:
https://aws.passkey.com/go/7381c708
Rate: Single/Double $269, Triple/Quad $269

Government Employees Reservation Link:
https://aws.passkey.com/go/4d359243
Government-rate rooms are limited and are available on a first-come, first-served basis.

Student Attendees Reservation Link:
https://aws.passkey.com/go/8865378c
Rate: Flat Rate Single-Quad $169
Please note that students must present a valid student ID to qualify for a student-rate room.

January 29, 2018, and a Chance for a Free One-Year Membership in SAA!

A special opportunity for you!!!! Register at the Washington Marriott Wardman Park by January 29, 2018, and your name will be entered into an SAA drawing for an incomparable prize—a one-year membership in SAA! Make your room reservation today! There will be two drawings, one for the student-rate rooms and one for all others.

Be an Advocate for Archaeology—Visit Capitol Hill during the Annual Meeting

Meet with your senators and representative on Capitol Hill, and tell them about the importance of archaeology! Policymakers must hear from us. We would like to see as many archaeologists as possible on the Hill during the Annual Meeting. Thank you in advance for your time and consideration in helping us spread our message. Here is how we envision this initiative:

Around March 1, 2018, contact the DC offices of your senators and representative and ask for a meeting between April 11 and April 13 (contact information can be accessed at the House and Senate main pages: https://www.house.gov/ and https://www.senate.gov/).

Daily briefings will be held at the Washington Marriott Wardman Park from 7:00 a.m. to 7:30 a.m. on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday. SAA recommends that you attend a briefing prior to your Capitol Hill meetings. If you can't attend a briefing, the manager, Government Affairs, will also be available throughout the meeting to answer any questions.

Early in 2018, SAA will provide talking points for you to use during your meetings.

A free online seminar, “Charging the Hill: A Guide to Survival,” was held on October 4 to discuss the best strategies on how to converse with members of Congress and their staffs. The seminar is now publicly archived on SAAweb and available to all as a resource.

SAA lapel pins will be given to individuals to wear on the Hill during the Annual Meeting.
Contact the manager, Government Affairs (david_lindsay@saa.org), for more information.

November 3, 2017—November 30, 2017: Open Call for SAA Committee Service

As you may be aware, each year, we hold an “open call season” for volunteers for SAA committee service. You will have received an e-mail on November 3, 2017, with a link to the committee service application. The call will remain open for applicants through the deadline of November 30, 2017. Committee chairs and Board liaisons to the committee will then have approximately one month to review applications and make decisions. By mid-January, appointment letters will be generated from the SAA office. We hope that you will want to get involved! Students: Most SAA committees have two student members! Try it out!

SAAweb Redevelopment Under Way!

It has been a long time in coming, but SAA is closer to the launch of the redevelopment project. Over the summer, a number of critical steps were taken. The executive director reached out to the Board, all committee and task force chairs, and interest group organizers for their input on envisioning the new site. Staff also gathered examples of the kinds of websites that members liked. That input was compiled to share with the consultant who was developing the RFP for the project. The RFP was completed this summer, and it was submitted to a number of vendors for bidding. At this writing, staff have reviewed proposals, interviewed vendors, and are waiting for the last proposal to come in. Once that process is completed, staff will make a recommendation to the Board, and the Board will be asked to approve the project.

Regardless of the vendor selected, the launch of a new site will take 8–12 months from inception, and member input will be sought along the way. The launch will take that amount of time because of the taxonomy and tagging required to enable sophisticated searches. That process will be defined in detail by the selected vendor. The user experience for the website is key. All staff are engaged in this process, as it impacts all of SAA’s programs and services. Stay tuned for additional progress reports!

Coming in 2018 from The SAA Press
Out of the Cold: Archaeology on the Arctic Rim of North America
by Owen K. Mason and T. Max Friesen

The Arctic rim of North America presents one of the most daunting environments for humans. Cold and austere, it is lacking in plants but rich in marine mammals—primarily the ringed seal, walrus, and bowhead whale. In this book, the authors track the history of cultural innovations in the Arctic and Subarctic for the past 12,000 years, including the development of sophisticated architecture, watercraft, fur clothing, hunting technology, and worldviews. Climate change is linked to many of the successes and failures of its inhabitants; warming or cooling periods led to periods of resource abundance or collapse, and in several instances to long-distance migrations. At its western and eastern margins, the Arctic also witnessed the impact of the world systems of Asia and Europe, as the effects of the Norse and later Europeans engaged the east; while in the west, commodities from East Asia and finally the Russians impacted the Bering Strait.

Thank you to the over 3,000 participants that submitted to SAA's 83rd Annual Meeting in Washington, DC!
One of the highlights of the SAA Annual Meeting is getting to see colleagues and friends that we are usually only in touch with via e-mail, or perhaps not at all, during the regular year. While we are all busy in sessions focusing on presentations of the latest archaeological find or debate, the afternoons and evenings are often a social time to catch up with colleagues. Washington, DC, is perhaps most famous for its monuments and museums on the National Mall (see the September 2017 issue of The SAA Archaeological Record), but the city also has a wonderful restaurant and bar scene perfect to escape the dark lecture hall and interact with colleagues and friends.

The meeting hotel is located a short (~1 mile) walk or cab ride from the Adams Morgan area of Washington. A number of excellent restaurants are located on Columbia and 18th Streets. These include an outstanding ramen bar (Sakuramen), an Ethiopian restaurant (Quara), an Indian restaurant (Jyoti), an Italian restaurant (Rosario), an Eritrean restaurant (Keren), and many more. This trendy neighborhood offers a chance to eat great food from all over the world and reflect on the amazing cultural diversity that makes Washington and the entire United States so special. Also in this area, The Black Squirrel offers a plethora of craft beers on tap that are sure to quench your thirst after a long day in archaeological sessions. You can even get oysters on the half shell at Pop’s SeaBar, and taste some of the shellfish that have been a staple in the mid-Atlantic region for thousands of years. No trip to Adams Morgan would be complete without a stop at Madam’s Organ, a bar full of taxidermy (perfect for zooarchaeologists) that you have to see to fully appreciate.

Washington is an outstanding city for foodies. One of DC’s celebrity chefs is José Andrés. He is a bit of a local legend with several restaurants in the area. He was also the subject of a lawsuit by President Trump over a dispute related to the Trump Hotel. Lawsuits aside, I highly recommend a visit to any of Andrés’ restaurants. My two favorites are Zaytinya, a Mediterranean small plates restaurant, and Oyamel, a Latin American restaurant, which serves a dish centered around grasshoppers! Both offer great drinks, good food, and a nice atmosphere for conversing with small- to medium-sized groups of colleagues. They are also a short Metro or cab ride from the meeting hotel.

DC is not the brew pub hub that you will find in, say, Portland, Seattle, or San Diego, but we do have several good local watering holes that offer nice selections of beer and other beverages. If you are looking for a unique way to unwind, you and a few colleagues might be interested in checking out the DC Brew Tour. The tour includes a designated driver and stops at several craft breweries/pubs in Washington, giving you time to explore good beer and talk about archaeology. What could be finer? Details can be found here: https://www.citybrewtours.com/dc/.

Maybe beer and cocktails aren’t your thing, or you’re not of age. I totally understand that. It is safe to say that most archaeologists love coffee—some of us a little too much. While the hotel is equipped with a few restaurants, for those who want to venture a little farther afield, Philz Coffee is less than a mile away and offers an amazing selection of coffees hand-poured over your own personal Chemex. Of course, not all of us feel the need to go to that extreme, so right across from the Marriott is Open City, a coffeehouse, diner, and bar, where you can get the beverage of your choice. Both places also offer some outstanding traditional and herbal teas if you’re not a coffee aficionado.

Other local icons include Ben’s Chili Bowl and Busboys and Poets. At Ben’s Chili Bowl—a favorite of Barack Obama—you will be treated to world-famous hot dogs and chili, and can view their famous mural. Finally, for a mix of art, culture, literature, and good food, Busboys and Poets is another local icon that is as much a community gathering place as it is a restaurant. Whatever your eating and drinking pleasure, we have you covered in Washington!
A confession: I snuck into my first SAA Annual Meeting. It was 1994, at Disneyland. I walked around that meeting with the name tag of a very prominent Southwestern archaeologist. I got more than a few double-takes.

I wasn’t anarchic but merely a poor community college student who had already fallen in love with archaeology. The summer after high school I volunteered on a survey project led by Chris Downum at Northern Arizona University. The next spring Chris conveyed that he had registered for the SAA Meeting but couldn’t go at the last minute; I could take his place. So I showed up in Anaheim and told the volunteer behind the registration desk that my name was Dr. Christian E. Downum.

That first meeting was revelatory. For an 18-year-old, it was amazing to suddenly be a part of a community that cared as much about dirt and history as I did. It was thrilling to hear new research, to see the exhibits room filled with books I desperately wanted to read. I saw the world of archaeology making new conversations—and connections. In those moments I understood that to be a professional archaeologist meant being a part of our professional organization.

Some years later when I was a graduate student at Indiana University (IU), I had the chance to attend another professional organization, this one for scholars of applied ethics. There I saw an event called the Ethics Bowl, a friendly but energetic competition between schools to debate ethical quandaries. Inspired to use the format for archaeologists, I worked with my fellow IU student Julie Hollowell—and with the support of SAA staff and leadership—to introduce it to the SAA Annual Meeting. (Thirteen years later, the Ethics Bowl is still going strong!) From that effort, I was encouraged to serve on the Committee on Ethics, which helped me begin to see how the SAA’s internal structure worked and to contribute to the Society’s engagement with important questions about the ethics of our practices.

After I passed the Ethics Bowl’s organizational baton, I joined the Native American Scholarships Committee as chair. I wanted to be on this committee because, like so many, I hoped to create new opportunities for the discipline to become more diverse and inclusive. As chair, I helped reorganize the selection process and wrote (and was awarded) a National Science Foundation grant on behalf of the SAA to fund Native American students’ participation in field schools. Although I didn’t have spare income to donate, I discovered one easy way to contribute to the SAA’s Native American Scholarships Fund was by donating book royalties. I’ve since donated nearly all of my book royalties—though unfortunately no New York Times bestsellers yet—to the SAA’s fund for Native American students.

Books guided my next service to the society. I was encouraged to join the SAA Book Award Committee. What a job! Each year, I’d receive dozens and dozens of new books in the mail, and then had the task of trying to read them as quickly as possible to discover the best in the bunch. This was hard work, but almost no burden could I find more joyful.

In 2014, I was nominated to serve on the SAA Board of Directors. I was placed on a ballot with a colleague whom I revere; I was sure I didn’t have a chance. It likely was the closest race in SAA history, but somehow I received the appointment. Being on the Board is like having an intricate watch peeled open—its inner workings revealed. Suddenly, I saw the vast complexities of crafting the Annual Meeting program, the diplomatic dance required to bring together other organizations on policy issues, the hard choices about securing the SAA’s financial future, the steady struggle required to ensure that the SAA’s diverse viewpoints are heard and respected, and so much more. I only hope that, as a Board member, I was able to give back to the SAA as much as I have received through the years.

Time will tell what my next service to the SAA might bring. But one thing is for sure: Now I always pay for my own Annual Meeting registration.

A CONFSESSION: I SNUCK INTO MY FIRST SAA ANNUAL MEETING.

IT WAS 1994, AT DISNEYLAND. I WALKED AROUND THAT MEETING WITH THE NAME TAG OF A VERY PROMINENT SOUTHWESTERN ARCHAEOLOGIST. I GOT MORE THAN A FEW DOUBLE-TAKES.

I WASN’T ANARCHIC BUT MERELY A POOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE STUDENT WHO HAD ALREADY FALLEN IN LOVE WITH ARCHAEOLOGY. THE SUMMER AFTER HIGH SCHOOL I VOLUNTEERED ON A SURVEY PROJECT LED BY CHRIS DOWNUM AT NORTHERN ARIZONA UNIVERSITY. THE NEXT SPRING CHRIS CONVEYED THAT HE HAD REGISTERED FOR THE SAA MEETING BUT Couldn’t GO AT THE LAST MINUTE; I COULD TAKE HIS PLACE. SO I SHOWED UP IN ANAHEIM AND TOLD THE VOLUNTEER BEHIND THE REGISTRATION DESK THAT MY NAME WAS DR. CHRISTIAN E. DOWNUM.

THAT FIRST MEETING WAS REVELATORY. FOR AN 18-YEAR-OLD, IT WAS AMAZING TO SUDDENLY BE A PART OF A COMMUNITY THAT CARED AS MUCH ABOUT DIRT AND HISTORY AS I DID. IT WAS THRILLING TO HEAR NEW RESEARCH, TO SEE THE EXHIBITS ROOM FILLED WITH BOOKS I DESPERATELY WANTED TO READ. I SAW THE WORLD OF ARCHAEOLOGY MAKING NEW CONVERSATIONS—AND CONNECTIONS. IN THOSE MOMENTS I UNDERSTOOD THAT TO BE A PROFESSIONAL ARCHAEOLOGIST MEANT BEING A PART OF OUR PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION.

SOME YEARS LATER WHEN I WAS A GRADUATE STUDENT AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY (IU), I HAD THE CHANCE TO ATTEND ANOTHER PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION, THIS ONE FOR SCHOLARS OF APPLIED ETHICS. THERE I SAW AN EVENT CALLED THE ETHICS BOWL, A FRIENDLY BUT ENERGETIC COMPETITION BETWEEN SCHOOLS TO DEBATE ETHICAL QUANDARIES. INSPIRED TO USE THE FORMAT FOR ARCHAEOLOGISTS, I WORKED WITH MY FELLOW IU STUDENT JULIE HOLLOWELL—AND WITH THE SUPPORT OF SAA STAFF AND LEADERSHIP—TO INTRODUCE IT TO THE SAA ANNUAL MEETING. (THIRTEEN YEARS LATER, THE ETHICS BOWL IS STILL GOING STRONG!) FROM THAT EFFORT, I WAS ENCOURAGED TO SERVE ON THE COMMITTEE ON ETHICS, WHICH HELPED ME BEGIN TO SEE HOW THE SAA’S INTERNAL STRUCTURE WORKED AND TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE SOCIETY’S ENGAGEMENT WITH IMPORTANT QUESTIONS ABOUT THE ETHICS OF OUR PRACTICES.

