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The Annual Meeting was an excellent reminder of the variety of topics and interests that are housed under the umbrella of the SAA. It was an excellent opportunity to visit posters, listen to papers, and visit committee meetings to look for new content for the magazine. These efforts will lead to future issues featuring articles on work-life balance in archaeological careers, archaeological field schools, revisiting the SAA code of ethics, advances in bioarchaeology, and a new occasional and interactive column on student research. As always, I welcome submissions and suggestions for content for *The SAA Archaeological Record* and hope to hear from many of you. It is my goal as editor to make this a publication by and for the SAA membership, and your suggestions and submissions help to make this a reality.

This month’s *The SAA Archaeological Record* features the first of a two-part forum on New Deal Archaeology that originated as a poster session at the Sacramento Meetings, organized by Bernard Means and sponsored by the History of Archaeology Interest Group. This forum is looks at New Deal Archaeology not just as a historical phenomenon, but also as a source of archaeological evidence used by generations of archaeologists to the present day. The papers in this issue help to introduce the scope of New Deal archaeology, examine its place in disciplinary history, and explore its geographic reaches and the types of evidence it offers archaeologists today. In November, we’ll be introduced to a series of case studies that explore the legacy of New Deal archaeology at different sites and in varying regions of the United States. Thanks to Bernard and the authors for all of their hard work and enthusiasm for this forum.

The individual papers in this issue represent some excellent individual submissions to *The SAA Archaeological Record*. I appreciate the patience of the authors as we’ve run special issues that have resulted in later publication of their works than I originally anticipated.

I’d like to end by looking forward to the 77th Annual Meeting in Memphis. Forums such as the one in this issue take a good deal of time to bring together, and Bernard originally contacted me about this material when he submitted the session abstracts last autumn. So, whether looking back to your recent presentation at Sacramento, or looking forward to your upcoming paper or poster in Memphis, I hope to hear from you about contributing to *The SAA Archaeological Record*. 
The Sacramento meeting was the 4th largest SAA meeting ever! Each meeting reminds me again that it is the incredible work of SAA’s hundreds of volunteers that makes the Society what it is. Without all of the committed people that we have, there would be no SAA. The wonderful work produced by our committees and task forces are the building blocks of the Society. To be at an annual meeting is to see it all in action. Annual meetings are a keystone component of the Society and it was a pleasure to see things go so well.

If you aren’t already, think about how you would like to get more involved in SAA. In the recently completed needs assessment more than half of you said they were interested in serving on a committee. We want to take you up on that offer! The next Call for Volunteers will be out in late fall. This last fall we put in place a new system to make it easier to serve. To apply to serve on an SAA committee you only need to fill out and submitting a brief form on SAAweb. Over 100 members volunteered through the open call process initiated this past fall and we want to grow that number in 2011. Also—remember, if you are eligible and would like to be reappointed, you must apply through the call as well. We hope that you will want to get involved!

Coming in January 2012 is SAA’s first Conferencia Intercontinental, a meeting with a one plenary session, an attendance limited to 250, and a select group of peer reviewed papers and posters. The Conferencia is designed to bring SAA to Latin America (Panama City, Panama) and to provide a supplemental avenue of engagement for SAA members and non-members in Latin America. Submissions are due by June 15, 2011. Check it out on SAAweb www.saa.org and click on the “Conferencia Intercontinental” logo.

If you submitted a paper for Sacramento—thanks—and you know that the current SAA Annual Meeting Submissions System could use some improvement! An all-new SAA submission system is under development and will be be inaugurated for the 2013 meeting in Hawaii. Only one more year with the current system!

Under discussion is the role of SAA in professional development. This was another topic that was identified as an important one in the needs assessment. Two task forces will be examining the kind of professional development that members have expressed a need for and that the Society can provide. Watch for more on this critical topic and new opportunities to build your skill sets at the Memphis meetings next year.

The 2010 Needs Assessment Survey is currently under analysis by the Board and will be a major action item for the Fall Board meeting. You, our members, (47 percent) responded to our request for input that will guide some future directions for the Society. Thank you for your time and participation and the guidance that it will provide to the Board.
I began writing this immediately following my completion of the SAA Needs Assessment Survey. One of the first questions in that survey asked how long I have been a member of the SAA. I joined in 1990, the year I started graduate school. I have been a member of the SAA for 20 years—it certainly does not seem as if it has been that long.

In my career as an archaeologist, I have served in many roles: student, field crew, crew chief, field supervisor, project manager, mentor, and teacher. All of these roles have served me well in service to the SAA. Each role has defined my interests and the unique perspectives I am able to bring to my volunteer service.

I have been trying to pinpoint the exact moment when I decided to become an involved participant in the SAA. I can't remember the moment (20 years is a long time!), but I do recall searching for an opportunity to serve. As a new graduate student, I was not sure I had much to offer the SAA; nonetheless, in 1995, I met with the then chair of the newly formed Student Affairs Committee (SAC) to discuss joining the committee. She invited me to become the Vice-Chair of the committee, and by 1996, I became the chair of the SAC. This was one of my greatest challenges and one of my greatest accomplishments in my service to the SAA. I started my tenure as chair with an entirely new committee and a new set of goals. We worked hard to integrate the SAC within the structure of the SAA. We sponsored thematic sessions highlighting the cutting-edge research being done by student members of the SAA, and we sponsored forums and newsletter articles designed to address pressing issues for students. It was also during this time that the Student Paper Award was developed by one of our committee members (Jane Baxter, now the editor of The SAA Archaeological Record).

It made sense for me to chair the Student Paper Award Committee (SPAC) when my final term with SAC was complete. It allowed me to continue in service to the SAA, while also providing me with an opportunity to serve on a different type of committee, with its own set of challenges. While chairing these two committees, I also served two separate terms on the Public Education Committee (PEC). The PEC is a large committee with many subcommittees. While also an advisory committee like the Student Affairs Committee, the PEC has a broader reach, and the nature of the work we did provided me with an entirely different perspective of the kind of work done by SAA committees. I am currently serving as chair of the Committee on the Status of Women in Archaeology (COSWA). COSWA has provided me yet another entirely different perspective. COSWA focuses on current issues while also looking to our history for guidance. It has been uniquely rewarding.

As my term with tenure comes to an end, I am searching for another committee on which to serve. Why? What comes from volunteering for the SAA? I have met some amazing people and formed lifelong friendships. I have had the opportunity to make positive changes in areas that are important to me as a professional. I have also been fortunate to work with the Executive Board and the SAA staff to gain a greater understanding of the Society in which I have been a member for 20 years. If you are considering volunteering, go for it! You certainly have something to offer the SAA and our effectiveness is dependent on our committees and task forces.

Caryn Berg
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UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA
Missoula, MT
Contact: douglas.macdonald@umontana.edu
online registration:
https://safe.onlinemontana.com/onlinemontana/fundraiser/?s=6113
Dee Ann Story, a renowned Texas archaeologist, died December 26, 2010 at the age of 79 in Wimberley, Texas after a lengthy and courageous battle with cancer. She was born to Emma and Eugene Suhm in Houston on December 12, 1931, and was preceded in death by her husband Hal Story whom she married in October 1961, her parents, and her sister Beverly Morgan. Dee Ann attended Texas Woman’s University in Denton and completed her undergraduate and Master’s degrees in anthropology at The University of Texas at Austin, and her doctoral degree in anthropology from the University of California at Los Angeles in 1963. While at the University of California, she worked with Jesse Jennings at the Glen Canyon Archeological Project; at Glen Canyon she served as an assistant director doing fieldwork and directing the laboratory. She became assistant director of the Texas Archeological Salvage Project at The University of Texas at Austin in 1962. She was a lecturer in the Anthropology Department at The University of Texas from 1963 to 1965, Assistant Professor from 1965 to 1972, Associate Professor from 1972 to 1978, and became Full Professor in 1978. In 1987, she became Professor Emeritus in 1987. She also served as the Director of the Texas Archeological Research Laboratory from 1965 to 1987. Dee Ann, as she was known among her friends and colleagues, and Dr. Story among her many students, had an accomplished career in archaeology, teaching, and publishing many articles and monographs on Texas archaeology. She also directed many major archaeological and research projects in Texas for which she received numerous honors of recognition.

Her main archaeological interests were the ancestral Caddo culture of east Texas and later the Archaeological Conservancy. She was a member of national and regional professional societies, among them the American Anthropological Association, Society for American Archaeology, Society for Historical Archaeology, Plains Anthropological Society, Arkansas Archaeological Society, and Texas Archaeological Society. She served on the board of the Archaeological Conservancy. She was awarded the Curtis D. Tunnell Lifetime Achievement Award, the Excellence in Archeology Award, and the Award for Historic Preservation, all from the Texas Historical Commission. She was a past president and a Fellow in the Texas Archeological Society where she also received the Lifetime Achievement Award. Other awards of recognition came from the Archaeological Conservancy, Houston Archaeological Society, and the Society for American Archaeology for Outstanding Contributions.

As a teacher and mentor, Dee Ann made profound impacts on the lives and careers of her masters and doctoral students. She chaired the committees of many of Texas’ leading archaeologists, taught courses in basic anthropology and archaeology, and taught field methods in archaeology. Like any outstanding teacher, mentor, and educator, her guidance and influence changed the lives and career directions for many of her students who have gone on to other universities and agencies across the country carrying on her remarkable legacy.