AFTER I PASSED THE ETHICS BOWL’S ORGANIZATIONAL BATON, I JOINED THE NATIVE AMERICAN SCHOLARSHIPS COMMITTEE AS CHAIR. I WANTED TO BE ON THIS COMMITTEE BECAUSE, LIKE SO MANY, I HOPED TO CREATE NEW OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE DISCIPLINE TO BECOME MORE DIVERSE AND INCLUSIVE. AS CHAIR, I HELPED REORGANIZE THE SELECTION PROCESS AND WROTE (AND WAS AWARDED) A NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION GRANT ON BEHALF OF THE SAA TO FUND NATIVE AMERICAN STUDENTS’ PARTICIPATION IN FIELD SCHOOLS. ALTHOUGH I Didn’T HAVE SPARE INCOME TO DONATE, I DISCOVERED ONE EASY WAY TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE SAA’S NATIVE AMERICAN SCHOLARSHIPS FUND WAS BY DONATING BOOK ROYALTIES. I’VE SINCE DONATED NEARLY ALL OF MY BOOK ROYALTIES—THOUGH UNFORTUNATELY NO NEW YORK TIMES BESTSELLERS YET—TO THE SAA’S FUND FOR NATIVE AMERICAN STUDENTS.

BOOKS GUIDED MY NEXT SERVICE TO THE SOCIETY. I WAS ENCOURAGED TO JOIN THE SAA BOOK AWARD COMMITTEE. WHAT A JOB! EACH YEAR, I’D RECEIVE DOZENS AND DOZENS OF NEW BOOKS IN THE MAIL, AND THEN HAD THE TASK OF TRYING TO READ THEM AS QUICKLY AS POSSIBLE TO DISCOVER THE BEST IN THE BUNCH. THIS WAS HARD WORK, BUT ALMOST NO BURDEN COULD I FIND MORE JOYFUL.

IN 2014, I WAS NOMINATED TO SERVE ON THE SAA BOARD OF DIRECTORS. I WAS PLACED ON A BALLOT WITH A COLLEAGUE WHOM I REVERE; I WAS SURE I Didn’T HAVE A CHANCE. IT LIKELY WAS THE CLOSEST RACE IN SAA HISTORY, BUT SOMEHOW I RECEIVED THE APPOINTMENT. BEING ON THE BOARD IS LIKE HAVING AN INTRICATE WATCH PEELED OPEN—ITS INNER WORKINGS REVEALED. SUDDENLY, I SAW THE VAST COMPLEXITIES OF CRAFTING THE ANNUAL MEETING PROGRAM, THE DIPLOMATIC DANCE REQUIRED TO BRING TOGETHER OTHER ORGANIZATIONS ON POLICY ISSUES, THE HARD CHOICES ABOUT SECURING THE SAA’S FINANCIAL FUTURE, THE STEADY STRUGGLE REQUIRED TO ENSURE THAT THE SAA’S DIVERSE VIEWPOINTS ARE HEARD AND RESPECTED, AND SO MUCH MORE. I ONLY HOPE THAT, AS A BOARD MEMBER, I WAS ABLE TO GIVE BACK TO THE SAA AS MUCH AS I HAVE RECEIVED THROUGH THE YEARS.

TIME WILL TELL WHAT MY NEXT SERVICE TO THE SAA MIGHT BRING. BUT ONE THING IS FOR SURE: NOW I ALWAYS PAY FOR MY OWN ANNUAL MEETING REGISTRATION.
I recently had the honor of giving a two-hour talk about the archaeology of the Bears Ears area to a capacity crowd at Cliff Castle Casino in northern Arizona. The talk was received with “rave reviews,” according to organizers from the Verde Valley Archaeological Center—and a repeat performance for the Montrose chapter of the Colorado Archaeological Society later that month evidently broke the attendance record for such talks at their venue. Clearly the archaeology of Bears Ears is a topic of great interest to many, and accompanying the invitations to present my talk in additional venues were a number of suggestions to put it into print. So that’s what this is.

As of this writing, Bears Ears National Monument encompasses just over 1.3 million acres in southeastern Utah (Figure 1). While its boundary will almost always be contested or controversial, it is also arbitrary. Decades of archaeological research in the region suggests that the extent of what has always been a continuous cultural occupation area originally included much more of the surrounding landscape than what’s currently shoehorned into the monument boundary. Thus, the “Bears Ears area” as defined in this piece is composed of almost every major landform in the Utah portion of the Four Corners.

A Brief History of Bears Ears Archaeology

The first person to “make a collection”—early archaeology had much in common with Indiana Jones films—in the Bears Ears area was Charles Lang in about 1880, leaving his inscription on canyon walls during these and later excursions (Blackburn and Williamson 1997). His materials were incorporated into the Chicago World’s Fair in 1893, and are now housed at the Field Museum in Chicago where they currently play a central role in Laurie Webster’s excellent Cedar Mesa Perishables Project (Curtis 2017).

Starting in 1890, the brothers McIoyd and Graham made use of trails cut by Mormon pioneers to launch explorations of the area. They plumbed Grand Gulch all the way to Shangri-La Canyon, and made a number of additional excavations in upper Grand Gulch. Most of their materials were bought by Rev. C. H. Green in 1891 and subsequently made their way into the Field Museum, where they too have become a centerpiece of the Cedar Mesa Perishables Project.

Depending upon the source, the excavations of McIoyd and Graham are portrayed as either [a] scientific inquiries carried out in strict accordance with the highest standards of professional integrity for the time, or [b] wanton looting. Either way, they inspired the Peabody Museum to organize and sponsor a scientific expedition into the area in 1892, headed by Hopewell archaeologist Warren K. Moorehead (Knipmeyer 2006). The expedition was planned and directed by the magazine The Illustrated American, and resulted in a 14-article series titled “In Search of a Lost Race.” Although the trip itself was harrowing, and all original materials were destroyed when the magazine’s New York office burned down a few years later, the 14 short publications remain. They are now available online for free via the Hathi Trust Digital Library (e.g., Figure 2).

In the mid-1890s, Richard Wetherill and his brothers made a pair of extensive expeditions to map and excavate ruins in the Bears Ears area. While still considered controversial by some archaeologists, the Wetherills deserve an ovation for their attitudes toward Native Americans at the time. In 1888, an unnamed reader queried The American Journal of Archaeology on the fact that they never covered any actual American archaeology, and received this printed response:

The archaeology of America... is busied with the life and work of a race or races of men in an inchoate, rudimentary, and unformed condition, who never raised themselves, even at their highest point, as in Mexico and Peru, above a low stage of civilization, and never showed the capacity of steadily progressive development. Within the limits of the United States the native races attained to no high faculty of performance or expression in any field. They had no intellectual life. They have left no remains.
Figure 1: Map of the Bears Ears area showing major landforms and current monument boundary (courtesy of Catherine Gilman, Archaeology Southwest)
indicating a probability that, had they been left in undisturbed possession of the continent, they would have succeeded in advancing their condition out of the prehistoric state. The evidence afforded by their works of every kind—their architecture, their sculpture, their writing [sic], their minor arts, their traditions—seem all against the supposition that they had latent energy sufficient for progress to civilization. (Frothingham 1888:260–261)

So sayeth Arthur Frothingham, PhD, distinguished professor of history at Princeton University and cofounder of that journal. I’ll return to the issue of racism and archaeology toward the end. Meanwhile, that very same year, prominent Native American figures like Wolfkiller and Mancos Jim could be found convivially hanging out at the Wetherills’ ranch, while Richard’s father B. K. Wetherill was busily writing letters to the superintendent of the Smithsonian Institution pleading for protection of Mesa Verde as a national park (Lister 2004).

In the early 1900s, Byron Cummings joined or led a number of expeditions in the Bears Ears area, and in 1910 sought to attract the attention of state and federal officials by deploiring what was already an extensive problem with looting in southeast Utah (Salt Lake Herald 1910). His students Neil Judd and A. V. Kidder would deplore the very same thing in their own publications shortly thereafter. These early observations would make southeast Utah a ubiquitous example in efforts to stymie pot-hunting for 100 years and counting, even while the problem itself has yet to go away.

Early expeditions in the area by Charles Bernheimer and Earl Morris also led to some colorful adventure-reading, as well as laid the foundation for the later Glen Canyon Project, to be discussed in a moment. Bernheimer in particular had a penchant for the periphrastic, feeding tales of his excursions to newspapers whose subsequent stories began with phrases like, “Some five or ten thousand years ago a community of Americans made their homes in caves carved out of the solid rock high above the floors of canyons in the Southwest” (New York Times 1929). They were off by about five or ten thousand years. Also in the 1920s, Nels C. Nelson of the American Museum of Natural History carried out a series of excursions throughout the area in order to gain a better understanding of the material collections entrusted to him at the museum; he recorded a total of 80 sites but only successfully relocated two of Wetherill’s originals (Spangler et al. 2010:37).
From 1956 to 1963, the National Park Service (NPS), Museum of Northern Arizona (MNA), and the University of Utah (U of U) converged on the leviathan Glen Canyon Dam Salvage Project. When the project began, the only applicable federal laws were the 1906 Antiquities Act and the 1935 Historic Sites Act, although by 1960 the Reservoir Salvage Act partially supported the project as well (Lipe 2017). It consisted of an enormous survey conducted jointly by the U of U and MNA along the Colorado River and its tributaries ahead of the flooding of Lake Powell (Jennings 1966). Moreover, the NPS extended considerable flexibility to project personnel regarding where they should investigate. Taking advantage of this flexibility, crew chief Bill Lipe investigated much of the lower San Juan and nearby Cedar Mesa areas in the heart of Bears Ears country.

Thus began the Cedar Mesa Project (CMP). Utilizing grants from the National Geographic Society and National Science Foundation, Lipe—along with R. G. Matson and “a small army of students” (Spangler et al. 2010:41)—conducted intensive investigations on Cedar Mesa between 1972 and 1976. Their innovative research design included randomly located sample survey quadrats and systematic canyon surveys in 5 of 20 drainage units, supplemented by systematic inventories of Grand Gulch and Mcloyd’s (formerly Ruin) Canyon, and augmented by judgmental selection of sites to be more extensively sampled and mapped (Lipe 2014).

Applications of CMP data are legion. No fewer than 10 master’s theses and 5 doctoral dissertations from several universities came out of the project, and more than 80 technical publications or reports have resulted from the 5-year project (nearly all of which can be viewed on Washington State University’s Research Exchange website: https://research.libraries.wsu.edu/xmlui/). Synthetic analyses and publications from the CMP dataset also continue (e.g., Matson et al. 2015), and the end of the project’s relevance and legacy remains too distant to see.

The Present State of Bears Ears Archaeology

Decades of research in the Bears Ears area has revealed a mosaic of human prehistory that includes populations articulating differently with different landforms depending upon time, ecology, and climate. Using the classic Pecos culture-period sequence as a platform for framing the archaeology of Bears Ears, settlement and subsistence patterns appear to interdigitate between subregions in a contiguous and continuous manner right up until the final depopulation of the area by about AD 1275.

The Paleoindian era (ca. 12,000 to 10,000 BP) represents adaptations to terminal Pleistocene environments, and was dominated by small groups of relatively mobile foragers who used most sites only briefly or infrequently. Now-extinct Pleistocene “megafauna” were abundant on the Colorado Plateau at the time, and included saber-toothed “cats,” several species of horse, large-headed llama, gigantic short-faced bears, musk-ox, and of course woolly mammoths. While Paleoindian foragers have been traditionally cast as obligate big-game hunters, ethnoarchaeological evidence suggests that they relied on a wide array of resources (see Byers and Ugan 2005)—although hunting definitely played a central role.

Paleoindian archaeology is sparse in and around the Bears Ears area, but there are two notable exceptions. First, the so-called Bluff Mammoth is an alleged depiction of two Columbian mammoths located near the San Juan River just to the west of Bluff. The find has attracted no small amount of controversy, and has become a focal point of local culture because of that (Figure 3). Second, and more significantly, an extensive Paleoindian site was found on Lime Ridge to the west of Bluff. Its significance to local prehistory is multifaceted, chief among which is that its diversity of artifacts and lithic sources represented in a site with a relatively short use-life allows researchers to accurately characterize why people were there and what they were doing (Davis and Till 2014).

The Archaic era spans approximately 10,000 to 2,500 years BP, or between the end of the Paleoindian era and the appearance of agriculture, and is typically divided into Early, Middle, and Late subphases. The Early Archaic is usually characterized as a period of expanding dietary breadth, with increases of mean temperature and general aridity—and corresponding changes in vegetation and animal populations—compelling foragers to begin taking a broader view of “food.” The Middle Archaic is generally considered a time of mobility, as continued environmental changes reconfigured the spatial and temporal distribution of foodstuffs. And the Late Archaic roughly coincides with the global climate starting to approach modern conditions, compelling people throughout the Colorado Plateau to begin adopting mixed farmer-forager economies that eventually gave way to full-blown agriculture (see Matson 1991).

In the Bears Ears area, the Archaic period in toto is best represented in the Dark Canyon complex, where the site density of Archaic lithic scatters is unparalleled in the entire surrounding region. In terms of radiometric data, the best example comes from Old Man Cave, a dry shelter located northeast of Cedar Mesa where an open-twined sandal returned a radiocarbon date of about 7,400 BP. Examinations of the site revealed that it was heavily looted, but that both Basketmaker II (see below) and Archaic cultural materials were evident in the remaining deposits (Geib and Davidson 1994). The implications of this site to the broader archaeology of the Bears Ears area are vast, particularly with regard to the question of Puebloan origins.
The Formative era in the Southwest is typically subdivided into Basketmaker II (1500 BC to AD 500), Basketmaker III (AD 500–750), Pueblo I (AD 750–900), Pueblo II (AD 900–1100), Pueblo III (AD 1100–1300), and Pueblo IV or Modern Pueblo thereafter. It is during these time periods when the aforementioned “mosaic” nature of human–environment interaction comes into clearest view in the culture history of Bears Ears.