At the time Dee Ann entered the field of archaeology, it was dominated by men with very few women. Despite this imbalance, she not only persevered but became a distinguished archaeologist and scholar, and she opened the door for many more young women to go the field and become professional archaeologists as well. When working in the field, Dee Ann worked in the pits, becoming saturated with red clay like everyone else, and she stretched the work time from daylight until late afternoon. Dee Ann’s work ethic was legendary and it rubbed off on all of her students. Her students gained a sense of pride and discipline, and she taught them all how to present ourselves as professional archaeologists. She connected with her students in a way that gained her their utmost respect and admiration, truly a teacher’s teacher. Her contributions to the Texas Archeological Society, Texas archaeology, Caddo archaeology, The Archaeological Conservancy, and to the lives of her former students will stand as her lasting legacy.
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The A. V. Kidder medal, awarded by the American Anthropological Association, is arguably the most famous award in American archaeology. There is another award named informally in honor of Kidder. This lesser-known Kidder award was passed on in private until 2002, when it was given to me by George J. Gumerman, III at the Pecos Conference in Pecos, NM, as reported in the November 2003 issue of The SAA Archaeological Record. Gumerman expressed his hope that from then on, the award would be made in public but in such a way that it was not expected by the recipient. That occurred on Friday August 13, 2010 in Silverton, Colorado.

The unfamiliar Kidder award had been described as a rendering of a Navajo man producing a sand painting, done with considerable charm but still not a great painting. Thanks to fellow southwestern anthropologist, James C. Faris, we now know that the work is an etching by Elizabeth Keever Boatright, who served on the faculty at Sul Ross State College in Alpine Texas, was the first artist in the U. S. to make etchings in color, and the first white woman given permission to sketch Indian themes. She became known as “Etcher of Indians.” Among her most famous works, and one of her personal favorites, was the “Sand Painter (Navajo)”. The list of her exhibitions covers 12 pages.

For most archaeologists, however, the most important aspect of the etching is the unique horizontal stratigraphy on its obverse side. The first inscription reads “Given me by Charles A. Amsden in 1931” The inscribed name, A. V. Kidder is in pencil and largely worn away. The second inscription reads “For Clyde Kluckhohn, discerning and sympathetic student of the Navajo. A.V. Kidder (no date).” The next reads, “Given to Walter Taylor, in 1963, in memory of Clyde. Florence Kluckhohn.” And then, “Given to Bob Euler, good friend, good companion, good south-westerner. Walter W. Taylor 1970.”

And “Given to George Gumerman (III), my finest friend, a good southwestern archaeologist, and a dynamic accelerator of archaeological Research,” Bob Euler, June 19, 1991.”

Some things to note about the layers are that the recipient does not keep the etching forever. The joy is that it is passed on after an appropriate period of time. All of the recipients have been passionate about Southwest archaeology, have been extraordinary colleagues, and have cared for their students and advanced our field. As Gumerman did, I refrain from suggesting to whom the etching next should be given, but request that it be passed on in public when the time is right. The most recent inscription reads:


What a pleasure it was for me to present this Kidder Award!
THE ARCHAEOLOGY DIVISION
OF THE
AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

is pleased to announce

the 2011 Patty Jo Watson Distinguished Lecturer:

Barbara J. Mills
Professor of Anthropology, University of Arizona:

"More than Metaphor: Social Networks in Archaeology"

and

the 2011 Gordon R. Willey Prize Recipient:

April M. Beisaw

for

"Memory, Identity, and NAGPRA in the Northeastern United States"


Join us at the 2011 meeting in Montreal, Canada, November 16-20, to celebrate
the achievements of our colleagues. Preregistration from July to October 1: see
http://aaanet.org/sections/ad/index.html for program details
The Gene S. Stuart Award specifically honors journalists who have written an original article or series that focuses on archaeology and appears in a newspaper or magazine. Awardees are recognized for engaging, interesting, and responsible writing which contributes to or enhances public understanding of archaeology and important related issues. The award is named in memory of Gene S. Stuart (1930−1993), who was both a writer and a managing editor for National Geographic Society books. She was an award-winning author who exemplified the highest quality writing for the public on archaeological topics. By making this award, the Society for American Archaeology (SAA) honors her work while simultaneously recognizing outstanding writing by contemporary journalists.

The Gene S. Stuart Award Committee is a subcommittee of the SAA’s Media Relations Committee. Members of the award committee and chair are selected from the members of the Media Relations Committee. The award committee chair annually invites writers and editors to submit nominated articles by the middle of January and an award winner is chosen from these nominations by the end of January. A $2000 monetary prize has been part of the award for the past three years. This monetary prize does not come from the SAA but from an anonymous donor, who has renewed this prize on an annual basis. Sixteen journalists have received the award since 1994. The Gene S. Stuart Award is presented at the annual meetings of the society during the business meeting.

The 15th Gene S. Stuart Award was presented at the 75th anniversary meetings of the SAA in St. Louis (2010) to Andrea Cooper for her original story printed in American Archaeology magazine (a publication of the Archaeological Conservancy), during the 2009 publication year. The awards committee consisted of Andrea Elyse Messer, Sarah Schlanger, Pei-Lin Yu, and Renata Wolynec (Chair).

According to the citations which accompanied her award, Andrea Cooper, an award-winning freelance journalist and essay writer, “earned the 2010 Gene S. Stuart Award for her thoughtful, informative, and timely article about ongoing changing relationships between archaeological and Native American communities. ‘Embracing Archaeology’ focuses on the dynamic perspectives of The Eastern Band of the Cherokee regarding the value of archaeology as a means to understanding Cherokee history. By focusing on individuals, Cooper brings to life difficult issues while shedding light on the points of view of both communities. Her sensitive discussion of the intersection of Native interests and those of the archaeological community highlights emerging interests in developing archaeological expertise within Native communities and for Native interests. The subject matter of this piece is timely, discussing both the value of archaeological work for Native communities and the value of cooperation by archaeologists with Native communities for promoting archaeological research.”

According to her website www.andicoop.com, Andrea Cooper’s credits include NPR’s “All Things Considered,” The New York Times, and Time magazine.

“Embracing Archaeology” is reprinted from American Archaeology Fall 2009, pp. 20–24. Reprinted by permission from Andrea Cooper and The Archaeological Conservancy.
Embracing Archaeology

The Eastern Band of the Cherokee was once suspicious of archaeology. Now they’re using it to learn about their history.

By Andrea Cooper

Chief Michell Hicks and TRC Environmental Corporation’s field director Tasha Benyshek stand next to the remains of an early 18th-century Cherokee winter house.
Paul Webb arrives by truck with cardboard boxes full of treasures. We’re waiting in a park entrance across from the stunning new Cherokee school, built next to the site known as Ravensford, where one of North Carolina’s largest, most intensive archaeological projects took place. Webb, whose cheerful demeanor is as easy to spot as his shock of white hair, greets the 42-year-old Cherokee man with me, Russell Townsend, like an old friend.

I get a crash course on discoveries made at Ravensford—114 structures, thousands of features, maybe 500,000 artifacts—from Webb and Townsend before Webb reveals what’s in the first box. He lifts pieces of a large jar, circa A.D. 1450, found at Ravensford. Soot on the exterior and abrasion on the interior, possibly from stirring, suggests the jar was a cooking vessel.

Webb rests the vessel pieces on the flatbed and moves to the second box, which holds sections of a smaller pot with a design of intricate circles from about 1600. Next, he shows a sample of the brilliant beads brought by English settlers. In Cherokee lore, medicine people used beads as bargaining chips with the spirit world to produce good health or other benefits.

It’s hard to avoid thinking of the supernatural in this place. The median in the road separating us from the school is there because graves rest beneath it. “Here, hold this,” Webb says, interrupting my reverie and offering a fragment of another jar. I grip it harder than needed. “Do you ever stop worrying about breaking the artifacts?” I ask. Webb and Townsend consider each other, laugh, and give the same response. No. You never do.

The scene on this breezy day has a magical quality, and not just because Webb keeps pulling artifacts out of his boxes like bunnies from a top hat. It’s amazing the scene is happening at all, that Webb, a Caucasian archaeologist, and Townsend, one of a very few Cherokee-born archaeologists, have worked together to uncover the richness of Cherokee cultural heritage. In part because of legal changes, in part because of Townsend’s and the tribal council’s leadership, Cherokee archaeology has thrived in the last 10 years.

Not so long ago, the Cherokees didn’t want any more archaeologists in their midst. In 1990, archaeologist Brett Riggs paid what he thought was a courtesy visit to the Cherokee tribal council. A Ph.D. candidate, he expected to present his plan to research 19th-century Cherokee ethnography and archaeology to the council. The research would take place on traditional Cherokee lands that hadn’t been owned or controlled by the tribe since 1838, when the U.S. government removed the Cherokee in what’s become known as the Trail of Tears. Riggs felt a responsibility to let the tribe...
know of the proposed work, answer their questions, and consider any advice they wished to offer. He thought the council members might simply thank him for his interest. He had no idea what he was in for.

“The council chairman arose, fixed me with a fierce gaze, then unleashed an articulate, scathing tirade on the endless stream of researchers who plundered the Cherokees for dissertation data, then gave nothing in return,” Riggs wrote about the session. “Particularly noxious were the archaeologists, who went about digging into the graves of Cherokee ancestors to plunder their last belongings as a final act of conquest. He concluded with a challenge for me to justify my proposed work and my profession.” Which Riggs did, politely.

But that attitude lingered, and some would say for good reason. Until very recently, the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians felt “pretty much the same as most Indians concerning archaeology—that archaeology was a very intrusive science. It was a science of busybodies. It was not appreciated,” Townsend says. “A lot of Cherokees felt these research excursions into their history were being undertaken without their knowledge or approval, and they weren’t gaining any of the benefits.” University researchers would send teams to excavate Chattooga or other Cherokee towns, Townsend says, and take the data back to their institutions, not back to the Cherokees.

The Cherokees’ attitudes began to change in the 1990s. Their leaders came to see archaeology as a tool that could help them learn more about their history; and archaeologists as professionals who could provide something of value to the tribe. The Eastern Band hired Riggs as an archaeological consultant in 1993 to conduct a cultural resource survey on land that now holds a casino, and again in 1997 to survey property that included the sacred Kituwah Mound, which Cherokees consider their birthplace. Riggs and other archaeologists provided written reports and data for use in Cherokee museums and schools. “I think they proved archaeologists could be people of virtue and ethics, and they could have use in this kind of community,” Townsend says.

Meanwhile the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 was amended to require tribal consultations for federal projects on current and former Indian lands. Federal and state government officials now have to consult with tribes regarding archaeological issues that affect them. The revised act provided “one of the first opportunities for archaeologists to sit at the table with members of Indian tribes (and talk) about how they wanted to see these projects executed,” Townsend says. Another factor was the opening of tribal historic preservation offices, including the Cherokee office in 2001. The tribe hired Riggs as its first deputy tribal preservation officer;
he directed a second round of testing and evaluation of the Kituwah town site, which covers almost 300 acres, before leaving to join the Research Laboratories of Archaeology at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

Today, Townsend is the tribal historic presentation officer. His area of responsibility includes not only Qualla Boundary in western North Carolina, where the Eastern Band largely lives, but also the portions of North Carolina, Alabama, Tennessee, South Carolina, Georgia, Kentucky, Virginia, and West Virginia where Cherokees lived historically.

The tribe is responsible for cultural resource surveys on the Qualla Boundary in advance of construction projects, and is also responsible for reviewing archaeological projects associated with federal undertakings in traditional aboriginal territory. In the last decade, the tribe has designed and overseen many projects, hiring firms such as TRC Environmental Corporation, where Webb is principal archaeologist, to conduct fieldwork and analysis. The Eastern Band maintains strong ties with the Cherokee Nation and the United Keetoowah Band of Cherokee Indians, both in Oklahoma, and Townsend shares information with them.

The researchers unearthed house patterns, hearths and pits, and other artifacts. They also uncovered quartzite tools and tool making debris dating to roughly 1500 B.C., and pottery with several different stamped designs from Woodland settlements dating from about 1000 B.C. to A.D. 1000. “We found much more than we expected,” says TRC’s senior archaeologist Tasha Benyshek.

There were more than 15 Cherokee houses at Ravensford that dated from the early to mid 1400s. Three centuries later, the area was home to five small settlements. “We found very well-preserved house remnants, some that date to probably the early 1700s,” Webb says. “You can see very clearly in the ground you have the patterns from the posts and entryways that connected the buildings. You also have the burned remains of the buildings themselves preserved in the ground. You can see the central fire pit. It’s not glamorous in the sense of single artifacts that just blow your mind, but it’s phenomenally well-preserved information, some of the best-preserved examples that anybody’s ever found.”

Eighteenth-century Cherokees built pairs of houses together—a rectangular summer home and a round winter one insulated against the cold. The winter houses were built in basins and are now manifested as dark stains. Benyshek and her coworkers exposed hearths, postholes, a bottle gourd and other foodstuffs, stone tools, and pottery vessel fragments. One burned house contained a collapsed wall and roof timbers lying on top of the floor. “Eventually, we’ll

**These excavated postholes reveal the pattern of a paired early 18th-century summer house (rectangular, on left) and octagonal winter house.**
have a good idea of what was in the building when it burned, as well as what activities took place during the occupation,” Webb says.

The recovered artifacts included arrowheads, a stone pipe, and a chunkey stone, a piece used in a game played by the Cherokee. Players would roll the chunkey stone, then bet on who could throw a stick or spear closest to where the stone would stop. A round stone and ceramic pieces for another game were found as well, though it’s unclear how that game was played.

The researchers also encountered graves, which they left untouched. While the tribe is subject to federal preservation laws, such as the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, it has its own code regarding the treatment of burial and human remains. It’s important to the Cherokees that their ancestors’ graves stay undisturbed, out of respect and also for spiritual reasons. Having touched an artifact that might have come from a grave, Townsend plans to get a ritual cleansing later in the day.

Throughout the project, many Cherokee residents stopped by. Every teacher in the Cherokee school system visited the site, as well as elementary, middle, and high school students. All the visitors made it impossible to get mired down in the data of archaeology. “You’re reminded these are people you’re documenting,” Benyshek says. “Everything you’re trying to put together represents the people who live there.”

**TOWNSEND** gives me a tour of the many sites where excavation has been completed and new construction is taking place: A day care center, a former motel, a private language-immersion school where Cherokee students will learn the Tsali language and written syllabary. But one place where new construction won’t occur is Kituwah Mound, where Cherokees believe their people began, where the Creator gave the first fire and the clan law to the tribe. A structure on the mound housed a sacred flame that Cherokees kept burning constantly.

Some modern-day Cherokees have been eager to find out if there was archaeological evidence of the fire, and to know what else was there. They had lost the mother town of Kituwah and the mound once already, prior to the Trail of Tears, when the state of North Carolina didn’t honor a federal government treaty and confiscated the reserve. The Cherokees didn’t own this 309-acre parcel again until 1996. It was so expensive to purchase, some argued for building a tourist attraction on part of the land to recoup the tribe’s expenditure. Others were aghast at that possibility.

To help settle the debate, the tribe hired Brett Riggs in 1997 to direct an archaeological survey of the site. His team dug some 1,700 small test holes, from 12 to 15 inches deep. Eighty-four percent of them revealed archaeological
materials, the oldest of which dated from the early Archaic period.

In 2000, a groundhog uncovered a skeleton on the Kituwah site; it was associated with a Pisgah village, roughly A.D. 1100–1200. This discovery prompted the question of how many more graves might there be. To answer that question, Riggs was hired to direct another study in 2001. He and his team employed a proton magnetometer that detects small changes, known as anomalies, in the Earth’s magnetic field created by disturbances. Archaeologists found many hearth sites, including one at the center of the mound. One photo, at once vague and distinct like a pregnancy ultrasound image, depicted concentric anomalies that, Riggs believes, marked the reconstructions of a townhouse. It was a structure used as a temple, council house, and civic center. The people rebuilt the townhouse as needed in the same spot through the years.

The townhouse anomalies resemble 16th-century townhouse patterns found during excavations of nearby Coweeta Creek Mound. At that site, the ruins of these community buildings, stacked one atop another, grew over time as a mound, probably the same way in which the Kituwah Mound grew through several centuries of use, Riggs wrote in a report to the Eastern Band. Plowing has reduced the height of Kituwah Mound and very likely destroyed the latest stages of the townhouse there, Riggs believes. All the evidence at Kituwah suggested a temple “destroyed at the midpoint in the use-life of the mound, probably in the 15th or 16th century.”

While conducting remote sensing on a section of the site away from the mound—a place thought to be a lightly inhabited—the team discovered about 15 graves. Tribal officials asked how many more graves might be hidden. Kituwah had been a town of 200 to 300 residents for many generations, and the people tended to be buried where they had lived. Based on that information, Riggs estimated that hundreds, perhaps even 1,000, graves could be there. Consequently, the tribe decided to keep the Kituwah property as is, using it strictly for farming, Cherokee heritage and cultural events, and religious observance.

Townsend is comfortable with the decision to preserve Kituwah as it has been for generations. “Archaeologists constantly leave data behind because we didn’t have the time, permission, or money” to obtain it, he says. At the same time, he and many other tribal members are unhappy about the possibility of leaving behind too much material or disturbing graves at a controversial project, a runway extension for a local airport. Government and state officials and tribal leaders have been at odds over how and how much to excavate. Airport officials have agreed to strip and map the entire area, which will reduce the chance of accidental disturbance of human remains during construction, says Townsend. Benyshek and her team, hired to do the field work there, have already found two palisaded villages from about A.D. 1100. The discovery is newsworthy because archaeologists hadn’t expected to find palisaded villages in western North Carolina at that time.

That airport debate demonstrates the changing nature of the relationship between the Cherokees and archaeologists, who are now often allies rather than adversaries. “It’s a matter of educating archaeologists that they have a bigger responsibility than just tearing up some ground,” says Eastern Band Chief Michell Hicks. “That’s not what it’s about. It’s about showing the lives of people over time and giving back to the people... Hopefully, (the information) gets carried on to future generations. I think that’s archaeologists’ responsibility.” Hicks hopes the tribe can build a restoration and research facility in the future where Cherokee students can learn about their archaeological history.

Archaeology has added to the Cherokees’ already strong bonds to each other and their land. The importance of community here can’t be underestimated. Russell Townsend is working on his Ph.D. in archaeology at the University of Tennessee and is passionate about his field. Yet at the end of my day in Cherokee, he revealed something I never expected. “I’d rather drive a garbage truck here,” he admitted, “than teach archaeology at a big, distant university like Princeton.”

ANDREA COOPER is an award-winning writer whose credits include Time, The New York Times, and NPR’s “All Things Considered.”
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The use of total stations in archaeological excavation has numerous advantages over traditional tape measurement. These advantages include rapid high precision and accurate measurements, the ability to directly record digital measurements to computer, and virtually no transcription error when coupled to a computer-based bar-code assisted data acquisition system (Dibble et al. 2007). Our excavations at Pinnacle Point in South Africa rely entirely on total station measurement directly to hand-held computer. In this “total station archaeology” (TSA) we use the total stations for all piece-plotting of finds and samples, section drawing, feature measurement and drawing, and grid lay-out. TSA allows for very powerful and rapid integration of digital imagery with grid-space, and here we describe how we use this approach to translate photography into geometrically true records of stratigraphic sections. This allows integration of plotted finds with imagery, and captures the goals of both section drawing and photography.

Traditionally, archaeologists approach the recording of stratigraphic sections in two ways that are usually rather poorly integrated. First, they photograph their sections, often employing various combinations of dry versus wet profiles, with and without flash, and using various combinations of zoom to capture as much of the profile as possible (wide angle) or as “flat” a profile as possible with minimal distortion (50 mm focal length or more on a 35 mm camera). Since photography can be accomplished relatively rapidly, most archaeologists photograph sections regularly in case of damage or collapse. Properly exposed and color-corrected photographs provide the most complete and objective record of a section, but they are not true to grid-space and this is a significant weakness. For this reason, most archaeologists also draw their profiles to scale, and this laborious process is sometimes saved for the final task upon completion of excavation. Section drawing typically involves establishing a level line across the top of the profile, and then measuring down to various points of interest. This process, as is true of all tape measurements, is relatively imprecise (McPherron et al. 2005). With TSA, we have the ability to join the strengths of photography and section drawings. As a case study, this report describes the procedures in place for photographing and rectifying excavated profiles at Pinnacle Point (Brown et al. 2009; Marean et al. 2007).