The Basketmaker II (BMII) period (so-called by Kidder because he presumed an earlier Basketmaker period must surely have succeeded the Archaic) is marked by an increasingly sedentary settlement system, the advent of more substantial domestic dwellings, and an increasing reliance on maize and squash horticulture. Although hunting and gathering continued, there was a steady shift toward seasonal sedentism until year-round settlement in loose clusters of small habitations replaced the nomadism of the Archaic period altogether. This is at least partly due to the fact that increased reliance on cultivated veggies meant that people couldn’t leave their crops unattended for too long.

Researchers recognize a number of regional Basketmaker II variants throughout the Colorado Plateau, with the Eastern (or “Durango”) and Western (or “White Dog”) traditions typifying the early Basketmaker world in the greater San Juan Basin (Lipe 1999). Studies of Eastern BMII have focused most intensely on sites in and around Durango—hence the nickname. Studies of Western BMII have largely been directed or influenced by research in the Bears Ears area, especially on and around Cedar Mesa (Matson 2014).
The Basketmaker III (BMIII) period is generally distinguished from the preceding period by the introduction of three new cultural traits: bows, beans, and ceramics—all of which imply an even more settled and sedentary way of life. In general, comparison of the ratios of known Basketmaker II and III sites throughout the Southwest indicate that a large population increase occurred during the latter period, leading researchers to characterize it as a period of “homesteading.” In the Bears Ears area, BMIII archaeology is very well represented to the east of Cedar Mesa around Montezuma Creek and Comb Wash (Hurst and Robinson 2014), and a wealth of late-Basketmaker/early-Pueblo sites also occurs in the higher-elevation drainages around Elk Ridge to the north, all of which underscores the idea that this was a period of exploring and settling new territories. Additionally, Comb Ridge’s iconic Procession Panel (Figure 4) has been interpreted as BMIII rock art depicting congregation of a large population in a central place, signaling experiments with larger and more complex community organization preceding the transition to Pueblo I (Throgmorton 2017).

The Pueblo I period was one of tremendous variability and tumultuousness throughout the Four Corners. It included many architectural and community-level changes from the preceding period, most notably the beginnings of full-scale villages. In the Bears Ears area, all of Cedar Mesa and most of the lower-elevation landforms in general saw drawdowns of occupation that in some places precipitated full-on abandonment. Meanwhile, the high-uplands area of Elk Ridge and the upper portions of nearby drainages experienced a concomitant boom during the Pueblo I period that complements the depopulation noted in the surrounding areas. Originally thought to represent temporary or seasonal refugia for low-landers, recent ecologically derived investigations by the author indicate that while a severe drought probably did propel local people uphill during the Pueblo I, they stayed there for many generations, building some of the area’s earliest village communities in the process (Burrillo 2017).

Lower-elevation Pueblo I settlements also occur on Alkali Ridge and the Dolores areas to the east, as well as Bluff and Comb Wash, suggesting a “go high, go low” strategy where some people moved into lower drainages looking for water while the rest account for the higher-uplands boom mentioned above (William D. Lipe 2017, personal communication). Interestingly, there is also a marked correlation with subsequent major population centers and twin-rock formations in the Bears Ears area (e.g., Figure 5), possibly suggesting some form of cultural remembrance for the time everyone gravitated to the Bears Ears themselves when the weather turned frightful (Burrillo 2017:131–132).
The Pueblo II period in the Four Corners is one of major demographic shifts. Around AD 890, a climatic change to cooler, drier conditions seems to have caused a shift in settlement patterns, and by the beginning of Pueblo II many people had moved out of the San Juan Drainage as a whole. During the AD 1000s, the climate shifted again to prevailingly hospitable conditions, with predictable growing seasons and reliable precipitation. Owing at least partly to this, the Pueblo II period saw the emergence of the “great house” system of community organization, best known and expressed in the Chaco Canyon area of northern New Mexico. The climatic plenitude of the mid-Pueblo II period accompanied a significant population surge in the Bears Ears area suggestive of immigration, “in this case possibly including the return of families who had moved south to Chaco and other regions during the [AD] 900s” (Hurst and Robinson 2014:34). This is supported by two lines of evidence. First, reoccupation of earlier Basketmaker sites by people associated with the Pueblo II period are common, especially on Cedar Mesa, suggesting reoccupation of the area by people who already knew it. Second, Chacoan influence is recognized throughout the Bears Ears area dating to or after the mid-Pueblo II period (e.g., Till 2017).

The bountiful rains of the early Pueblo II period meant that populations had expanded to or even past average-year carrying capacity for local environments, putting them in a precarious position should the weather turn nasty again. Thus, when a massive drought occurred in the mid-1100s (Benson and Berry 2009), the Chaco system fell apart and people came flooding back into the Bears Ears area, causing a great deal more reoccupation.

The Pueblo III period would be the final period of occupation for the Bears Ears area prior to abandonment by the AD 1270s. The locations and sizes of major settlements changed dramatically; whereas in the mid-to-late-Pueblo II period most families were living on mesa tops near the best soils for farming, by the mid-Pueblo III period they had relocated their settlements closer to reliable water sources and into canyons or cliff walls. The iconic “cliff dwellings” of Cedar Mesa and Mesa Verde alike both date to this period. Settlements often aggregated around springs, in a defensive gesture correlated with internecine tensions and warfare that popped up throughout the San Juan Drainage (Matson et al. 2015).

It’s also during the Pueblo III period that Bears Ears populations dispersed and settled the widest array of landforms, including Dark Canyon, Fable Valley, and Beef Basin—the latter of which includes such arresting examples of free-standing architecture that a portion of it is actually named Ruin Park (Figure 6). Towers also became common throughout the area, especially at the heads of canyons, and are thought by some
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Current chronometric evidence suggests that the Ute and Paiute also first appeared in the Bears Ears area sometime around 1600 (McPherson 2009:58); however, oral histories and ethnographic accounts suggest that Pueblo, Ute/Paiute, and Navajo peoples have all used the area for much longer than the archaeological record suggests.

At present, there are about 9,000 recorded archaeological sites within the monument boundary, with about 5–7% of the area having undergone intensive systematic cultural resource inventory. Given that more than 75% of modern archaeology is conducted as a component of compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) (Lekson 2009; see below), this sampling universe is inherently biased toward areas where roads, buildings, stock tanks and fences, and other improvements are most lucrative. A limited Class II sample inventory conducted by SWCA in 2016 is the first purely research-oriented survey of the landscape as a whole since the Cedar Mesa Project of the 1970s, although—thanks to the monument designation—funding now exists among fundraisers in the private sector for much more expansive investigations. Meanwhile, based solely on the per-acre results of the CMP and

researchers to be socially symbolic rather than utilitarian in nature (Van Dyke and King 2010).

For still-uncertain reasons—although undoubtedly including climate change and environmental stress—Ancestral Pueblo populations withdrew completely from the San Juan Basin by the end of the AD 1200s. This appears to have occurred on Cedar Mesa earlier than the rest of the San Juan Basin by at least a few decades, where local depopulation began to occur well before the mega-drought of the AD 1270s, casting doubt on the long-held assumption that drought alone was the prime mover in the terminal Pueblo III depopulation of the region. Meanwhile, the presence of Hopi ceramics and historic Pueblo shrines throughout the Bears Ears area indicates continued pilgrimage to the area by Pueblo peoples more or less continuously right up to the present day.

Post–1300s Native American archaeology is unfortunately still in its larval stage among Bears Ears researchers, with Winston Hurst and Jay Willian (2011) in the vanguard. The earliest tree ring-dated Navajo site in the Bears Ears area is a hogan in White Canyon that dates to the early 1600s (Spangler et al. 2010:149).

Figure 6: One of the most iconic structures located in the appropriately named Ruin Park (photo by the author)
SWCA samples, a conservative projection by Lipe (2017, personal communication) estimates a total archaeological assemblage of between 158,000 and 185,000 sites. Which is to say: we have still but scratched the surface.

During the weekend of July 22–23, 2017, a group of about 40 archaeologists and conservationists gathered together in Bluff, Utah, to share their knowledge about archaeology in Bears Ears National Monument. The monument itself and its controversial status was not the focus topic, given that both pro- and anti-monument experts were invited. Instead, the weekend was an extended workshop devoted to amassing cumulative knowledge about the area’s archaeology; what the current and future research and conservation priorities are; and how best to create a successful, integrated research community that includes the tribes, agencies, other archaeologists, and the public. The results of the meeting are formally presented in a beautiful 51-page report (Doelle 2017) accessible to the public on Archaeology Southwest’s website: https://www.archaeologysouthwest.org/pdf/Bears_Ears_Report.pdf. The meeting and consequent report emphasize the holistic nature of Bears Ears history and prehistory, where the landscape represents a rich tapestry of interrelated places and stories.

The Future of Archaeology at Bears Ears

In a characteristically piquant observation, author Vine Deloria Jr. (1969:78–82) once compared anthropologists to a plague of locusts that descended upon indigenous communities each summer, living off grant money and gathering information for articles and books that were at best unintelligible and useless—if not outright insulting—to the indigenous community members from whom they’d gleaned their data in the first place. While exaggerative in nature, the charge is essentially valid. Anthropology’s checkered history includes having begun as an instrument of imperialism designed to help understand native peoples in order to better subjugate them, and the scars of this early phase are still evident.

The biggest change to this behavioral culture phase occurred in the 1960s with the passage of National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and NHPA (especially Section 106), both of which prescribe consultation with tribes as a component of any archaeological undertaking that occurs on public land. This didn’t have an especially tumultuous impact in every region, but in the Southwest—where, in places like southeastern Utah, people identifying as Native American comprise up to 60% of the total population—it was enormous. Even bigger was the impact of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990 (NAGPRA), which, as Steve Lekson put it in his wonderful History of the Archaeological Southwest, “effectively shifted control of the past from archaeologists to Native peoples” (Lekson 2009:180).

A combined effect of these laws meant that archaeologists needed to steer their research in directions that were as inoffensive as possible with regard to the tribes, who’ve never been very keen on the type of social science that, as Navajo Senator Eric Descheenie put it in a 2015 public lecture, “dehumanizes its subjects.” Which makes quantitative archaeology a non-starter, in many people’s eyes. And again: the biggest impacts of this were felt in the Southwest, while the processual revolution continued more or less unabated in places like the nearby Great Basin. This regional disparity culminated in a conceptual no-man’s-land between Southwest and Great Basin researchers, called by Winston Hurst (2014, personal communication) the “Jennings Curtain” after Glen Canyon Project director Jesse D. Jennings.

Nonetheless, common causes often unite even better than common enemies. My own graduate program was distinctly steeped in quantitative behavioral reconstructionism, yet my colleagues and I enjoy full and friendly support from both the Bears Ears Intertribal Coalition and the local archaeological community. Nor is this atypical for the place. In a particularly moving public lecture titled “What ‘Sacred’ Means,” Hopi archaeologist and author Lyle Balquah told a crowd of over 300 attendees at Celebrate Cedar Mesa last March that Bears Ears archaeologists are to be uniquely lauded for their unfettered cultural inclusiveness vis-à-vis the local tribal communities. Balquah noted the following as shining local examples: Dr. Laurie Webster, Ben Belorado, and me. I’ve never been so flattered.

And that’s the real legacy of Bears Ears archaeology. The history of our science and its relationship with Native Americans is a tricky one, largely characterized as a steady evolution from imperialism through racism to inclusion. This last step is reflected increasingly well in the private sector on projects like the Animas-La Plata, where upwards of 60% of archaeological field work was carried out by locally hired members of Native tribes (Lipe 2017); however, with regard to convergent conservation, preservation, and research goals, there is no place that compares with Bears Ears.

Conclusion

I can think of no other place with so storied a history, so storied a prehistory, or so storied a history of the study of its prehistory. From the first forays into the area by Paleoindian foragers, to the land management battle that makes headlines to this day, the human story at Bears Ears is one fraught with splendors and drama. The latest developments in Bears Ears archaeology foretell a future where history will once again be made in terms of dissolving the ever-shrinking lacuna between Western scientific archaeologists and local indigenous communities. The current state of conservationism and resource preservation at Bears
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Ears is up in the air, and is frankly a topic best reserved for its own dedicated article. But regardless of its ultimate land management status, the trends emergent from—and contingent upon—anthropological research and researchers in the Bears Ears area are ones unlikely to change course anytime soon.

The author is indebted to Drs. William D. Lipe and R. Kelly Beck for their invaluable review and edits.
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Van Dyke, Ruth M., and Anthony G. King
A virtual desktop (VD) is a practical, user-friendly solution for dealing with data management and collaboration on archaeological projects. VDs are accessed remotely over the internet by a user. The VD runs on a computer server located on the internet, often referred to as a “cloud server.” Since this is a centralized server shared by the team, all users will see the same software and files when they connect to that server. Apart from the remote network connection, a VD differs very little from the normal local computer desktop on a personal laptop. This comfortable familiarity is one of its main advantages. A cloud server can provide individual VDs for multiple users at the same time. Each user interacts with their own VD, but the cloud server’s hard drive holds software and files shared by all. In essence, this allows a dispersed archaeological team to work together on the same computer from many locations, with each team member working within the familiar environment of an individual computer desktop.

In some cases, such as group work on text documents or spreadsheets, online tools such as Google Docs and Office365 now enable direct collaborative editing, and thus have seen quick adoption. What we lack on the Web are more complex relational or spatial data management systems that would enable us to curate and analyze the complicated datasets we use in archaeology. The underlying problem is that the Web’s architecture was not designed for complex programming, and the browser limits options and processing capabilities. Thus, for tasks such as heavy image processing, geographical information systems, and 3-D modeling, compelling browser-based solutions do not exist. Some projects have created custom software for online collaboration, but these tend to have constrained functionality, have seen limited adoption beyond their home project, and take too many resources to maintain. VDs, on the other hand, are both familiar and fully functional without custom coding; they do not require modifications to existing workflows since most teams do their work on computer desktops already, and they enable all team members to work on the same files without causing version conflicts.