The Equipment and Methods in the Field

Most of our excavations at Pinnacle Point have focused on cave and rock-shelter sites, some with long continuous exposed sections, and others with smaller widely scattered excavation areas. We employ 3 Topcon total stations in our excavations, all positioned to cover overlapping areas under excavation, each run by a dedicated “gunner” who targets shots called in by the excavators. Our total stations have prism-less capability and are run by hand-held computers. Most total station manufacturers have prism-less models that cost slightly more than the prism-only models, and we have found that the prism-less capability is cost-effective. As the name implies, prism-less capability allows one to take measurements without the use of a reflective prism. This mode is most effective when shooting onto some type of high-contrast material. We typically shoot onto small pieces of thick paper or cardboard (a chit) with a round target (Figure 1). However, with adequate light one can shoot directly onto anything, and thus prism-less systems allow one to shoot onto and map features that are fragile or difficult to access. Prism-less shooting is as accurate and precise as using a prism within the designated ranges of the instrument.

We run our total stations entirely from hand-held computers (the Tripod Data Systems [TDS] Ranger, Recon, or Nomad). These are rugged systems with varying levels of water and shock resistance. Our hand-held computers run TDS Survey Pro software. This is powerful surveying software that allows you to access critical functions with minimal complexity. For example, the software allows a resection (shooting 3 or more points of known coordinates to establish the coordinates of the total station), stakeouts (providing the software with coordinates so that the total station can then find that point for you—useful for laying out a grid), and of course traverses and side shots. Side shots are what most archaeologists would use for measurement—
they involve shooting from a fixed location to plotted finds and other items of interest. Our hand-held computers are linked to bar-code scanners, and all plotted find numbers are bar-code scanned directly to the hand-held where the software joins the identification number to its three dimensional coordinates (see Dibble et al. 2007).

Survey Pro provides a read-out of the grid coordinates of each shot so that these can then be read to a person needing a measurement—for example, while drawing a feature or profile. Of course, these measurements are also stored in a database and can be plotted on screen for examination, or exported to a software package (such as Excel or a GIS). Of critical importance, Survey Pro allows the user to add information to each shot, and this information can be simple or complex. For example, each shot automatically prompts the user for a description, which can then be typed in. However, typing is prone to error and is time consuming.

To overcome this problem, Survey Pro allows the user to design drop-down menus for adding information to each point. These drop-down menus are built in an easy-to-use program that runs on the PC, and then your menus are loaded to the handheld and available for use. We have designed a set of menu add-ons for both excavation and field surveying. The former prompt the user for information like shot type (plotted find, photograph, section drawing). The latter prompt the user for descriptions of the feature being shot, and we have nested drop-down menus for various features (cave, cemented dune, speleothem, etc.).

The project uses Nikon cameras (D-series), and all excavation photographs are taken as RAW (NEF) images. An NEF file is a proprietary Nikon format that is essentially an unaltered and unprocessed image. It is the highest resolution available, yet is somewhat smaller than a TIFF. Before photographing begins, a series of numbered photo chits (Figure 1) are placed into the profile with small pins at roughly 50cm intervals. At least one, leveled photography scale is pinned to the profile, and when possible a level is also placed in the top of the photograph. A tripod is placed in front of the section, and we often use a Benbo tripod as their special leg configuration allows for more flexible positioning (Figure 2). We level our cameras, and this can be done with a small level or by adjusting the viewfinder so it lines up with the leveled scale on the top of the section. A series of photographs are taken with various flash settings and with the profile wet and dry. If the profile is particularly large, close-up photographs are also often taken of various portions. After the series of photographs have been taken they are checked on the on-site computer to be sure that the profile has been adequately captured for our records. Once a satisfactory series of photographs have been taken, the three-dimensional coordinates of the photo chits are recorded using a total station. These will later be used to rectify the photographs and place them into true grid space in our GIS.

The project also routinely takes plan photographs of features (such as hearths) or significant finds in situ. These photographs are also taken so that they can be placed in correct grid space. Four chits, marked as NE, SE, NW, SW, are placed in the appropriate corners of the area to be photographed. Several photographs are taken, again using a leveled camera on a tripod. The three-dimensional coordinates of the four chits are then recorded with the total station. When these photographs are rectified, it is possible to view them in correct grid space in conjunction with other plotted finds, samples, or features.
Image processing

All photographs are viewed using Nikon Capture Editor©, Nikon’s image processing software. Using the program’s Multiple Image Window, all the photos for a particular profile are compared to each other and a few of the best photographs are chosen for processing and rectification. The chosen photographs are then opened in Nikon Capture Editor to be color corrected. Not every photograph will need the same treatment and it is ideal to start with photographs that seem closest to true color on site. Several procedures are tested to see what gives the best results for each individual photograph. The main goal, of course, is to generate a photograph that most accurately represents the true profile. However, it is also important that adjoining profile photographs match so they can be joined in GIS. Most photography simply requires a resetting of true white, black, and/or gray. All profile photographs have a true black and white scale in them and photo chits are printed in photographic gray. It is possible to use the Set White/Black/Gray Point feature in Nikon Capture to tell the software what points in the photographs should be these respective colors (Figure 3). The program then uses this information to calibrate the coloring in the rest of the image. Other images may require an adjustment of the brightness or contrast or some filtering of red, green, or blue. All of this is easily done in Nikon Capture using the Color Balance Palette (Figure 3).

Rectification of photographs

When we began our project at Pinnacle Point, we started using an arbitrary grid, as most projects do. However, we have been able to correct our grid to the South African National Grid system (Lo.23). After color correction the profile photographs are rectified to true space on the South African National Grid using the coordinates of the photo chits in the photographs. This minimizes distortion of the image that is inherent in photography while also allowing us to view the photographs within a GIS environment.

We use ArcGIS© for all photography rectification, data viewing and analysis. The unrectified photograph is loaded into the GIS project using the Add Data button (Figure 4). The photograph will be added to the project but will not have spatial reference information attached to it. The photograph will be moved to the correct location using the photo chits visible in the image. The three-dimensional coordinates of each numbered chit are collected in the field using the total station and these data are stored in the project’s main database. It is necessary to tell the GIS what these coordinates are at each point in the image that represents the center of a photo chit. This is done using the Add Control Point tool found on the Georeferencing tool bar. First, zoom in on the center of the first chit. Then using the Add Control Point tool left click on the crosshair of the chit and then...
One of the main advantages of rectified photography is the ability to plot measured items onto the photograph and thus join measured observations to observed stratigraphy and features. Figure 5 presents an example of a section photograph at various steps of the process discussed. The photograph is from Pinnacle Point Site 5-6, a Middle Stone Age site currently under excavation. The first profile photograph is the original unaltered.
Figure 6: a-c) The color corrected images for PP13B profile N93.5 E106.5 to E109 d) The composite rectified image.
NEF version. The second photograph has been altered by setting the white point and slightly adjusting the contrast and red level. The third photograph has been rectified in ArcGIS and the plotted finds within 50 cm of the profile plane have been projected onto the photograph. Looking at plotted finds in conjunction with the profile photograph is particularly useful when checking the accuracy of field designated stratigraphic units and for determining occupation levels. In this particular example, one can see the plotted finds separate into several distinct levels.

Figure 6 gives another example of the usefulness of rectified photographs. It is possible to stitch multiple section photos together to get a detailed composite of larger sections that cannot be easily captured in one image. Taking smaller photographs of portions of the profile allows for a more detailed photograph, and allows one to avoid using wide-angle lenses that warp the image. These three photographs from PP13B are from different sections of the same profile. When the photographs are rectified they will create a detailed composite image of the entire profile. It is then possible to display plotted finds and other samples onto the photograph. Photographs in GIS can be turned on and off, and this can be extremely useful in visualizing the changing stratigraphy across a site. For example, if one has photographed a series of sections along a set of excavation lines (for example the N102 line, N101 line, N100 line), these lines of rectified sections can be successively turned on and off so as to see how particular strata change in configuration across a site.

Rectified photographs can be combined with various other analytical techniques to assist in understanding the formation processes involved. When we excavate we take two total station shots on any find that has a recognizable length. We have developed a GIS routine that generates a line representation of the orientation of these elongated artifacts. If we plot them on a rectified photograph, we can then examine the photograph to see if, within any particular strata, there are finds that lay out of horizontal distribution, suggesting a vertical disturbance. In this example, the finds are from three separate layers (plotted in different colors) from the LC-MSA deposits at PP13B, and are primarily lying along the natural bedding planes of the stratigraphy as shown in the photograph (Figure 7).

Conclusion

We have produced hundreds of photographs with rectification chips in them. Many of these images are ultimately chosen for rectification, and then become embedded in GIS projects. As such they become outstanding tools for analysis, but also a high-quality archive record of the stratigraphy. Using web-delivery tools, these could be made available over the web to other researchers, just as cities and municipalities use GIS tools to allow homeowners to find gas and electrical lines. Total Station archaeology combined with GIS provides many possibilities for improving the recording and analysis of archaeological field data, both with standard measured data such as artifacts (McPherron 2005), but also with imagery as we have shown here.
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The last decade has seen a steady rise in the use of hand-held computing devices like laptops and tablet PCs in higher education, so much so that the 2011 Horizon Report lists mobile computing as a top technology to watch in the coming year or two (Johnson et al. 2011:12). When mobile tablet PCs are equipped with scientific visualization software, classes can be taught outside, field methods demonstrated and data collected in real-time using the table PC pen. The technology of mobile computing has broad application in the field sciences (Armstrong and Bennett 2005), and archaeology is a terrific example of a discipline that can easily adapt to using mobile computing (Tripcevich 2010). Field-based mapping and data collection allow for the discovery of patterns while in the field (Clarke 2004; Searcy and Ure 2008). Data are instantly validated and verified due to the contextual awareness of the researcher, which facilitates spotting errors and gaps in data collection at a point when it is still possible to make corrections or to modify research plans (McPherron and Dibble 2003; Searcy and Ure 2008; Tripcevich 2010). Mobile devices for data collection will have a significant influence on higher education instruction (Armstrong and Bennett 2005), and many scientific disciplines have introduced tablet PCs into the field-based curriculum to promising results (e.g., Benson et al. 2006; Manone et al. 2008; Menking and Stewart 2007; Neumann and Kutz 2006; Tripcevich 2004a; Whitmeyer et al. 2010).