The first step in building a VD infrastructure is determining where the cloud server will be hosted. A cloud server is simply a computer that exists somewhere on the internet and that accepts incoming connections from users; in this case, those connections open individual VDs (Figure 1). Many companies now rent servers “in the cloud” (i.e., on the internet), and university IT departments can often also provide cloud servers.
Although several configurations are possible, a simple initial setup might consist of a single cloud server, with a powerful processor and plenty of memory and storage space. For example, a server with a quad-core processor, 16 GB of memory, and 250 GB of storage space is a comfortable place to initiate teamwork, but every team will have different requirements. Having a dedicated graphics card can help with 3-D modeling tasks. All the major operating systems (OSs) can support VD infrastructure by running on the server. For example, Microsoft has an operating system called Windows Server (currently at version 2016) that enables multiple users to run VDs at the same time (also called remote desktops). Each user gets a VD that looks like their normal Windows desktop, where they can run their usual software. Linux has also seen significant use in this type of infrastructure, and several third-party software programs support VDs that run on any of these OSs.

The VD server can host multiple simultaneous users—up to a certain number depending on licensing—each running their own VD. A user makes a connection to a VD through a small software program (called a “client”) running on her local computer. The VD can completely fill the screen on the local computer, making it appear as if the VD is the local desktop, or it can run in its own smaller window, allowing the user to interact both with the VD and the local computer simultaneously (Figure 2). The user interacts with the VD with the mouse and keyboard of her own machine. Although any device with any OS (from Windows, Linux, or Mac laptops to Android tablets, etc.) can connect to the VD over a stable internet connection, interacting with a VD on a small smartphone screen using a finger instead of a mouse usually does not provide an ideal user experience. Since VDs run the normal software on essentially any platform, they enable programs that lack cross-platform support to run on any computer. For example, non-Windows laptops can appear to run software such as ArcMap and Microsoft Access. Furthermore, each team member will have access to whatever software the project uses, without the need to license and maintain that software on each individual laptop. This can potentially save costs with shared licenses and save time by avoiding the installation and update of software on each person’s laptop, including the maintenance of open source software.

The centralization of project data is another major advantage of VDs. The VD server has an internal hard drive for storing and working with files, and dedicated network drives can also be mapped to the VD. Once common project files and databases are uploaded to the VD server, all team members can use these just as they would use any such resources within a normal computer desktop environment. The user can open databases, photographs, and 3-D models by simply double-clicking on them, and any changes the user makes will immediately become available to the next person who opens the file. For relational and geospa-
tial databases, the software allows multiple users to work on the database at the same time. For individual files, such as photographs, file locking prevents conflicting changes. By setting file permissions, a project leader can restrict access to certain files or folders depending on a team member’s project role. Since the VD server is on an extremely fast internet connection, automatic backup from the server’s hard drive to one of the many cloud file storage systems is very efficient. The fast network speed is also an advantage for moving large files like 3-D models and videos to other servers on the internet, though this need is mostly obviated by the data centralization of the VD server. VDs make archaeological projects better data stewards by simplifying data management tasks, thus more efficiently preparing datasets for online publication in open access repositories such as Opencontext.org (https://opencontext.org/).

A less obvious benefit of using VDs involves the efficient and cost-effective utilization of resources. Currently, most teams depend on the computer processing power of each team member’s individual laptop. Yet these resources mostly sit idle (when the laptop is turned off) or are underutilized (when the user is word processing or Web browsing). Under normal circumstances across an entire team, people work at different times and conduct a variety of different tasks that require variable processing power. By sharing the VD server’s resources, the team as a whole requires fewer total resources, decreasing overall costs. For example, imagine two team members who live in time zones 10 hours apart, in California and Turkey. They both need to do intensive 3-D model processing, but they work and sleep at essentially opposite times from each other. Paying for one computer in the cloud that they can both use obviates the need for each to have an expensive laptop that they turn off at night. The two users could also share a single license for the 3-D modeling software. A VD infrastructure ultimately lessens the financial burden on each team member, since a laptop with minimal processing power but a decent screen could do powerful 3-D modeling, virtually.

Figure 2: The remote virtual desktop of the CAAM Virtual Lab running in its own window within the local laptop's desktop. An Access database is open on the virtual desktop, and a Word document is open on the local laptop’s desktop, partly obscured by the virtual desktop window. Note that each computer has its own recycle bin, since each has its own file system.
The computers that make up VD infrastructure are often located in a large data center, which can hold many servers used by many people. The availability of additional hardware provides a team with multiple options for scaling processing power up and down. Most companies charge only for the machine resources used, often by the hour or even by the minute. More powerful hardware, such as advanced graphics cards, will have a higher price tag, but can be used selectively only when needed, and will often cut down on the amount of time required to work on a model. With some attention, over time a project will likely see cost savings even with increasing processing power requirements.

There are a few considerations worth addressing regarding the use of VDs in archaeology. First, while the incremental nature of moving to VDs is an advantage due to ease of adoption, this also presents a challenge for explaining the technology. Terms such as “desktop,” “server,” and “virtual” already hold certain meanings in people’s minds. Even the technical community lacks consensus for how to name this technology, and related terms include desktop virtualization, remote desktops, virtual machines, terminal services, and even “hypervisor.” From the user’s perspective, the only critical aspect is having a familiar desktop experience with centralized files and data.

Another factor to consider is the subscription model of VDs, since the renting of computer power and storage space results in an ongoing cost, often billed monthly. Here we face a disconnect from legacy budget workflows, where computer hardware has traditionally been purchased upfront with a one-time large outlay of funds. As mentioned above, cloud computing ultimately enables more efficient sharing of resources, thus likely decreasing relative costs over the long term. This is becoming increasingly important as archaeologists in general significantly scale up their computing needs with the advent of ubiquitous 3-D recording on field projects.

A final consideration is the internet connection between each user’s laptop and the VD server. Connection speeds vary significantly based on internet provider and location. Slowly but surely, speeds are increasing everywhere, but some locations still present a challenge. Rural excavations are often disadvantaged in terms of available local infrastructure. One field solution is for a team to establish a VD server within their local network, and to upload data to a cloud server at the end of each season. Such a network can be run with as little as one inexpensive Wi-Fi router, though larger spaces will require multiple routers. Ultimately, the best approach for dealing with connection quality is consumer education—the more each of us understands connection speed, the more we can communicate our requirements to the companies that provide internet services. To determine connection speed, do an internet search for “speed test” and then run the test at the first link. The speed will usually be reported in Megabits per second (Mbps), where 1 byte contains 8 bits. If you consider that a typical digital photograph is 10 Megabytes (MB) in size, you could calculate that at a speed of 8 Mbps, that file could be downloaded in 10 seconds. The speed at which most internet connections download and upload files is often different, referred to as asynchronous, with upload speeds usually much slower. In order to comfortably use a VD, a download speed over roughly 10 Mbps and an upload speed of over 2 Mbps is preferable, and most modern broadband and mobile connections are higher than this. Note that to transfer large digital files from the field to the VD, an even faster upload speed is preferable to cut down on the time that one needs to wait to use those uploaded files on the server.

VDs are not a new technology; some archaeological projects have been using them for over a decade. However, demand and supply of cloud servers has increased significantly over the past few years across most professional fields, enabling many new options. This past academic year, the Center for the Analysis of Archaeological Materials (CAAM) at the Penn Museum of the University of Pennsylvania (UPenn) taught two classes that exclusively used VDs for classwork. Over the summer, these resources were consolidated into a Virtual Lab (VL), to parallel CAAM’s physical lab spaces. The VL is a VD server accessible by the archaeology students and researchers of UPenn. This past summer, several PhD students used the VL from their fieldwork projects around the Mediterranean and Central Asia to perform digital tasks, including the creation of 3-D models with photogrammetry software.

Although setting up rented VD infrastructure can take only a few hours, there is a learning curve to getting started. Steps include using an online company’s website to select the type and size of server you want, and setting up user accounts on the server. If you are interested in trying VDs for your archaeological project, you might start with Amazon Web Service’s free tier, which provides a year of free access to a small server. This is just one of many private vendors that rent cloud servers. The free tier server allows two simultaneous users, and is sufficient for working with files, images, and databases. Some GIS and 3-D modeling work is possible, though not necessarily comfortable. To get started, please visit the following online introductory tutorial for VDs in archaeology: http://repository.upenn.edu/penn_museum_papers/53
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W hen we speak and write to the public about archaeology, it's mostly about the archaeology—the science of it, the study of the past. We tell people what we do, what we find, what we know, and how we know it. We speak broadly about how we employ a variety of methodological and theoretical approaches to understand the past, and we convey to them this understanding—what that artifact is, when a site was occupied, how people lived there, the origins of agriculture, writing, and cities, the rise and fall of civilizations, the value of historic preservation, effective excavation and mitigation strategies, etc. Conversations about our own specific research sound similar. Lately I've been saying something like this: “I’m working with a colleague on a large, stratified site on the east coast of the island of Newfoundland that was occupied by a variety of different peoples over the last six thousand years. Our research focuses on the earliest occupation of the site by a people we call the Maritime Archaic. We are trying to understand where these people came from and when they first settled the island, the nature of their occupation, the environment at the time they lived there, and why they eventually abandoned the site, and indeed, the entire island.”

What we generally don't share is the joy that comes from a career spent working outside, in often stunning locations, with colleagues that become family—how archaeology is more than the study of the past. It is also a life lived well, in the company of people we love.

I spend my summers camping (like a kid!) in a dark forest of dead and twisted trees framed by jagged cliffs and a metallic-blue sea. Whales are so common where we work that we take them for granted; we scarcely look up from our trenches when they surface during the day and are mildly annoyed when they wake us at night. Bald eagles, osprey, and seabirds of all sorts shriek overhead. There are moose, caribou, beaver, fox, ptarmigan, and—luckily, so far—only bear shit to be found in the woods. At night we sit around the fire, watch the stars unfold, and tell stories. I also get to dig in the dirt (like a kid!) for old stuff with friends.

Some of my archaeology friends I’ve known nearly as long as my wife. The span of many more friendships exceed the age of my children. These are people who have fed and housed me (in one place I even have my “own” room and key), shuttled me to and from the airport in the small hours, driven me to the field, and tolerated their houses being crowded with dirty gear and dirty people. When I think about it, I probably have more good friends who work or live in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador than I do in any other one place on earth. And so when I visit, or go to a conference where we’re all together, it’s like a family reunion: we hug and drink beers, retell old stories, and update each other on our careers and (other) families.

***

On May 23rd—less than a month before I was to go into the field—my 16-year-old daughter, Jordan, was killed in a car accident. It was the first day of summer vacation. Jordan died at a nameless intersection in rural Illinois with a driver’s license in her purse that was only a few weeks old, in a new used car that had been her’s for less than that. She didn’t even get to finish a tank of gas in her new car, or experience a fender bender (like a kid!).

I returned home from the hospital, heartbroken, and initiated the sorriest of all phone trees. One of my first calls was to a colleague with whom I work in Newfoundland. Word spread from there. In the dark days that followed, my extended archaeology family (old grad student friends, former professors, colleagues, students) sent messages of sympathy and flowers for the funeral, and donated thousands of dollars to scholarships and charitable organizations in my daughter’s name. I even had an offer to help fly my youngest daughter and wife to Newfoundland in the event I was still going to the field. Was I?

In the immediate hours after my daughter’s death some close friends stopped by our house to comfort us. Others stayed away, probably to give us space and privacy to grieve, but I preferred the company. At the same time, our community and friends ral-
lied to ensure that we didn't have to cook, or shop, or really do anything. Several neighbors (and a lawn care company) approached me with kind offers to mow my lawn. I turned them down. I looked forward to spending a couple of hours doing something simultaneously thoughtless and constructive. In short, I wanted to be around friends, and I wanted to be busy. Fieldwork promised both; I imagined a summer spent far from my daughter's grave, in the peace and solitude of the wilderness, surrounded by friends, and distracted by digging, measuring, screening, and documenting. So I decided to go. My wife, who once saw me off to the field just a day after our honeymoon, understood. She and my youngest daughter would stay home and plan their own summer of friends and distractions.

In retrospect, the experience was mixed. I very much enjoyed the company and comfort of my Newfoundland friends and family. We hugged and drank beers, retold old stories, and updated each other on our careers and (other) families. I also got to dig in the dirt for old stuff with friends in one of the truly spectacular places on the planet. On the other hand, the solitude of the field delivered in a way that I had not expected. I guess I had underestimated just how many long quiet hours there were in a day in the wilderness. In those broad open spaces, it was easy for my mind to wander to a sad place. The escapism I looked forward to wasn't all that healthy either. In Newfoundland I didn't have to walk by my daughter's empty room with her crumpled backpack on the floor or help my wife design her headstone. This made my homecoming—a sharp reminder of what had happened—unexpectedly difficult. But maybe staying home wouldn't have been any easier. Honestly, I don't know which would have been better and I haven't given it much thought. If I've learned anything from this brutal tragedy, it's that pondering "what ifs" is a worthless thought exercise.

***

This summer we brought some ready-mix cement to the field and used it to establish a local datum point on the site. It is tied to our master datum, an iron stake hammered into a cluster of rocks overlooking the beautiful cove where we have worked for the last 10 years. Our master datum is ground zero for the science that takes place at the site. It provides a universal point of provenience for everything we find. It helps us understand the past. But the master datum point is also located at the heart of our campsite; the rocks on which it is situated are where we spy for whales and crabs, build our nightly fire, sit and chat, and go to be alone (Figure 1).

As the field-season was winding down, my longtime collaborator and friend noticed that we still had a little bit of cement mix left over and decided to use it to shore up our master datum. As the wet cement set, I collected pebbles from the beach to spell out my daughter's initials in it, while he, inexplicably, started knapping the base of a broken whiskey bottle. Minutes later my brother handed me a glass heart (Figure 2).
The object in question (Figure 1) comes from the archives of the University of Colorado Museum of Natural History: a black-and-white 35mm slide taken in 1954 in Silver City, New Mexico, showing a pen-and-ink drawing of an eleventh-century Mimbres-style bowl, itself black-on-white. The photographer was Prof. Hugo Rodeck, then director of the University of Colorado Museum of Natural History. The drawing itself was the work of “Red” Ellison, a noted Silver City archaeologist—but not an academic.