The role that field computing plays in archaeology is one that supports the move toward digitizing to preserve artifacts and field findings (King 2009). When used for archaeology fieldwork, a tablet PC for data collection can help the researcher eliminate transcription errors and improve accuracy, help to save money, provide data security, and allow for versatility while in the field (Searcy and Ure 2008). Tablet PCs offer a perfect complement to archaeological field equipment and reduce the need for a notebook and pencil (Tripcevich 2004b). But even with all the benefits of using a field-based computer, the field of archaeology has been slow to integrate this technology (Searcy and Ure 2008).

Team-based classes and problem-solving are intrinsic to archaeological study (Snow 2009). Experiential learning and real-world experience, if not already present, should be incorporated into the archaeology curriculum (Neusius 2009). A number of educators (Gumerman and Smiley 2009; Manone et al. 2006) also stress having students use industry-standard computer applications and the importance of developing marketable job skills. Some hold that students at the graduate level are not acquiring the field methods training needed for a career in archaeological excavations (Killick and Goldberg 2009). We understand that colleges are not vocational schools, but we agree with Snow (2009) and think that a modern effective curriculum must include exposure to learning rigorous scientific approaches that include skills and competencies.

Course Description

Field Archaeology at Vassar College, a small, selective liberal arts college, is a 200-level course in which students from all majors are welcome. Field Archaeology is taught as a team-based, problem-solving class investigating an ongoing research site in which the students use tablet PCs for data collection at the excavation site. The students learn traditional archaeological field techniques. The most important aspect of this class is to give our students the skills of recording and mapping test pits as the excavation proceeds. Class size is limited at 10 students for logistical reasons, particularly van size.

The course is a traditional Field Archaeology course and has been taught off and on by the second author since 1974. The students are outside each Saturday of the fall semester learning excavation techniques at one of Johnson’s research sites. Since the earliest years, Johnson has used standard archaeological excavation tools, like trowels, buckets, and sifting screens. As new technologies emerged, such as laser Total Stations, they have been incorporated into the course. The most important aspect of this class is to teach the students how to record and map the test pits as the excavation proceeds. In the past, students documented their observations both on record forms and
in narratives in their notebooks. In the early years these were typed up, later on processed by computer in order to create formal documentation of the excavation findings. In 2006, we integrated tablet PCs into Field Archaeology and the students recorded directly into the standardized record form designed for the research project (Figures 1 and 2). The students worked in teams of two or three taking turns digging (Figure 3) and documenting the surface of the test pit square with a tablet PC and pen to draw (Figure 4). The form we used is a Microsoft Word template, and drawing the surface of the excavation directly onto the tablet PC allows for capturing the structure of the levels without the drawings requiring recopying. We believe that this method avoids degradation of the data as occurs inevitably when maps are copied.

To see a video of our in-field classroom activities at the excavation, please see http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9t110lsa2yY.

Collecting Evidence

Over two separate semesters of the Field Archaeology course, Fall 2006 and Fall 2007, we conducted assessment and evaluation through the use of pre-course and post-course question sheets, collection of anecdotal evidence, gathering written student comments, and in-class observations. Our tests looked at attitudes and confidence level as well as skill attainment.

Figure 1. Grid form example showing the site location, layer depth, scale and drawing of excavation surface.

Figure 2. Excavation level form example, filled in with field information.

Figure 3. The students at the field site showing soil sifting in the background, excavation under the rock overhang and documenting the field site, in the middle ground, on a tablet PC.

Figure 4. Excavation test pit taped off on left side of photograph and student documenting the surface of the square test pit.
Results from the questionnaire show that the students gained confidence in their technological abilities, saw the value of working as a team, and enjoyed using the technology. In all aspects of technology use, the learners felt that they had gained skills.

For the two semesters in which we taught Field Archaeology using tablet PCs we had a total of 11 students. We gave the students a pre-course questionnaire on the first day of class and ended with a post-course questionnaire using a Lickert scale (i.e., 1 = strongly disagree; 3 = neutral; 5 = strongly agree) to measure attitude and confidence changes after completing the courses.

The following list shows the questions we asked on the post-course questionnaire and the percentage of positive agreement (only answers of 4s and 5s), totaled and averaged for both semesters:

- I am confident in my technical background. (36.4 percent agree)
- I have a solid background which will allow me to learn new technologies in the archaeology field. (63.6 percent agree)
- I see value in working in a team and collaborating with other students on different tasks. (100 percent agree)
- I see value in working in a team with students from another discipline. (100 percent agree)
- I enjoy using technology in my work and play. (54.5 percent agree)
- I understand the role that technology plays in archaeology. (90.9 percent agree)
- I feel confident in my abilities to enter the archaeological field. (72.7 percent agree)
- I developed specific field skills in this course. (100 percent agree)
- I have learned to synthesize and apply what I have learned from lecture in the field. (63.6 percent agree)
- I have gained critical thinking skills through this course (e.g., ability to evaluate different field methods, apply them to different situations). (63.6 percent agree)
- Applying techniques we learned in lecture in the field was valuable to me. (45.5 percent agree)
- Using technology in the course (tablet PCs, GPS, GIS) was valuable to me. (63.6 percent agree)

Again, the responses above are from only 11 students but we clearly see that they all recognize and appreciate the value of working as a team. Though there is very poor agreement on their attitude toward their own perceived technological abilities, they feel confident in their ability to learn, have an understanding in the role technology plays in archaeology, have confidence in going further into the field of archaeology, have an ability to synthesize and apply what they’ve learned, have gained critical thinking skills as a result of the course, and feel that the use of technologies in the course was of value.

We collected attitudes of skill attainment in a similar fashion as above. We asked pre- and post-course about the learner’s perceived level of skills shown in Table 1, as a question “Please rate yourself on your current understanding/ability to use each of the following skills. (1 = no experience, 2 = little experience, 3 = proficient, 4 = very proficient, 5 = expert).”

From the various skills questions, we can see a positive change, or growth in measured skills, throughout the class. At the beginning of the 2006 and 2007 courses, on average, the learners did not perceive themselves as proficient in any of the listed skills except for map reading and taking digital photographs. By the end of the course, nearly all categories of skills increased to proficient or better except for use of a docking station with a tablet PC and use of Global Positioning System units, both of which we did not get to using in the class.

We also collected written feedback from the students, asking them three targeted questions. Here is a subset of the comments that were made shown as bulleted items.

---

**Table 1: Results of skill attainment questions averaged for both semesters that Field Archaeology was taught (2006 and 2007) and the change from the beginning of the course to the end of the course.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Pre-Course Average (n=9)</th>
<th>Post-Course Average (n=11)</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Map Reading</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>+0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compass use in the field</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>+0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compass use with a map</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>+0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPS (Global Positional System) use</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>+0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collecting data in the field</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>+0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The features of a Tablet PC computer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>+1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attaching the Tablet PC to a docking station</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>+0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pen or stylus use with Tablet PC software</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>+2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entering data collected in the field into a computer</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>+1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Information Systems (GIS) software</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking digital pictures and transferring them to a computer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>+1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording archaeological data correctly</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+2.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q. What is the most important skill you developed in this course? Why do you think this skill is important?

- Basic excavation skills, particularly using a subdatum measurement and setting up a grid square. I think their importance is fairly obvious and essential.

- I now have a mental image of what archaeology entails.

- To learn how to set up test pits and datum. It's important to understand every aspect of a pit and where materials are found inside a pit.

- How to properly record artifacts, etc. on the PC because it's useful to learn new skills.

- Working as a team, which allows for easier and more effective excavations.

Q. What role do you believe technology plays in archaeology? Provide an example in which technology is helpful in archaeological studies.

- (I) is important for accuracy. Using technology to accurately map the location of a site or pit.

- (I) is very useful for visualizing the “big picture” layout of a site.

- (I) provides archaeology with the ability to gather, standardize and process information from different fields and in different mediums. It provides accurate and specific information that broadens archaeology’s reach.

- Being able to consolidate geographic, geological, archaeological and personal information and integrate into a single report is easier with such tools.

Q. What factors do you need to consider when supporting uses on tablet PCs?

- Providing spare batteries for the field.

- Battery problems are persistent. Generally the tablets are straightforward once you are accustomed.

- More memory and faster speeds so that it would be less time-consuming.

- How long they will be in the field vs. battery life AND conditions at the location (rainy/snowy).

- Love and care? Patience.

These responses give us confidence that the use of technologies such as the tablet PCs and the other field tools was not a hindrance and was in fact an asset to the course and benefited the learning outcomes of our students. Though the sample size is small, we think other schools can benefit from these data and from our work in integrating an emerging technology into Field Archaeology. Because of the small class sizes that we enjoy, we are able to provide more students with more time using the different technologies. And because we had multiple tablet PCs we were able to go to the field with confidence in the technology, though we never had a computer failure while in class. All of this should be useful information for other learning-centered institutions when it comes time to making purchasing decisions for new field hardware and tools, that there is a solid background of positive results when bringing tablet PCs into teaching a field-based course.

What We Learned

There are challenges to teaching Field Archaeology. Foremost, it is much more interesting to dig than it is to stop and record. This is true for whatever recording technology one is using. As the students familiarized themselves with using the tablet PC, the process of recording using a tablet became less onerous than using pen and paper.