Ellison drew the interior of a Mimbres bowl with black “framing lines” high inside the rim, typical for the type. The feature of interest was the figure at the center of the bowl, a jackrabbit with pronghorn antlers. In a word: Jackalope. Jackalopes are modern mythical creatures of the western United States; antlers are taxidermied onto jackrabbit heads, and sold in tourist shops from Montana to New Mexico. What is a jackalope doing on an eleventh-century Mimbres pot, and how did a slide of a drawing of that pot end up in the archives of the University of Colorado Museum?

Who Were the Mimbres?
The Native American Mimbres culture flourished in southwestern New Mexico from about 950 to 1150 CE (for a recent summary, see Nelson and Hegmon 2010). They occupied small “pueblo” villages along the Gila River, the Mimbres River, the Rio Grande, and the tributaries of those major streams.

Among their several achievements, the Mimbres developed an artistic style that is perhaps the most famous of all ancient Native American arts. Painted with outstanding skill in black pigments on the white-slipped interiors of hemispherical bowls, Mimbres artists depicted a remarkable range of plants, fish, reptiles, birds, mammals, people, scenes, and supernatural entities. Both jackrabbits and antelopes were common motifs, and were accurately depicted.

Most major art museums have at least a few Mimbres pots; some have hundreds. The best pots, at auction today, bring tens of thousands of dollars. Their commercial value doomed Mimbres archaeological sites: looting on industrial scales—mechanized, systematic—destroyed almost all but a few of the original two dozen major Mimbres villages, particularly after the early 1970s when prices for “tribal art” increased dramatically.

Mimbres art is far beyond the scope of this essay (see Brody 2005; Brody and Swentzell 1996; LeBlanc 2004). It is important to note, however, that chimeras—mythical combination-beasts—were a minor but common theme in Mimbres art. Rabbit-snake, quadruped fish, human-coyote: these are but a few of the chimeras on Mimbres pottery. A jackrabbit-antelope, while apparently unique to the object in question, is extraordinary but certainly not impossible.

In 1954, Professor Hugo Rodeck took a picture of a Mimbres chimera: a jackrabbit-antelope. But not on a Mimbres pot; rather, Rodeck took a picture of a drawing of a pot by archaeologist “Red” Ellison.
Who Was Hugo Rodeck?

Hugo Rodeck (1902–2004; Figure 2), who trained at the University of Colorado as an entomologist, was director of the University of Colorado Museum of Natural History from 1939 to 1971. In 1926, the museum sponsored the excavation of Mimbres sites by famed archaeologist Earl H. Morris (1889–1956); two hundred Mimbres pots were added to the collections at this time. The images of plants, animals, and people on these pots fascinated Rodeck.

On an extended sabbatical in 1952–1953 (and sporadically thereafter up to 1974), Rodeck visited and photographed over 2,000 Mimbres figurative pots at a dozen museums and—in many private collections. Today, that would be difficult; since looting supplies the demands of the antiquities market, archaeologists are critical of private collectors, and collectors, consequently, are wary of archaeologists. In the 1950s, however, those frictions were far in the future. And Rodeck, after all, was not an archaeologist, he was an entomologist. Rodeck was a Mimbres enthusiast, much like collectors, but was not himself a collector, beyond his museum’s holdings. The author can attest that Hugo Rodeck, even in old age, was charismatic; in his prime, he was a formidable figure. Rodeck was able to view many private collections that today are closed to professional archaeologists (these images have been added to the Mimbres online archive, MimPIDD, on tDAR). Among the famous private collections that Rodeck studied was that of “Red” Ellison of Silver City, New Mexico, in the heart of the Mimbres region.

Who Was Red Ellison?

Richard “Red” Ellison (1910–1992; Figure 3) was a civil engineer for the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway, and later for the Chino copper mines near Silver City. Like Rodeck, Ellison was fascinated by the ancient Mimbres and, with his wife Virginia, he excavated many Mimbres sites, accumulating a large private collection. The couple also owned Kwilleylekia, a major Salado (fourteenth century, post-Mimbres) site near Cliff, New Mexico. For a modest entrance fee, visitors could watch Red excavate the pueblo and visit his on-site museum. The sign at the gate advertised “Living Museum” and “All Tile Restrooms”; Kwilleylekia was on American Automobile Association maps of that time.

Ellison was not fond of academic archaeologists. He had worked with self-made archaeologist Harold Gladwin (the details of that connection are not clear). Gladwin, a major player in early Southwestern studies, regularly tilted with professors—his dismissive phrase for PhDs was “Phuddy-Duddy.” Red apparently felt much the same. From personal knowledge, the author can attest that in the early 1970s, Ellison was highly suspicious of professors. It was remarkable that Ellison allowed Prof. Hugo Rodeck to examine and photograph his collection in several visits from 1952 to 1960, in Silver City and in El Paso, Texas.

Figure 2. Hugo Rodeck, director of the University of Colorado Museum of Natural History, studying insects. (Courtesy University of Colorado Museum of Natural History.)

Figure 3. Red Ellison (left) and the author (right) in 1971. (Courtesy of the author.)
A Mimbres Jackalope?

Authenticity of the Jackalope

We have only a photo (35mm slide) by Hugo Rodeck of an ink drawing by Red Ellison; that is, our evidence is two removes from the pot itself. It appears that Ellison had once possessed the pot, but no longer had it in his collection. (Rodeck kept notes recording each pot’s dimensions and provenance; unfortunately, the notes from the relevant session with Ellison’s collections have not survived.) On the slide itself, Rodeck noted “Ellison del.”—“del.” being a biological notation for an image of an organism drawn or delineated by the original observer. Rodeck accepted Ellison’s jackalope as real.

But recall that Red Ellison did not much like professors. And, from the author’s personal knowledge, Ellison had a rather sharp sense of humor. It’s possible that Red’s jackalope was a prank. It would be nice to think that Red is yanking our chains from beyond the grave.

Context suggests otherwise. Ellison apparently respected Rodeck sufficiently to allow him to study his private collections; the author is not aware of any archaeologists afforded this access (including the author). Moreover, the drawing in question is one of a total of 39 Ellison drawings photographed by Rodeck, in addition to photographs of scores of actual pots in Ellison’s collection. All 39 drawings are very similar in execution: crisp and detailed, with excellent draftsmanship (as might be expected from a civil engineer). The jackalope image is one of 18 drawings of pots no longer in Ellison’s possession at the time of Rodeck’s visits. The other 17 images in that series are in no way extraordinary in content: insects, birds, mammals, and other themes typical for Mimbres art. The remaining 21 drawings photographed by Rodeck were images drawn by Ellison of pots which were, at that time, still in Ellison’s collection. Rodeck took photos (slides) of the actual pots and of Ellison’s drawings of those pots. Comparing the 21 drawings to the 21 slides of the actual pots demonstrates the accuracy of Ellison’s delineations: Not precise, of course, but very close. The contextual evidence favors both the accuracy of Ellison’s drawing, and the reality of the Mimbres jackalope pot.

Unnatural History of Jackalopes

The image in question (Figure 1) is clearly a jackrabbit: dark tail, tall dark-tipped ears. (Properly, the jackrabbit is not a rabbit, but a hare.) The other obvious Leporid candidate, the cottontail rabbit, has a small white tail and shorter ears. The horns in the image are antelope: a single shaft with a prominent hook or prong. (Properly, the American antelope is not an antelope, but a pronghorn). Modern manufactured jackalopes use deer antlers, easier to procure and work than the pronghorns’ horn sheaths, but the archetypal jackalope had and retains horns. Jackalope, not jackadear.

The folk history of the American jackalope (fittingly dubbed Lepus temperamentalus) is far beyond the scope of this essay. The origins of the jackalope conventionally are traced to Douglas, Wyoming, in the 1930s (City of Douglas, Wyoming 2017). Douglas celebrates an annual “Jackalope Day,” and the author is not aware of rival claimants. While endemic to the northern Plains states, the jackalope’s range quickly expanded to curio shops throughout the US West and Southwest.

It should be noted that Shope papilloma virus can infect rabbits and hares, causing horn-like growths, usually on the head and back. While the Douglas, Wyoming, origin of the modern jackalope should not be doubted, it is possible that Mimbres artists saw a hare infected with this virus. On the other hand, no disease explains other Mimbres chimerae. They are creatures of myth or ideology, and it seems likely that the Mimbres jackalope was too.

The Mimbres jackalope—if real—does not challenge Douglas, Wyoming’s primacy in the evolution of the modern mythical beast. It does, however, establish a deeper history for this fabulous creature on the American continent. Much as the modern horse originated in the New World, vanished, and was later reintroduced from the Old World, the Wyoming jackalope reintroduces ideas that are thousands of years old back into the knickknack shops of southwestern New Mexico, the homelands of the ancient Mimbres people.
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What would a future without archaeology look like? How do we work to ensure that archaeology remains vibrant and relevant, especially considering today’s changing political and economic landscape?

Archaeology in the United States is robust but is highly dependent on governmental funding and regulations, all of which can change. Budget cuts are likely, and we may be competing with other needs for limited research funds. There are political threats to the Antiquities Act of 1906, the first legislation that established federal government interest in archaeology in the United States, as well as other regulations. Therefore, we need strong voices, arguments, and examples from individuals and organizations about the value of understanding the past to help ensure archaeology’s and the planet’s future.

Archaeological information has always been relevant to issues facing human societies and communities. We are encouraged that archaeology has a growing body of research with explicit value for contemporary problems under the rubric of public archaeology, public interest archaeology, contemporary archaeology, and other such labels. A list of these archaeological publications and organizational initiatives number in the hundreds. While more research is needed, archaeologists also need to better present the value of our work beyond our own profession.

To help meet these challenges, the Amerind Foundation hosted a two-day workshop in May 2017 to draft an action plan. Most participants were leaders of core archaeological associations and related organizations, and we hope to increase collaboration among these groups.

We discussed two major topics—the values/relevancies of archaeology, and constituencies/audiences/stakeholders—and identified some possible actions. What we offer here is a general framework with the purpose of stimulating further thinking, discussion, and action among archaeologists. We recognize that the specific contexts and settings influence how or whether people value archaeology; as a result, salient points need to be tailored to the specific circumstances. Furthermore, we focused on archaeology in the United States, but the issues raised are hardly limited to one country.

Values and Relevancies of Archaeology
Archaeologists need to work to increase the relevance of our field and to make clear to our many audiences and constituencies that archaeology is indeed applicable to a wide range of interests in today’s world and to a host of issues facing people wherever they live. Messaging about why archaeology matters could highlight some of the following points.

Archaeologists believe that archaeology is clearly relevant to descendant communities, and we should continue to collaborate with those communities to ensure that archaeology is of value to them. Archaeology can help communities better understand...
stand their shared heritages; it also can bring indigenous peoples' stories to light, show how closely they are connected to local landscapes, and make clear their links to specific sites or artifacts. Numerous studies of Ancestral Pueblo archaeological sites throughout the US Southwest—some by Native American archaeologists—constitute just one of many examples. Furthermore, archaeology can be intentionally used to chip away at unconscious bias by encouraging an appreciation of cultural diversity and challenging assumptions about a variety of cultural behaviors.

Archaeological findings also can be relevant to political entities (states, cities, etc.) and feed local or nationalistic pride, as is the case in Mexico. Nevertheless, as history has shown, intentionally misconstrued use of archaeological results can also have very dangerous results—Nazi Germany being just one awful example—making professional archaeological voices in the public sphere of even greater importance.

Archaeology can provide corrections, reveal complexities, and yield material evidence unavailable in the written historical record, as well as fill key gaps in that record. Many examples exist of these contributions, such as the research on the slave quarters at Monticello, the African burial ground in lower Manhattan, and sites associated with Colorado's coalfield wars.

Archaeology has developed and applied many methods, techniques, and approaches that are being utilized in a wide variety of non-archaeological endeavors (forensics [as can be seen in CSI, for example] and evidence gathering for war crimes investigations, modern garbage and landfill studies, homeless encampment studies, and transient immigrant camp studies, among many examples).

Archaeology offers an important tool for lifelong learning. It engages K-12 students through a sense of wonder that helps stimulate student interest in science learning. For older students and adult learners, it offers a multidisciplinary, problem-based approach at the intersection of science and the humanities; it also can stimulate interest in field and laboratory sciences. The Society for American Archaeology, among many other groups, has an active outreach effort aimed at pre-college students.

Archaeological sites play a significant role in heritage tourism around the globe and thus are a strong worldwide economic driver for towns, cities, regions, and countries. One can name hundreds of examples in this regard, such as Chichen Itza in Mexico, Lascaux Cave in France, Angkor Wat in Cambodia, Mesa Verde in Colorado, and Jamestown in Virginia. For example, in the United States, the value of heritage tourism is worth billions of dollars.

Additionally, archaeological findings can give decision-makers, planners, and the public a significant deep-time perspective on key issues, such as the success or failure of varying adaptations to changing environments and to economic and demographic trends. Archaeology thus offers historical perspectives on a variety of current problems, particularly the sustainability of the growing urban populations across the globe with changing climate regimes. Surely, the thousands of ancient cultures that have lived on the earth over many millennia developed solutions that could well be useful in the future.

Constituencies/Audiences/Stakeholders

While there are many groups with interest and stake in archaeology, we grouped these into the following major categories.

Policy Makers and Implementers

These groups are those that directly affect the legal, administrative, and bureaucratic context of our work. Given recent political changes, archaeological organizations have intensified coordinated advocacy. Outreach and advocacy must happen at all levels: municipal, county, state, regional, and federal. We prioritized five actions:

1. Strive for greater coordination among archaeological organizations. Core archaeological organizations have increased cooperation. This should be formalized through institutionalized and ongoing communication. The Coalition for American Heritage represents such an effort, and we encourage organizations to remain engaged in collaborative projects.

2. Reach out to non-archaeological organizations. Archaeology has much to offer other disciplines and vice versa. Archaeologists could organize sessions at their meetings and invite other disciplines for sessions on cross-disciplinary topics that would be of value to all the participants.

3. Intensify contacts with historic preservation. State Historic Preservation Offices, Tribal Historic Preservation Offices, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and other organizations are essential connectors between archaeology and historic preservation efforts, as well as between archaeology and important decision-makers. Archaeologists could work with such partners to ensure that archaeological sites are included in lists of threatened resources or to develop new annual lists of the most threatened archaeological resources to publicize at-risk heritage locations.

4. Emphasize and publicize efficient and effective practices. National and international archaeological organizations should provide more ways of distributing information about best practices for advocacy and outreach.
5. Offer greater recognition for implementers. The archaeological community needs to forge long-term relationships with those implementing policy. This needs to occur at a variety of levels.

Business

Businesses are critical to archaeology, but not just as the primary clients for cultural resource management. Equally important, they are often core organizations in political processes and recognize the importance of cultural heritage for strengthening civic engagement and pride. We suggest five priorities:

1. Emphasize efficient practices. Businesses want results, predictability, and efficient processes. Too often archaeology is viewed as an impediment to development rather than as an opportunity. Archaeologists working throughout North America, however, have proven that efficient and effective collaboration with businesses is possible. Organizations, such as the American Cultural Resource Association and others, should further disseminate the best practices and examples of successful collaboration.

2. Highlight the value of corporate citizenship. Most businesses recognize that it is in their interest to be good citizens through support of communities. We think archaeologists could take better advantage of corporate citizenship. Archaeologists should seek out business opportunities and recognize those businesses that support cultural heritage efforts.

3. Communicate more with trade associations. Contacts with trade associations are efficient ways to communicate with whole segments of businesses. Archaeological organizations should consider appointing liaisons with these groups.

4. Highlight benefits of local preservation ordinances. Vibrant communities are good for businesses. A sense of appreciation of cultural heritage helps build strong communities, and archaeology’s role in this needs to be highlighted. Making presentations at various meetings, such as at local chambers of commerce, and offering tours of successful preservation efforts for select groups may help build support for archaeology.

5. Emphasize best practices for heritage tourism. For many places, heritage tourism is an important economic driver. There are specific communities that recognize this, such as St. Augustine, Florida, and Santa Fe, New Mexico. Heritage tourism is valuable far more widely, however; in fact, it is hard to think of a community without interesting archaeology.

Educators/Students

Archaeologists and archaeological organizations have long recognized the importance of educating the next generation from K–12 through university. We can do more by highlighting the relevancy of archaeology in curricula and developing project-based archaeological curricula that fully integrate discussions of the ethics of practice and research; encouraging and promoting support for more involvement by archaeologists in schools; providing more training on writing for nonacademic audiences; focusing especially on middle school students as target audiences, as this age group appears to be uniquely open to science and thus to archaeology; and encouraging the formation of school clubs.

Practitioners

This group includes a diverse range of professionals who have at least peripheral relationships to archaeology. Archaeologists have emphasized outreach to students and various communities. We have been less successful at reaching out to practitioners, such as scientists in other disciplines. We discussed the following possible relationships:

1. Link natural and human systems through a landscape perspective in order to facilitate outreach to and interaction with other disciplines. As we have long recognized, humans have been an integral part of the web of life. Other disciplines, such as conservation biology, have come to appreciate that an understanding of ecology requires an understanding of human history in its full complexity. The same can be said for economics, sociology, and engineering, among many others. We can, for example, invite scholars from other disciplines to special sessions at our meetings and work to have archaeological sessions at meetings of interested disciplines.

2. Reach out to the legal profession about the value of heritage preservation and education. Archaeologists should work to cultivate relationships with individual lawyers and with legal associations. Offering field trips showcasing archaeology is one such approach.

3. Publish in cross-disciplinary journals. The majority of archaeological research is published in discipline-specific journals that are read primarily by archaeologists. Cross-disciplinary journals, such as Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, Science, and Nature, are read by scholars from many disciplines and receive wide public exposure, as well.

Communities

Archaeology can be of great value to communities. Most recent discussions about community collaboration have focused on Native American nations, given the special nature of peoples who as sovereign nations have long relationships with their landscapes. It is hard, however, to think of a community that would not be enriched by archaeological research, including
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ethnic groups, as well as economic classes, regional and local populations, and industrial communities. We discussed the following initiatives:

1. Sensitize archaeologists to local contexts, sensibilities, biases, and concerns. To be effective in communicating and collaborating with communities requires sensitivity to the concerns of these communities. Anti-bias/anti-racism training at professional meetings is one step toward reducing problems. Also critical to effective collaboration are the identification of appropriate community contacts and efforts to ensure that collaboration is not just one-way communication. Again, archaeologists need to continue to disseminate best practices in community engagement and provide awards for those doing exemplary work in this area.

2. Collaborate with all generations, especially youth. Some of the most effective community outreach programs involve youth, and we encourage more such efforts; however, we should not forget older generations and should offer help with lifelong learning programs.

3. Encourage collectors to work in positive ways. There are thousands of artifact collectors and metal detector enthusiasts. Many, if not most, have deep interests in archaeology. Archaeologists need to continue to cultivate relationships with these types of collectors. Such efforts have the potential to benefit the archaeological record through gathering new distributional information and potentially reducing sales of artifacts. To do this, archaeologists need to increase support of avocational groups.

4. Support strengthening of import/export controls for illegal antiquities. Human heritage is worldwide, and the United States is a major market for illegal antiquities. While there has been progress in this direction, governments around the globe should be encouraged to implement stronger controls on the export and importation of illegal antiquities.

5. Increase outreach to recent immigrants. The United States is and will continue to be a land of immigrants. Archaeological outreach to recent immigrant communities can help them to gain a sense of place and history for their new homes. Conversely, we can see our work through the fresh perspective of these immigrants.

Funders

Archaeological research and related activities cost money. Although federal funding supports a good deal of archaeology in the United States through agency compliance with federal historic preservation laws, direct federal funding through the National Science Foundation (NSF) and the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) only supports a small fraction of archaeological research. Archaeologists should proactively seek new funding sources. Archaeologists are largely unaware of the thousands of local foundations throughout the United States. While their grants tend to be small, they may be useful for small archaeological projects. Archaeologists also might increase their collaboration with relevant industries and organizations, as the latter can help underwrite archaeological research.

Military

The military is important for several reasons. First, the military controls a vast amount of land throughout the United States, and many of these locations have significant prehistoric and historical cultural resources. Second, archaeological remains in overseas conflict zones face immediate threats as, unfortunately, we have seen recently in Iraq and Syria. Third, the US military are often the first responders on the ground in cases of environmental and natural disasters in many parts of the world. Archaeological organizations can help raise the profile of heritage protection in both conflict zones and disaster relief situations. We can publicize programs like the Veterans Curation Program, forensic programs, and work by the Defense POW/MIA Accounting Agency whose archaeologists recover and identify POW/MIA remains.

Media

Getting the word out about archaeology and its roles in a wide variety of contexts requires strategic media exposure. We offer the following suggestions to continue to amplify the work that archaeologists are already doing:

1. Treat media professionals as an audience. They are not just an information conduit; they are themselves an audience. Therefore, we need to understand the various types of media, and speak to different media professionals in a way that works. It would be helpful to offer workshops on writing for and speaking to media at professional meetings or other settings.

2. Foster stronger contacts and develop relationships with journalists. As anthropologists, we know how important social relationships are, so we need to cultivate relationships with journalists in the same ways we build relationships with other groups and individuals.

3. Improve social media strategies. Archaeology could do much more in using the power of social media to its advantage.

4. Identify archaeologists with expertise in various areas of archaeology and the ability to convey that knowledge in media-appropriate ways.
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Summary
While we have offered a framework for more effective outreach and advocacy, we recognize that there are so many more actions we can take to ensure that archaeology has a viable and important future. In the broadest sense, we see five overarching and priority approaches:

1. Help archaeologists understand that outreach and advocacy are essential not only for archaeology’s future but also for helping to meet many of the problems of the modern world.

2. Disseminate “best practices” more widely and consistently. The Society for American Archaeology, as an example, already has three outlets for doing so: The SAA Archaeological Record, Advances in Archaeological Practice, and its webpage. The Society for Historical Archaeology, as another example, hosts a community-based best practices page in its Abandoned Burial Grounds website: https://sha.org/resources/abandoned-burial-grounds/.

3. Greatly increase the social media presence for archaeology.

4. Coordinate ongoing outreach and advocacy collaborations within and among archaeological organizations and associations more effectively. This will require identifying and recruiting formal liaisons within these organizations.

5. Give greater recognition—via awards, for example—for outstanding advocacy and outreach efforts.

If archaeology were not to rise to the current challenge of explaining its value and if it were to lose much of its support and funding, what might our world look like in the future? We could lose an important economic generator, as heritage tourism declined. In addition, the contributions to history that many groups of people worldwide have made would remain underappreciated or ignored. We also might see irreversible destruction of our global heritage and the consequent loss of information that could have immense value for the modern world. Such destruction of information about how thousands of generations of our ancestors coped with the challenges of their times, including climate change, would be a painful blow to efforts to find a sustainable way of life for the increasing population of the earth.
Chinati Mountain, Novak-Benke, Spirit Eye—the multiple names for a single prehistorically occupied cave, each representing different chapters of a connected story. Chinati Mountain was the name given to the cave by nonlocal artifact collectors who exhumed a mummified male individual, went back to town, misidentified their location, and perpetuated a mummy myth that persists to this day. Ken Novak and Adrian Benke are two individuals who became associated in local history with the discovery of the burial of a Native American woman in the cave. Each man had different intentions: Novak sought the help of professionals, while Benke stole the remains and sold them on the black market. Spirit Eye is the name used among professionals aware of the obvious scars left by years of looting but unwilling to use a site name that pays homage to an antiquity trafficker. The cave near, the US–Mexico border, has a sordid history and presents challenges not encountered in non-looted sites. Over the course of my initial research at this site, I have found few instances where researchers are explicit in the decisions that led them to work at or abandon a site because of its looted history. This short article presents the process from my initial site visit to current fieldwork at Spirit Eye and presents many of the issues I have, and continue to grapple with, concerning working in a looted cave (Figure 1).

The History

In many regards, the history of Spirit Eye is as complex as the archaeological deposits it contains. Artifact collectors from Texas north toward Colorado knew of the rich prehistoric deposits inside the cave, and there is no doubt that many of these individuals dug in it over multiple decades. I can account for some of the looting episodes; some I cannot and, while the exact history of collecting will in all likelihood remain murky, the intensity of it and the destruction caused by their exploits are very clear. Multiple mounds of screened cave fill, some almost three meters tall, cover both the interior and exterior portions of the cave. The interior resembles a mineshaft from decades of intense excavation, and large discarded piles of artifacts are located near every screen pile. The numerous persons who mined Spirit Eye were all after the same thing: the unique perishable artifacts missing from open-air sites—and they were very successful.

There are several periods of extensive looting at the site with records, but two of them are well documented. The first was in the early 1960s; a group of five friends—led by Skippy and Big John—excavated and screened a large portion of the cave. Their typed notes list the numerous perishable artifacts they recovered, how and where they excavated, and detail their exhumation of a mummified male individual. This individual and the artifacts were put on display in a small museum, and as the years went by, the site and individual were disassociated and both slipped into local lore. In the early 1990s, after years of complaints, the then-State Archeologist of Texas, Robert Mallof, was successful in having the display taken down (I will return to this issue later).

The most well-documented campaign of excavation in the cave began in the mid-1960s and ended in 1969 when Ken Novak disinterred a mummified female. Following this discovery, the collector reached out to numerous professionals but, because of the remoteness and timing (during the holidays), was aided only by an amateur group—the El Paso Archaeological Society (EPAS). EPAS visited the site in 1968, assigned a trinominal, took photographs of the Novak artifact collection, and excavated a single test unit in the cave (Figure 2). In the correspondence before and after EPAS involvement, there is no information on what became of the mummified female during the 1960s and 1970s. In 1988, after 20 years, she appeared in an ad in the back of a shotgun magazine, and was shipped by an Adrian Benke to a buyer in California. The buyer trafficked in antiquities and exotic wildlife, and a sting operation for the latter led by the California Fish and Wildlife Department in the late 1990s returned the prehistoric woman to Texas and closed a chapter in the saga.

In August of 2017, I sat down with Ken Novak, who cleared up the matter of the Native American woman from Spirit Eye.

Novak, a local barber in the small town of Alpine, Texas, adorned his business with artifacts that customers had given...
him for his services, along with others he had found on ranches in the area. One of his clients told him of a cave with artifacts they could dig if they paid the landowner a couple of dollars. It was during the course of those digs that they uncovered the burial, and agreed they could not keep it. Novak wanted the remains to go to a museum, and his client knew of a student (Adrian Benke) from the local college who was from San Antonio and could bring the remains to the Witte Museum there. It was with this understanding that Novak gave the remains and associated artifacts to Benke, who, as we now know, kept and later sold them to the buyer in California.

Other less-documented excavations took place at the site. Pictures of a group from Colorado digging in the Texas cave were seized as federal agents built a case against them for looting on federal land elsewhere. Fingers have been pointed at other known collectors across Texas, but these claims are hard to substantiate. Pulling together the history of the site is defeating; its importance seems to diminish with each verifiable round of digging by amateurs. But this situation is not unique to Spirit Eye. As a note from Spirit Eye collectors says, “Upon leaving the cave for camp we could see other caves in the cliffs, which we will at a later date explore.” The remoteness of the West Texas landscape, with its huge tracts of private land, coupled with the high frequency and visibility of sheltered sites, creates a situation where collectors have affected many of these sites in some form. Pristine sheltered sites are a rarity, which means that professionals either avoid looted sites (and in doing so lose an important portion of the archaeological record) or confront the situation. I chose to do the latter, and found several issues that I think are important to add to the larger conversation of research and ethics specific to looted sites: (1) Is it appropriate to cull looted sites from larger analyses because they were looted? (2) Can we address important research questions at these affected sites? (3) What level of attention should collectors and their actions receive in the context of a larger research program? I know there will be a visceral reaction. Lack of data, time, and budget constraints restrict much of this conversation. The issues I am dealing with at Spirit Eye are not unique to this situation alone, and because of this, should be openly discussed.