We found two drawbacks with using the tablet PCs as you can see from the student’s written responses and we heard while in the field. First, the battery life in our original tablet PCs was too short. We are out in the field for eight hours and the battery lasted two hours. Though we had extra batteries, it is neither pleasant nor productive to have to stop what you’re doing to swap in the spare battery. This information helped us when we purchased newer tablet PCs because we bought tablets with a longer battery life. Second, we would like to see a more sensitive writing tool, with improved handwriting recognition. Some students preferred to use the tablet’s keyboard rather than the pen because they felt more comfortable typing and because the pen did not work in a comfortable way.

The written comments, the questionnaires, and formative comments during the courses all helped us in identifying new tablet PCs for our replacement purchase. We decided upon similar tablet PCs as we previously had (we had Hewlett-Packard TC1100s; see Table 2): light-weight, convertible tablets that can be used in the field as well as in the classroom. We purchased HP 2710P tablet PCs with extra RAM, daylight viewable screens, longer battery life, embedded cameras, car chargers, and extra batteries. We also purchased two ruggedized Panasonic Toughbook tablet PCs suitable for inclement weather, dirty and muddy field conditions, and cold or hot weather. We did hear, however, that some researchers take the 2710P tablets out in wet weather wrapped in a Ziplock bag.

Recommendations

We will continue to use tablet PCs in Field Archaeology to document excavations and collect data. We think tablet PCs signifi-
methodology even more by creating a form for data entry. For again erasing a time-consuming copying process. We are investigating Google Forms or Zoho Writer. We would like to explore streamlining the data collection method. Students have a tablet PC to use in this class. This would allow them to type up their narrative field notes while in the field, again erasing a time-consuming copying process.

We would like to explore streamlining the data collection methodology even more by creating a form for data entry. For this task we are investigating Google Forms or Zoho Writer. We think that this extra step might eliminate transcription errors entirely.

Acknowledgments. Many thanks are due to Hewlett-Packard and Jim Vanides for providing Vassar College with a Technology for Teaching grant in 2004 that allowed Prof. Johnson the opportunity to “play” with a tablet PC. We are grateful to Jason Long and Keely Roen of Pennsylvania State University for sharing their survey instrument which we modified to suit our needs.
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NEW DEAL ARCHAEOLOGY

ARCHAEOLOGY AND THE NEW DEAL
HOW ROOSEVELT’S “ALPHABET SOUP” PROGRAMS CONTINUE TO INFLUENCE ARCHAEOLOGY TODAY

Bernard K. Means

Bernard K. Means is an Instructor of Anthropology at Virginia Commonwealth University.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt’s federal work relief programs supported archaeological investigations across at least 75 percent of the 48 states that comprised the U.S. during the Great Depression. These programs were sometimes derisively referred to as “Alphabet Soup” because of the multiplicity of three- or four-letter acronyms used to refer to them, and included the Federal Emergency Relief Administration (FERA), the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC), the Civil Works Administration (CWA), the Public Works Administration (PWA), the Works Progress Administration/Work Projects Administration (WPA), and the National Youth Administration (NYA) (Figure 1). All of these programs would fund archaeological surveys and excavations conducted throughout the U.S. from 1933 to 1942. The idea that a citizen army of unemployed men and women could be sufficiently trained and supervised by the small, but determined, professional community that existed in the early 1930s was first tested in 1933 at the Marksville mound site in Louisiana using FERA funding (Lyon 1996:1). Federal officials were pleased with the success of this pilot project—as were archaeologists across the nation. As soon as new “Alphabet Soup” programs were created, local and state officials throughout the U.S. moved quickly to obtain relief workers to initiate or continue archaeological surveys or excavations (Fagette 1996; Haag 1985:274; Lyon 1996:4; Means 2012; Setzler 1943; Setzler and Strong 1936).

These work relief archaeological investigations generated extensive collections of artifacts and field records that retain considerable research potential. Archaeologists working across the U.S. today directly build on the legacy of New Deal archaeologists through reanalysis and reinterpretation of curated collections, often employing cutting-edge technologies. Members of the Society for American Archaeology’s (SAA) History of Archaeology Interest Group (HAIG) explored the continuing research potential of New Deal archaeology at the SAA’s 75th annual meeting in St. Louis in 2010 as part of the Biennial Gordon R. Willey Session on the History of Archaeology; many of the presenters have contributed to an edited volume expected to be published in the first half of 2012 from the University of Alabama Press. This volume cannot do justice to the amount of active research into New Deal archaeology that is currently ongoing and so HAIG sponsored a poster session highlighting the archaeological legacy of the New Deal at the SAA’s 2011 annual meeting in Sacramento. Some of that research is presented in the following pages of The SAA Archaeological Record.
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Archaeologists working in collections repositories, museums, universities, and other research facilities across the nation have at least a general notion of the New Deal–generated artifacts and archival records that these facilities safeguard from projects located in their specific locality or region. Some facilities have made determined efforts to make their collections more accessible to researchers, notably through electronic access via various web sites. A not very exhaustive list includes the Frank H. McClung Museum at The University of Tennessee in Knoxville (http://mcclungmuseum.utk.edu/research/recoll.shtml#Archaeology), the State Museum of Pennsylvania in Harrisburg (http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt?open=512&objID=4671&mode=2&in_hi_userid=2&cached=true), and the Irene Mound Collection from the Coastal Georgia Archaeological Society (http://www.sip.armstrong.edu/Irene/Irene.html). Despite this increased accessibility, the full geographic and temporal parameters of New Deal archaeological investigations currently are not well understood.

This situation stems partly from misperceptions about New Deal archaeology that have cropped up in my conversations with other researchers, and occasionally in print (see McCrorvie 2008, for example). Two major misperceptions are that New Deal archaeological investigations were largely confined to the southeastern United States because of the region’s more favorable climate, and that universities or federal agencies conducted all such projects. Some of these misperceptions stem from a cursory reading of two major works on New Deal archaeology published fifteen years ago: Paul Fagette’s (1996) Digging for Dollars: American Archaeology and the New Deal, and, Edwin Lyon’s (1996) A New Deal for Southeastern Archaeology (see also chapters in Pritchard [2009] and White et al. [2001]). These books focus on work relief archaeology in the southeastern U.S., notably through the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), and on investigations directed through major research universities, such as the University of Kentucky under William S. Webb, or under the auspices of federal agencies, notably the Smithsonian Institution and the National Park Service. New Deal archaeological investigations are often also commonly and uncritically referred to as Works Progress Administration (WPA) projects, regardless of the actual source of relief funding. William Ritchie (1954:4), for example, detailed his excavations at the Dutch Hollow site, an early historic Seneca village and associated cemetery in Livingston County, New York, as aided by a WPA crew through the months of September and October 1934. As the WPA was not created until 1935 (McElvaine 1993), some other relief agency must have supported this work.

I first became aware of these issues when I sought to contextualize the historical forces that influenced work relief archaeology in Somerset County, Pennsylvania, by contrasting these investigations to New Deal–funded research elsewhere in the Keystone State (Figure 1). As I conducted my research, I quickly learned that considerable work relief archaeology in the state was sponsored and directed by local governments or historical societies, and that, not surprisingly, much of this work was unpublished or inadequately published (Means 1998, 2010a, 2010b; Means and Harris 2010). Even when the material was published, it was not always identified as resulting from New Deal–funded investigations. For example, I discovered that archaeological work at Daniel Boone’s birthplace in Berks County, Pennsylvania, was a National Youth Administration (NYA) project through a reference in archival records that dealt with a different NYA excavation. The published account of these excavations left out this information, as well as the name of the person who directed the project, Eugene Gardner (Gardner 1940, 1941).

To further elucidate the full extent and nature of New Deal archaeological investigations in the U.S., I decided to draw on modern digital mapping tools to explore these decades–old excavations. My research began with modern published syntheses such as Fagette (1996), Lyon (1996), and Milner and Smith (1986); major works produced by the individuals directly involved in the New Deal investigations such as Cross (1941, 1956), Lewis et al. (1995), Webb (1938, 1939), Webb and DeJarnette (1942), and Webb and Wilder (1951); and innumerable articles written on sites large and small...
Although the SAA Archaeological Record is an excellent starting point, the proliferation of online access to journals, especially the “Notes and News” section of *American Antiquity* from the 1930s and 1940s, has facilitated this effort considerably. However, from the perspective of creating a GIS, some of the notes are vague and occasionally imprecise. In the October 1940 “Notes and News” (Anonymous 1940a:177), for example, the summary of Pacific Coast area research reported that:

> The Washington State Museum and the Department of Anthropology have been cooperating with the Spokane Public Museum in an archaeological survey of that part of the Columbia River Basin, which is being flooded through the completion of Coulee Dam. The digging in this survey is being done as an NYA project, and the work has been in progress since last August.

Because this region covers several counties, it is difficult to know even on the county level what geographic area is being described.

Searches of online digital journal databases, notably through JSTOR, on either the full names or abbreviations of the New Deal “alphabet soup” programs can turn up accounts of fairly obscure work relief projects that are at best tersely described. A 1940 report on NYA projects of all categories presented the following summary of excavations near Sacramento:

> Twenty boys were assigned to dig up Indian graves for the purpose of learning the cultural development of the Indians. They excavated ground to find specimens; they sifted the ground for artifacts; they restored the artifacts and cleaned, assembled and photographed them. Boys who were specializing in science were selected for this project. They were supervised by the administrative head of the junior college [Anonymous 1940b:87–88].

I have not as of yet found out if there was a formal publication on this research.