**Grappling with the Issue**

It is obvious that multiple individuals excavated Spirit Eye. The majority of the collected materials exist in private collections, smaller portions were donated to local museums, and the smallest portion was confiscated and is now held in a state repository. All of the cultural materials and prehistoric internments were...
excavated with the permission of the landowner (in fact, he actually encouraged the excavation of the cave for money). What I have now, is a large collection of unique perishable artifacts and human remains stretched across private, county, and state collections. If I follow Goebel (2015:32), I need to abstain from studying the private portions of the collection, but what then becomes of the remains and artifacts? Pitblado’s (2014a and 2014b) recent conversation concerning collaboration between professionals and collectors, and the ethics therein, addresses an important but small part of the issue at Spirit Eye. I believe that Sassaman (2014:381) and then Watkins (2015) underscore the larger issue (specific to Spirit Eye) by stating that US laws, and by extension effective heritage management, do not extend to individuals and private property. Therefore, these amateur excavations were within the limits of state law, and collaboration with organizations and individuals in this situation is only possible when collectors are willing to comply. Since I am a professional working within the confines of land ownership and property rights laws, this has the effect of reducing my efforts to little more than attempts to contact collectors and county museums. Moreover, the Spirit Eye collections have only become known through the process of trying to excavate a portion of the site that I determined had not been affected by looting. Now that I am aware of the extent of the looting and what was taken from the site (i.e., mummified humans), the stewardship and ethics portion of the collaboration conversation is salient but difficult to honor because looter participation is voluntary.

There is also the site itself; it did at one time contain an incredible archaeological assemblage, and there are still cultural deposits. If we focus solely on untouched sites, what are we missing (cf. Goebel 2015)? More to the point: Should research at a site be abandoned because it was looted? If so, at what point is the research potential of a site totally diminished? Surovell and colleagues (2017:298), in their discussion of the decline of archaeological discovery, suggest that “the next generations of archaeologists may find themselves working in a very different environment than those of a generation ago, where the use of existing collections and the reinvestigation of known sites will become increasingly common.” Can we add looted sites to this discussion and if so, what form does that take? Clearly, looted sites are on a spectrum wherein totally destroyed sites can get little more than a dot (with the absence of artifacts) on a map and an honorable mention in landscape level analyses, and those that are more intact are salvaged for what is left. I do not have hard answers here—this is obviously situational and site specific.

Then there is the matter of looting. As social scientists, can we place judgment on and dismiss widespread cultural phenomena like the looting of archaeological sites without grappling with the conditions that create the phenomenon? Do not read this as being dismissive of the inexcusable act of selling items of cultural heritage or disinterred human remains. Rather, in excluding looting from our analysis, are we embarking on a form of “past mastering” (Meskell 2002)? There are looted or destroyed sites where recent efforts place them into larger analyses (e.g., Emeryville Shellmound, Gault site, most of the Texas Lower Pecos sheltered sites). I am thinking here of the purposeful exclusion of sites from focused research because they were looted. I am sure we have all heard some variation of, “But it is looted,” as a caveat that offers an “out” from professional excavation work (the recent version I heard of this was, “Why do we map sites with lasers if we are going to study looted collections with poor provenience?”). However, at sites where archaeologists handled the excavation poorly, we seem to shrug, mutter a few expletives, and consider what can be salvaged; if the same damage was done at the hands of an amateur, we practice avoidance. Why? This exclusion undeniably erases some of the more important sites from the archaeological record and alters our interpretations of the prehistoric record by removing some of these prominent places from analysis.

As Meskell (2002:566) says, “Archaeologists and other cultural arbiters make decisions about erasure, the forms of history that are designated as unworthy or undesirable.” Looting, I think we can all agree, is a negative aspect of the history of many sites. But should it be excluded from analysis because it is an uncomfortable topic? It is not an ideal situation to track down multiple, often older individuals, and ask uncomfortable questions such as why they disinterred human remains. Through conversations with both professionals and amateurs it is clear, in the case of Spirit Eye, that much of the destruction of this and adjacent sheltered sites rose and fell during the 1960s. Rather than dismiss this portion of site history, I feel it is better to view these...
past actions within a larger context. Kersel and Chesson offer a clear example of how to incorporate looting into larger research objectives from Early Bronze Age cemeteries in the Dead Sea Plain of Jordan: They view “archaeological practice and looting as equally valid subjects for interrogation” (2013:686). They do this through recording what they call the first and second lives of Early Bronze Age pots. The first life focuses on the original context in which the pots functioned and then were deposited as funerary objects. The second life focuses on the complex interplay between the multiple modern groups that ascribe meaning to the same pots. Their research is an important step toward understanding why individuals loot archaeological sites and offers inroads for addressing social problems that lead to the destruction of archaeological sites.

The Spirit Eye Case

Since the early 2000s, professionals have grappled with the integrity of Spirit Eye because the intensity of the prehistoric occupation and importance was always clear, but so was the impact to it by collectors. After years of scrutiny and encouragement by a new owner, it was determined that a small portion of the interior cave deposits appeared to be intact, and in 2017 the decision was made to test them. At least the upper portion of this deposit was known to be a backdirt pile and because of this I knew it would be important to address the looting. Initially I did not know what would become of the effort, but because of the involvement of the EPAS amateur group, I had names to contact and a formal site number request to follow up. The few notes that accompanied the site number request included last names from the 1968 EPAS expedition, which led to conversations with the current membership, who were able to produce an incredible amount of written correspondence between professionals, collectors, and the group itself as well as several boxes of artifacts and photo documentation of the Novak artifact collection (Figure 3).

After this it became possible to corroborate additional written collector accounts (because of the unique double entrance to the cave) held by professionals but previously unattributed (Robert Mallouf, personal communication 2017). These additional written accounts helped track down the mumified male individual and associated artifacts, which had not been attributed to a site before this effort. The female individual was tracked down while looking for any artifacts that may have come from the cave, and the Texas Archeological Research Laboratory (TARL) was able to fill in the bizarre California portion of the story. We were able to determine that Benke (now deceased), of the Novak-Benke name, sold his portion of the collection to the California antiquity/exotic wildlife trafficker instead of giving it to the Witte Museum. Through several bizarre phone calls to every listed Novak phone number, I found the portion of the collection photographed in 1968 and clarified Novak's role in the dig. There are still artifacts in private collections that are unaccounted for, and these collectors have either turned down requests for information or denied participation. I had no idea as I contacted groups that the history of the site would provide so many cultural and human materials and such detailed correspondence. This will not be the case for most of us but, where possible, the efforts made at these locations are worth it; without such effort, information for many of these sites could be lost.
The Research

Fieldwork efforts are still ongoing. We have yet to discover definitive intact sediments, but most of the recovered artifacts (including those in known collections) are perishable artifacts. The assemblage from Spirit Eye offers a unique and holistic view into technologies that made the prehistoric adaptation to the Chihuahuan Desert possible. Moving forward, the goal is to understand how the years of unsystematic excavation progressed and to develop research methods that can be used to salvage data from this and other extensively looted archaeological sites. To date, fieldwork at Spirit Eye has recovered thousands of artifacts discarded by collectors in the backdirt pile, most of them incomplete perishable items (Figure 4). These include quids, human coprolites, cordage, various kinds of processed plant fiber, faunal artifacts, foodstuffs, and carved wooden artifacts—the portion of the assemblage so often lost in open-air sites. The site, although impacted, still holds far-reaching research potential that requires an unconventional approach. Contrary to Goebel (2015), I do not cringe when I talk with collectors. With few exceptions, what I have found in the case of Spirit Eye are ordinary people every bit as interested in cultural history as many archaeologists are, although the happenstances of life have kept them from pursuing professional careers or avocational groups.

Conclusion

A colleague once asked me as we stood on a prominent site together, “What do you think prehistoric people called this place?” The implication was that the occupation of the site was so frequent that prehistoric peoples had a name for the location. I have often thought about that question during the course of our work at Spirit Eye. It was important enough to be the final resting place for at least two individuals, and recovered artifacts suggest at least 3,000 years of intermittent occupation. The extent of damage by looters kept many professionals away from this important site for years, which is understandable. I am not performing the archaeology I was trained to do: It is a hybrid of investigative journalism and museum collections work, and I would have much preferred to excavate the cultural material from Spirit Eye Cave myself. Nevertheless, this and other looted sites have research potential; each will present different challenges beyond the issues I presented here (i.e., landownership, state laws, etc.). It is important that, when able, we conduct work at looted sites, especially those on private land where stewardship is more difficult but critical.
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Figure 4. The excavation at Spirit Eye of a looter backdirt pile that may rest on top of intact sediments. Photo courtesy of the author.
JOAN E. FREEMAN
1931–2017

Joan Elizabeth Freeman passed away on June 23, 2017, in Bethesda, Maryland, from complications caused by a series of strokes. She was 86 years old.

Wisconsin’s first State Archaeologist, Freeman was born in Madison, Wisconsin, on April 3, 1931, but grew up in Milwaukee. Her father was an assistant dean in the Graduate School at University of Wisconsin (UW)–Milwaukee; her mother taught English there as well. Freeman obtained her BA in history from Lawrence College in Appleton, Wisconsin, and her MA and PhD in anthropology from University of Wisconsin–Madison. She was the first woman awarded a doctorate in archaeology from UW, a fact of which she was justifiably proud. Through graduate school, she was involved in fieldwork in South Dakota as part of the sprawling Missouri River Basin Salvage program and later also participated in the excavation of a mound site in Illinois. A student of David A. Baerreis, she assisted him in the preparation of several reports on WPA digs which he had directed in Oklahoma. Although her 1956 master’s thesis focused on Late Woodland sites in Wisconsin, she turned to Oklahoma archaeology in her 1959 dissertation entitled “The Neosho Focus: A Late Prehistoric Culture in Oklahoma.”

In 1954, as a student assistant to Warren Wittry, Freeman began what would eventually become a 40-year career at the State Historical Society of Wisconsin (SHSW). Under Wittry’s tutelage, she gained considerable experience in the museum as its exhibits were modernized following the extended funding drought of the Depression and war years. She also was part of the crew for several salvage digs, most notably at the Wakanda Park Mound group in northwestern Wisconsin and the post-contact Bell site in eastern Wisconsin. As part of Wisconsin Archeology Survey crews, she also worked at Aztalan, a palisaded Late Woodland-Middle Mississippian site on the Crawfish River in south-central Wisconsin. With Baerreis, she reported on the ceramics from the site in a 1958 article in The Wisconsin Archeologist.

In 1960, Freeman was named Curator of Anthropology at the SHSW after Wittry left for another job. “It was a long hard fight, mostly by waiting, but I got the job over objections to a female curator,” she acknowledged at the time. As anthropologist curator, she found herself not only tasked with care of the museum’s extensive Native American ethnographic and archaeological holdings, but was also the director of the SHSW’s recently inaugurated Highway Archaeology Salvage program. At the time, the program was expanding into reservoir work, after the SHSW contracted with the National Park Service for survey and site excavation in the proposed Kickapoo Reservoir basin, and a few years later, the Eau Galle Reservoir project. With her assistant, Jay Brandon, she helped draft the state’s Antiquities Act, which was enacted into law in 1965. Under the law, she was named as State Archaeologist, a position that added considerably to her workload but for which she received no additional compensation.

As much as Freeman enjoyed the museum setting, she loved the field and through the 1960s and early 1970s conducted excavations throughout Wisconsin, including notably at the Price III site, where she uncovered an extensive Late Archaic cemetery, and the Millville site, a Middle Woodland village. With National Science Foundation funding, she and Baerreis conceived of a large-scale project aimed at understanding the changing environment of the Middle Woodland era in the upper Midwest. For the project, she directed crews in work at mound and habitation sites in Trempealeau County, Wisconsin. Her published reports include those on the Price III and Millville sites in The Wisconsin Archeologist, which led, in 1968, to her being awarded the Increase A. Lapham Award for Anthropological Research from the Wisconsin Archeological Society. The award, instituted in 1926, was the first given to a woman. During four seasons (1962, 1964, 1967, and 1968), she continued excavation at Aztalan, the data from which was to form the basis for proposed reconstruction of portions of the site by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources.

Freeman’s legacy is twofold, and includes significant archaeological collections, such as those from Aztalan, which continue to be used for both theses and dissertations. She also introduced numerous students, from UW as well as other schools, to field and laboratory work, and encouraged many in their own careers. As one of her charges noted upon hearing of her death, “I am not exaggerating when I say her guidance and true friendship changed my life in an incredibly positive way.” Another commented: “Joan was a big part of my archaeology education. She was a wonderful human being.”

Freeman served as State Archaeologist until 1988 and retired from the SHSW in 1994. However, devastated by the theft of numerous Native American artifacts by a former curator, she volunteered hundreds of hours of her time between 1998 and 2003 to assist museum staff in documenting the extent of the loss. She could hardly have done otherwise, referring as she did more than once to the collections as “her children.” Freeman never married; she is survived by her two nephews and their families.

—Marlin F. Hawley
Wisconsin Historical Society
ALEXANDER JOHNSTON LINDSAY, JR.
1929–2017

Alexander “Lex” Johnston Lindsay, Jr., 87, a southwestern archaeologist, died peacefully in Tucson, Arizona, on January 14, 2017. Lex was born in Denver, Colorado, on June 25, 1929, the only child of CPA Alexander J. and Caroline L. Lindsay, who instilled in him a strong work ethic, a deep respect for evidence, and attention to detail. In 1947, he enrolled in Colorado A&M (now CSU) in Fort Collins planning to become an engineer, but after the first two years, he transferred to University of Denver (DU), where he majored in anthropology under Arnold Withers. This move was almost predictable, because he had wanted to be an archaeologist ever since his parents took him to the Denver Museum of Natural History and Mesa Verde National Park when he was five years old. In 1952, he married Marjorie Jane Boatright, received a BA in anthropology from DU, and became a first lieutenant in the US Army serving in Korea.