As others have noted through the years, much New Deal archaeological work remains unpublished or minimally published, and original field records might prove incomplete or nonexistent. A significant repository of well-organized WPA accounts can be found at the National Anthropological Archives (NAA) in Suitland, Maryland. There exists a relatively good index and finding aid (McCoy 2011) to the WPA reports now in the possession of the NAA, which, in many cases, include excellent site plans, artifact illustrations, and photographs of features and field personnel. At least for Pennsylvania, I can state that these reports reflect a small portion of the WPA work conducted in the state, and I suspect this is true for other states as well. And, these records do not cover work done by other “alphabet soup” agencies, such as the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) or NYA. Because WPA funds were dispersed to localities for officials to fund work as they saw fit, and these records do not cover work done by other agencies, the records of these excavations are likely somewhat decentralized as well. Some archival records and artifacts for Pennsylvania work relief projects are in the State Museum of Pennsylvania or the Pennsylvania State Archives, while others are in the possession of local historical societies (Means 2010a, 2010b). Again, this is likely true of many other states as well.

**A GIS for New Deal Archaeology**

Creating a GIS for New Deal archaeological investigations seemed the most effective way to display and analyze how work relief projects influenced the development of American archaeology on a national level. To keep this somewhat ambitious project manageable, I decided to limit the types of work relief projects I would initially map to archaeological surveys and excavations. Considerable efforts were expended by work relief crews on repairing, stabilizing, or reconstructing archaeological sites across the nation; tracking these as part of this pilot GIS effort would have made the project too cumbersome. I am also not examining at present the significant work relief efforts expended on museum collections and research (see, for example, Nash 2012), although I plan on incorporating these types of projects in the future as another layer in the GIS. The current map, created in ArcGIS 10, displays the individual counties within each state where records have been found that at least mention New Deal archaeology having taken place (Figure 2). Once the GIS becomes fully

---

**Figure 1: Illustration of WPA excavations at the Peck 1 village site, Somerset County, Pennsylvania. Courtesy of Virginia Satterfield.**
operational, researchers will be able to select a county within a state and obtain information on the type of New Deal archaeological investigations conducted within that county (Figure 3). The major variables incorporated into the GIS are: state; county; funding agency (e.g. CCC, NYA, WPA, etc.); sponsoring organizations; lead excavator(s); dates of investigations; references; and, associated websites. Individual site locations are currently not being mapped, partly out of an effort to protect those resources, and largely because this would be a prohibitive endeavor given the resources at hand.

Closing Thoughts

While not by any means an organized and integrated national effort, New Deal archaeology certainly radically transformed our understanding of America’s past, led to the professionalization of archaeology, and generated tremendous collections from significant sites that have enduring value to researchers. New Deal archaeology also represents the one time in history when ordinary American citizens were themselves closely integrated into the efforts to uncover the nation’s heritage. The GIS Map of New Deal Archaeology is intended in part to celebrate their contribution. As progress is made on the GIS map, details will be provided in the HAIG newsletter available freely on line at: http://www.saa.org/HistoryofArchaeologyInterestGroup/tabid/1434/Default.aspx.

Acknowledgments. I would like to give my profound thanks to Virginia Commonwealth University student Clinton King, a key figure in creating the GIS Map of New Deal Archaeology. Clinton was also a tremendous aid with research conducted at the National Anthropological Archives. I also would like to thank the staffs of the National Anthropological Archives and the Pennsylvania State Archives for their assistance over the years with obtaining access to original New Deal archaeology records. Janet Johnson of The State Museum of Pennsylvania has also helped considerably with my research. John Doershuk of Iowa State Archaeology graciously provided a list of sites excavated as work relief projects in Iowa that are incorporated into the GIS map. All errors or omissions are my responsibility.
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Public Archaeology can be seen as the “marketing branch” of the profession (Smardz and Smith 2000). Indeed, the romance of discovery inherent in the discipline has often been used to “market” it, and clearly this works. The mystery and adventure associated with archaeology draw many to the field, as a vocation or avocation. Big screen archaeologist Indiana Jones is all about the mystery and adventure; however, he expends little effort on the painstakingly complex process of moving from hypothesis to conclusion and even less effort communicating that information to his celluloid audience. Edward Kennard, a real-life contemporary of the fictional Indy, undertook the responsibility of educating the public to the archaeology surrounding them via his role as editor of the “Indians” and “Archaeology” sections of the American Guide Series compiled by the Federal Writers’ Project (FWP) under the auspices of the Works Progress Administration (WPA).

Creating archaeological texts ready for the masses is not a task usually funded by the U.S. government, but through the Federal Writers’ Project, a venue was created for providing the public with just this type of information. While a handful of writers had been employed prior to the FWP, often concerning work of a historical nature, such as interviewing former slaves or recording folk tales, this new project challenged state directors to produce prose with lasting value, not dry government jargon. The FWP needed to produce “real books, books meant to be used, to be read for pleasure as well as information, and to be talked about” (Taylor 2008:311). The goal of these guides, destined to become the equivalent of “Baedekers” for each state of the union, was born out of an effort initiated in Connecticut (Taylor 2008). The term “Baedeker” comes from name of a German publishing house that had pioneered the printing of travel guides for countries during the first half of the twentieth century, and the name became synonymous with any type of travel guide.

In the United States the FWP based the plans for state guides on the work of Edgar L. Heermann, a retired minister who wandered the wilds of Connecticut promoting conservation of its lakes and forests. His labors resulted in The Connecticut Guide: What to See and Where to Find It (1935). Heermann’s project was initially supported by the Civil Works Administration (CWA) and completed with funding from the Federal Emergency Relief Administration (FERA). Publication occurred just as the FWP was beginning to develop similar plans for the other 47 states along with Washington, D.C. and territories, such as Puerto Rico and Alaska.

Henry Alsberg headed the FWP but recognized that the scope of this endeavor would require many lieutenants. The guides would cover each state’s “geology and conservation programs; its climate, flora, and fauna; its Indian tribes and archaeology; transportation; agriculture; industry, commerce, and finance; labor; education; public health and social welfare; sports and recreation; newspapers and radio; folklore; literature; music and theater; art; architecture; and uniquely in the case of California, movies” (Taylor 2008:312, emphasis mine). He hired Edward A. Kennard as the editor for the “Indians” and “Archeology” sections after Professor Franz Boas of Columbia University recommended Kennard for a “possible specialized editorial position of the staff of the American guide” (National Archives, College Park, MD. F. Boas to H. Alsberg, letter, 25 March 1936, Papers of the Federal Writers’ Project). Kennard started on April 1, 1936 at a salary of $2600 per year.

The task of creating and editing guides for each of the states entailed a daunting amount of work. In a letter to George W. Cronyn, Associate Director of the FWP, dated roughly a year after he undertook this task, Kennard alludes to his own workload. “Only 99 more weeks of editing copy at the rate of 150,000 words per week!” (National Archives, College Park, MD. E. Kennard to G. Cronyn, letter, 4 May 1937, Papers of the Federal Writers’ Project).
Protection vs. Promotion

By asserting that Edward Kennard played a key role in the early promotion of Public Archaeology is not to discount the importance of the Antiquities Act of 1906 in protecting those resources. Public interest in the archaeological landscape of North America has a long history, dating to the time of the founding fathers and Thomas Jefferson’s excavations of Native American mounds on his property surrounding Monticello.

Public awareness of antiquities grew as more visually spectacular remains were reported in the American Southwest. Casa Grande became the first federally protected archaeological site when President Benjamin Harrison issued an executive order in 1892 to protect it (Harmon et al. 2006:21). As interest in the past grew, it spawned a market for authentic prehistoric objects, leading to the increasingly widespread practice of vandalism and looting at archaeological sites. Until the Antiquities Act was passed, the chief tool available for protecting antiquities on public land was the power to withdraw specific tracts from sale or entry for a temporary period (Harmon et al. 2006:27). This practice was ineffective at best. North America’s archaeological heritage needed something stronger. The first step was passage of the Antiquities Act.

One of the strongest justifications for protecting the country’s archaeological sites was to preserve their educational value, but the drafted legislation focused mainly on the permitting processes necessary to allow researchers access (Harmon et al. 2006). According to the act, the “objective of archaeological investigations is to study the past through historical and scientific methods, not to retrieve objects for display, exhibit, or sale” (Harmon et al. 2006:6). Thus, the Antiquities Act preserves the archaeological remains for study and, indirectly, creates an expectation of providing the public with knowledge about that past, not necessarily providing the public with the actual objects. This second part takes another three decades to begin.

The New Deal and Our Archaeological Heritage

The federal government funded multiple archaeological projects in many states during the Great Depression (Fagette 1996; Lyon 1996), first under the Federal Emergency Relief Agency (FERA) and later under the Works Progress Administration. The WPA and archaeology had complementary needs—the WPA needed to create jobs, and archaeology needed laborers (Taylor 2008). While this direct funding of archaeology introduced many WPA employees to the discipline and practice of archaeology, the State Guides created by the FWP provided the general public with a window into the archaeological heritage of each state—and in many cases, even gave them driving directions.

Idaho claimed the position of first state guide out of the gates in January of 1937. The publication drew rave reviews:

The state guidebooks continued to roll off the presses for the next several years. Maine, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Vermont, and the Washington, D.C. guides debuted alongside Idaho in 1937, followed by Connecticut, Delaware, Iowa, Minnesota, Mississippi, and New Hampshire the following year (Figure 1). The last of the state guides was published in 1941.