In 1954, at the urging of Withers, he entered graduate school at the University of Arizona (UA) to study anthropology under Emil Haury. While acting as dig foreman at UA Archaeological Field School at Point of Pines in 1952, he participated in the discovery of a community that had migrated there from the Kayenta region of northern Arizona, called the Maverick Mountain phase, the first evidence of what came to be called the Kayenta diaspora. It became a major focus of Lex’s research for the rest of his career. While a graduate student, he was a museum fellow and a preparator at the Arizona State Museum (ASM), a technician in the Radiocarbon Laboratory, a research assistant in palynology at the Geochronology Laboratory, and editor of the Kiva published by the Arizona Archaeological and Historical Society (AAHS). He earned an MA from UA in 1958 with a thesis on the pollen from the Lehner Mammoth Kill site, and a PhD in 1969 with a dissertation on the Tsegi phase of the Kayenta culture.

In 1958, he began his long career at the Museum of Northern Arizona (MNA) in Flagstaff as a field archaeologist on the Glen Canyon Dam Project. He soon became director of that project and, in 1965, curator of anthropology at MNA. His oversight of several large archaeological projects gave him the experience to contribute significantly to the transition from the emergency excavations of salvage archaeology to the carefully planned projects of cultural resource management (CRM). He was especially interested in the opportunities that these CRM projects provided to young people. He supported the MNA summer assistants and enjoyed mentoring many of them. He also taught at Northern Arizona University from 1968 to 1974 and contributed to many courses after 1981 at UA. At a time when women were excluded from many large southwestern projects, Lex, the supportive father of four active daughters, insisted that women be included in all MNA activities. He routinely employed women as field and laboratory assistants, project managers, research directors, and authors of reports and publications.

As MNA curator of anthropology, he significantly upgraded the site survey and specimen catalog systems, as well as the storage, curation, and conservation of collections. In 1978, he took leave from MNA to conduct for the American Anthropological Association a National Park Service-funded survey of the conditions under which federally owned archaeological collections were stored in nonfederal repositories. He and his team discovered that many of those collections were stored under deplorable conditions. In their 1979 publication, they recommended rigorous new standards for the curation of archaeological materials. That publication had a significant but not widely recognized impact on the museum community. Many museum curators and directors used it to bolster their requests for funds to upgrade their curatorial practices.

Lex enthusiastically participated in MNA’s many public programs, published popular summaries of research projects in large-circulation magazines, and worked closely with avocational archaeologists. A long-time member of the Arizona Archaeological and Historical Society (AAHS), he received its Victor R. Stoner Award in 1992. He was also a founder and long-term functionary of the Arizona Archaeological Society (AAS). Lex helped numerous community groups qualify as chapters of AAS, which honored him as Professional Archaeologist of 2007. Lex believed that an important aspect of public archaeology is the conservation and protection of archaeological resources, and he was one of the founders of the American Society for Conservation Archaeology, which gave him its Conservation Archaeologist Award in 1982. He also served as Arizona representative to the Society for American Archaeology’s Council for the Public Understanding of Archaeology, COPA (1975–1980). He was also a member for many years of the state’s Archaeology Advisory Council, which honored him with a lifetime achievement award in 2002.

In 1981, Lex retired from MNA after 22 years of service. MNA recognized him in 1998 with the J. Ferrell Colton Distinguished Alumnus Award and in 2013 as MNA Fellow. After retiring from MNA, Lex became a research associate at the...
Arizona State Museum in Tucson and renewed his active participation in AAHS affairs. He analyzed the archaeological collections from the Maverick Mountain occupation at Point of Pines and continued his research on population movements from the Kayenta region to southern Arizona. At this time, he demonstrated that the Tucson polychrome that reflects Kayenta style was locally made in southern Arizona by Kayenta migrants, like Maverick Mountain Polychrome at Point of Pines. He was also the first to recognize that the frequently encountered perforated plates were a hallmark of the Kayenta diaspora.

Lex’s archaeological research was characterized by precise and controlled excavation procedures, an uncanny ability to observe and record even the smallest hints in the archaeological record, and a stern insistence on solid evidence for every interpretation. He was a humble and unassuming individual who placed greater value on getting the job done and done right than on personal recognition. After his death, the AAHS created the Alexander J. Lindsay, Jr. Unsung Heroes Award to be given annually to those “individuals whose tireless work behind-the-scenes has often gone unrecognized, but which is often critical to the success of others.” Lex is survived by his wife Jane, his daughters Debbie, Pam, Caroline, and Judi, eight grandchildren, and five great-grandchildren.

—Raymond Harris Thompson
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#### Statements of Financial Position

December 31, 2016 and 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents</td>
<td>$2,554,415</td>
<td>$2,774,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable, net</td>
<td>14,937</td>
<td>16,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued interest receivable</td>
<td>2,065</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses, current portion</td>
<td>270,872</td>
<td>92,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total current assets</strong></td>
<td>2,842,289</td>
<td>2,885,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses, net of current portion</td>
<td>12,961</td>
<td>16,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>5,210,517</td>
<td>4,920,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property and equipment, net</td>
<td>144,399</td>
<td>94,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposits</td>
<td>11,031</td>
<td>11,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total assets</strong></td>
<td>$8,221,197</td>
<td>$7,928,576</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Liabilities and Net Assets                  |          |          |
| Current liabilities                         |          |          |
| Accounts payable and accrued expenses       | $68,102  | $140,336 |
| Deferred revenue                            |          |          |
| Membership dues, current portion            | 565,696  | 482,832  |
| Subscriptions                               | 76,410   | 141,277  |
| Meetings and other                          | 577,995  | 506,399  |
| **Total deferred revenue**                  | 1,220,101| 1,130,508|
| Total current liabilities                   | 1,288,203| 1,270,844|
| Other liabilities                           |          |          |
| Deferred lease liability                    | 62,035   | 64,812   |
| Deferred membership dues, net of current portion | 18,000   | 20,279   |
| **Total liabilities**                       | 1,368,238| 1,355,935|
| Net assets                                  |          |          |
| Unrestricted                                |          |          |
| Undesignated                                | 3,162,058| 3,049,904|
| Board-designated                            | 697,051  | 721,695  |
| **Total unrestricted**                      | 3,859,109| 3,771,599|
| Temporarily restricted                       |          |          |
| Permanently restricted                       | 512,140  | 361,405  |
| **Total net assets**                        | 6,852,959| 6,572,641|
| **$ total**                                  | $8,221,197 | $7,928,576 |
## Society for American Archaeology

### Statements of Activities and Change in Net Assets

**Years Ended December 31, 2016 and 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unrestricted</th>
<th>Temporarily Restricted</th>
<th>Permanently Restricted</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Unrestricted</th>
<th>Temporarily Restricted</th>
<th>Permanently Restricted</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue and support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership dues</td>
<td>$841,619</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$841,619</td>
<td>$907,114</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$907,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual meeting</td>
<td>628,106</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>628,106</td>
<td>871,539</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>871,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public programs and services</td>
<td>33,148</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33,148</td>
<td>24,872</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization and administration</td>
<td>263,452</td>
<td>252,421</td>
<td>26,501</td>
<td>542,374</td>
<td>76,993</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>76,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member programs and services</td>
<td>3,083</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,083</td>
<td>32,991</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards</td>
<td>8,889</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,889</td>
<td>34,169</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net assets released from restriction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public programs and services</td>
<td>86,114</td>
<td>(86,114)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26,981</td>
<td>(26,981)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total revenue and support</strong></td>
<td>2,125,111</td>
<td>166,307</td>
<td>26,501</td>
<td>2,317,919</td>
<td>2,255,819</td>
<td>(26,255)</td>
<td>26,163</td>
<td>2,255,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>58,805</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>58,805</td>
<td>55,251</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual meeting</td>
<td>429,131</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>429,131</td>
<td>514,224</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>514,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>292,079</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>292,079</td>
<td>308,224</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>308,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public programs and services</td>
<td>357,758</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>357,758</td>
<td>333,501</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>333,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member programs and services</td>
<td>63,154</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>63,154</td>
<td>81,568</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>81,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards</td>
<td>8,439</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,439</td>
<td>32,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and general</td>
<td>801,618</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>801,618</td>
<td>688,732</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>688,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership development</td>
<td>26,817</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26,817</td>
<td>26,889</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenses</strong></td>
<td>1,209,366</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,209,366</td>
<td>1,325,268</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,325,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change in net assets</strong></td>
<td>87,510</td>
<td>166,307</td>
<td>26,501</td>
<td>280,318</td>
<td>214,930</td>
<td>(26,255)</td>
<td>26,163</td>
<td>214,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reclassification of net assets</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(15,572)</td>
<td>15,572</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net assets, beginning of year</strong></td>
<td>3,771,599</td>
<td>361,405</td>
<td>2,439,637</td>
<td>6,572,641</td>
<td>3,556,669</td>
<td>387,660</td>
<td>2,413,474</td>
<td>6,357,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net assets, end of year</strong></td>
<td>$3,859,109</td>
<td>$512,140</td>
<td>$2,481,710</td>
<td>$6,852,959</td>
<td>$3,771,599</td>
<td>$361,405</td>
<td>$2,439,637</td>
<td>$6,572,641</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each year the Register of Professional Archaeologists (Register) and three of its sponsoring organizations provide scholarship opportunities for students attending Register-certified archaeological field schools. One scholarship in the amount of $1,000 can be awarded by each sponsoring organization (SAA, AAA, and AIA) to the director of a Register-certified field school. The director is then free to award the scholarship to a deserving student, or more commonly, to divide the award between two students.

The Register’s Field School Certification Committee and Chair Jane Baxter have recently updated its application and review process, including a new online application form (http://rpanet.org/?FieldschoolGuides). The deadline for submitting applications for 2018 field school certification and for recertification of your school is November 1, 2017. Field schools will be certified for two years. Recertification after the end of the second certification year will require completion of a new application form. The 2019 field school certification deadline is October 1, 2018, and the deadline for recertification is November 1, 2018.

2017 Society for American Archaeology Field School Scholarship Recipients
The 2016–2018 University of North Georgia Archaeological Field School atop Monte Bonifato, a forested mountain in northwestern Sicily, aims to investigate occupation and land use during the Iron Age through medieval periods. This is the first year of Register-certification for this school. The school’s principal investigator, William M. Balco Jr., divided the $1,000 award between two deserving students. Isabella Martino is an undergraduate student at the University of North Georgia in Dahlonega with a double major in both studio art and chemistry, with a minor in anthropology. Chloe Perry is currently studying history with a minor in anthropology at the University of North Georgia.
2017

DECEMBER 6
Online Seminar: Making Your Voice Heard in Support of Archaeology
(3:00 p.m.–4:00 p.m. EST)
For SAA Members Only.

DECEMBER 12
Online Seminar: Ancient DNA 101: What You Need to Know to Establish a Successful Project
(12:00 p.m.–2:00 p.m. EST)

2018

JANUARY 2
SAA’s 2018 Election Opens. Members will receive an e-mail ballot or postcard ballot from Vote-Now.

JANUARY 18
Knowledge Series Seminar: Anne Pyburn of Indiana University presents “Archaeology and Economic Development: The Rules of Engagement”
(3:00 p.m.–4:00 p.m. EST)
For SAA Members Only.

JANUARY 30
SAA Annual Meeting: SAA Member Participant Renew Deadline

JANUARY 31
Last day for SAA Members to vote in the 2018 SAA Election
SAA Annual Meeting: Deadline to register a team for the 14th Annual SAA Ethics Bowl Competition. Register by e-mailing saaethicsbowl@gmail.com with team member names and academic institution(s).

FEBRUARY 23
Online Seminar: Employing Innovative Approaches to Curation and Collections Management: The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers’ Archaeological Curation Program
(3:00 p.m.–4:00 p.m. EST)
For SAA Members Only.

MARCH 7
Online Seminar: Outreach, Engagement, and Advocacy: The Importance of Reaching the Public through Media
(3:00 p.m.–4:00 p.m. EST)
For SAA Members Only.

MARCH 22
SAA Annual Meeting: Last day to Advance Register for the meeting. Registration onsite will be available at higher rates.

APRIL 11–15
SAA 83rd Annual Meeting at the Washington Marriott Wardman Park in Washington, DC

MAY 2
Online Seminar: Archaeologies of Landscape
(2:00 p.m.–4:00 p.m. EST)

MAY 15
Online Seminar: International Opportunities for Latin American Archaeology Students
(12:00 p.m.–1:00 p.m. EST)
For SAA Members Only. Presented entirely in Spanish.

To learn more about SAA’s Online Seminar Series and lectures, visit www.saa.org and click on the SAA Online Seminar Series banner.
Ethics is the branch of philosophy that involves systematizing, defending, and recommending concepts of right and wrong conduct. Not everything that is legal is ethical—and not everything that is ethical is legal.

As members of the SAA, archaeologists agree to uphold the Principles of Archaeological Ethics, but what do stewardship, accountability, and preservation look like in the real world?

Each year, teams of 3-5 graduate and undergraduate students engage in debate about solutions to real world ethical dilemmas faced by archaeologists, academics, and curators. Solutions to these dilemmas are judged on their knowledge and application of ethical principles, personal experience, and legal precedents/laws.

ARE YOU UP FOR THE CHALLENGE?

Rules, procedures, and case studies can be downloaded at:

Register a team by January 31, 2018 at saaethicsbowl@gmail.com
We Want You! Volunteers Needed for the Annual Meeting!

SAA is seeking enthusiastic volunteers for the 83rd Annual Meeting in Washington, DC, who are not only interested in archaeology but who are also looking to save money and have fun.

To continue to give volunteers flexibility, SAA will again require only 8 hours of volunteer time! The complimentary meeting registration is the exclusive benefit for your time.

Training for the April 11-15 meeting will be provided via detailed manuals along with on-the-job training. Training manuals and the volunteer schedule will be sent out via e-mail on Monday, March 12, 2018. As always, SAA staff will be on hand to assist you with any questions or problems that may arise.

For additional information and a volunteer application, please go to SAAweb (www.saa.org) or contact Solai Sanchez at SAA: 1111 14th Street NW, Suite 800, Washington, DC 20005, Phone +1(202) 559-7382, Fax +1(202) 789-0284, or e-mail solai_sanchez@saar.org

Applications will be accepted on a first-come, first-served basis until February 1, 2018.