Consistency and cultural accuracy were constant goals, and Kennard often required revisions from local authors to meet them. In April of 1936, Kennard requested several changes in terminology regarding Nevada’s native inhabitants: “Page 3 Use the terms ‘men and women’ rather than ‘bucks and squaws.’...Page 37 ‘Princess’ in an inaccurate term to describe social position among North American Indians.” (National Archives, College Park, MD. E. Kennard to E. Hintman, letter, 7 April 1936, Papers of the Federal Writers’ Project). However, his critiques were not always welcome. The author of that section, Elizabeth Hintman, declined to make the requested changes:

As to the use of the words man and woman, as you suggested, in place of ‘buck’ and ‘squaw’, the latter terms are universally used in all the western states, and cast more refection on the Indian than does the term ‘wife’ when referred to by the husband. The buck invariably refers to his woman as his ‘squaw,’ and who in turn speaks of him as her ‘buck’ or man...In reference to ‘Princess’ (Sarah) Winnemucca; She was always known as such, even from her child hood days, and practically every story or article told or written about her gives her that title, and in her lecture tours, covering many of the states of the Union, she was always referred to in advertising as the ‘princess.’...Trusting that the correction made will meet with your approbation, I am Very truly yours, Elizabeth A. Hintman [National Archives, College Park, MD. E. Hintman to E. Kennard, letter, 4 May 1936, Papers of the Federal Writers’ Project].
While the guides were usually written by local authors, the editorial board worked in the nation's capitol and retained the right to control the content. George Cronyn supported Kennard's editorial decisions, shown by his letter to David E. Williamson, the Nevada State Director of the FWP:

[We] will not accept the article in its present condition. It must be thoroughly understood that all work written State offices is subject to the approval of Washington and that State editors are required to take into account the comments and criticisms of this office. Mrs. Hintman apparently objects to making the changes suggest by Dr. Kennard, and in that case I can only that suggest that someone else make them or else rewrite the article, since it is not entirely satisfactory...Whatever may be common usage among ranchers and others, in the American Guide Series we do not speak of 'buck' and 'squaw' and this is a fixed policy to which there will be no exceptions [National Archives, College Park, MD. G. Cronyn to D. Williamson, letter, 12 October 1936, Papers of the Federal Writers' Project].

In addition to the “Indians” and “Archaeology” sections of each guide, multiple, detailed driving tours, covering the significant features of each state, including many archaeological sites, invited readers to “get to know the state” on their own. Edward Kennard edited and drove many of these Arizona routes personally and then reported back to George Cronyn: “[A]bout 10,000 miles all over the roads and half the creek bottoms in the state and all are written” [National Archives, College Park, MD. E. Kennard to G. Cronyn, letter, 18 August 1937, Papers of the Federal Writers’ Project].

Each tour started with a short list of sizable communities and main highways utilized during the journey. The total mileage was listed and notes regarding the types of roads to be encountered. Below is the opening entry for Tour 2A in the Arizona guide:

Flagstaff—Cottonwood—Clarkdale—Junction with US 89; 87.1 m., State 79 (Oak Creek Canyon Highway).

Asphalt-paved.

Heavy snows in the northern part sometimes block travel temporarily.

Limited accommodations [WPA Guide to Arizona 1940:327].

The prose that follows educates and engages the reader so completely that the reader would not have to actually drive the tour to feel as if they had been there, which would be helpful during a time when a large portion of the population did not possess the financial resources to spend on a pleasure trip (Figure 2):

On the main side route is a junction with a paved road, 15.6 m.; L. on this 1.1m to MONTEZUMA CASTLE NATIONAL MONUMENT (adm. 10 cents), a five-hundred-acre tract surrounding one of the best preserved prehistoric cliff dwellings. The castle is in a recess halfway up the face of a perpendicular rock cliff 145 feet high. Early white visitors erroneously associated the place with Montezuma...The ash-pink adobe castle is reached by a series of ladders placed against the face of the cliff. The first floor is a horizontal row of eight rooms—some of the adobe bricks set in cement show the fingerprints of the original mason [WPA Guide to Arizona 1940:331].

These tours provide data of the archaeological, historical, geographical, economical and even fanciful varieties, as shown by this short passage that immediately follows the physical description of Montezuma Castle: “A cowpuncher once traded a saddle horse for Montezuma’s Castle—then...
Kennard held his editorial position until June 14, 1938, when his status necessarily changed due to congressional funding cuts. He continued his work on the Guides as a consultant without pay in addition to his new job at the Toreva Day School in Polacca, Arizona (National Archives, College Park, MD. E. Kennard to W. Cunningham, letter, 16 April 1938, Papers of the Federal Writers’ Project). These professional changes were not altogether disappointing for Kennard. He had initiated a research plan with the Hopi of Arizona before he took the FWP job. In a letter to Alsberg written soon after he started at the FWP, he indicated a desire to be assigned to the headquarters in Arizona (National Archives, College Park, MD. E. Kennard to H. Alsberg, letter, 4 June 1936, Papers of the Federal Writers’ Project). Ultimately, in 1938, his request was granted.

Edward Kennard understood archaeology deals with the heritage of all peoples and because of that we, in the profession, have a responsibility to communicate what we know to the public. Today archaeologists are rightfully becoming more and more concerned with how our work with the past is presented to, and consumed by, nonspecialists. The SAA’s homepage on the internet (www.saa.org) displays portals “For the Public” and “For the Press” with equal prominence as the portal “For Members,” clearly indicating our professional organization’s position that archaeology is not just for the archaeologists. We deal with a public resource—public monies, policies, and laws that often drive preservation and protection efforts. The ultimate goal of archaeological inquiry is to improve people’s lives by helping them to enjoy and appreciate their cultural heritage, that is, to educate them (Jameson 2003:160–161). In these efforts, we are following in the footsteps of Edward Kennard and the Federal Writers’ Project.
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Historical archaeology—the archaeology of the Modern World (approximately the last 500 years of human history)—has its disciplinary roots in the historic preservation movement of the United States during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (Pykles 2008). Historical archaeology’s true institutional beginnings, however, are tied to the federally sponsored archaeology projects conducted under the auspices of the New Deal programs of the 1930s. Chief among those projects in terms of the development of historical archaeology in the United States were the 1934–1941 excavations at Jamestown, Virginia, directed by J. C. Harrington (Figure 1). During this critical time in the history of the field, Harrington established some of the fundamental methods and practices used by historical archaeologists today and did much to promote and legitimate the emerging discipline. As a result of these efforts, Harrington is widely recognized as the “founding father” of historical archaeology in the United States (Miller 1998:5).

There are numerous isolated examples of excavations at U.S. historic sites from the seventeenth through early twentieth centuries, some even at the site of Jamestown (Hosmer 1981; Linebaugh 2005; Schuyler 2001). However, it was not until the passage of the Historic Sites Act of 1935, which clearly outlined the National Park Service’s preservation mandate, coupled with the generously funded New Deal work programs, that the preservation movement in the United States reached a level of coherent organization and professionalism, under which historical archaeology gained an institutional foothold (Hosmer 1981).

The preservation efforts at Jamestown were central to this development. Leading the way early on was The Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities (APVA), which acquired a portion of the original Jamestown town site in 1893 and eight years later (1901–1902) sponsored exploratory excavations of the ruins behind the old church tower, the only standing architectural remains from the seventeenth century. It was not until 1934, however, when the National Park Service (NPS) secured possession of the main portion of Jamestown Island, that a large-scale archaeological program at the site was instituted, relying on the labor of young African-American men enrolled in the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC). Because there were few, if any, professionally trained archaeologists with any experience, let alone interest, in excavating historic sites at this time, the NPS looked to Henry C. Forman, an architectural historian, to direct the new Jamestown archaeology program. From the beginning, the NPS initiated a peculiar division of labor between Forman’s crew and that of the other bona-fide archaeologists hired to assist in the project. Essentially, Forman and his crew were to excavate the foundations scattered throughout the townsite, while the trained archaeologists and their men were assigned to dig in the “non-architectural” parts of the site, searching for things like colonial-period ditches and fence rows that would help delineate historic property boundaries. Highlighting this bizarre division of labor was an alleged “three-foot rule” that forbade the archaeologists from coming closer than three feet to a foundation in their excavations (Harrington 1984:35).

Over the next two years this bifurcated program of excavation led to jealousy, mistrust, and in-fighting, which ultimately resulted in the resignation, dismissal, or reassign-
ment of the entire supervisory staff in the summer of 1936 (Harrington 1984:36, 1994:4; Hosmer 1981:612). Into this void stepped J. C. Harrington (Figure 1), who at the time was completing graduate work in archaeology at the University of Chicago. Harrington, in many ways, was seen as the ideal candidate for the Jamestown dig. Prior to enrolling in graduate school to study archaeology, he had earned a bachelor’s degree in Architectural Engineering at the University of Michigan and worked as an architect in both New Mexico and Indiana. Significantly, as part of his undergraduate education he spent the summer of 1923 working with the School for American Research in Santa Fe, making measured drawings of nine early Spanish Mission churches and visiting prominent archaeologists, including Edgar L. Hewett and Alfred V. Kidder, at their excavations. It was during this time Harrington developed more than a passing interest in archaeology. When the Great Depression seized the U.S. economy, however, in the early 1930s, Harrington lost his architectural job in Indiana and was faced with one of three choices: “either working for the Government, selling apples, or going back to school and doing graduate work” (Harrington and Harrington 1971:2). Although he chose the latter, enrolling at the University of Chicago in 1932, it was only four years later when the NPS offered him the job at Jamestown (Harrington 1994; Miller 1998; Pykles 2010).

The NPS saw Harrington’s background in architecture and his graduate training in archaeology as the ideal suite of skills for the Jamestown archaeology project. Like other historical archaeological projects at the time, the digs at Jamestown were architecturally oriented. Emerging as they did from an interest in preserving and interpreting the historic built environment, the goals of these early excavations were “to uncover foundations and secure architectural information about the original buildings...for the purpose of better on-site interpretation for the visiting public.” (Harrington 1984:31–32). Artifacts, when collected, were “viewed as secondary items appended to architecture and serving the goals of restoration” with the result that “the museum case rather than the scholarly monograph is the benefactor” (Schuyler 1975:3–4). This emphasis on historic site restoration dominated the new field in its early years. Indeed, the majority of archaeologists involved early on with this kind of work used the term coined by Harrington himself to describe their activities—“historic site archaeology” (Harrington 1952). This is perhaps best illustrated by the way the Jamestown artifacts were treated during the two years of excavation preceding Harrington’s arrival. Referring to the situation as “the great tragedy of Jamestown,” Harrington noted that “Instead of keeping artifacts together for each feature or grid unit for later comparative study, each class of object was stored together—glass bottles, iron hinges, clay pipes, etc.” (Harrington 1984:35). This resulted in an amazing assemblage of seventeenth-century material culture, but, unfortunately, with absolutely no context. To his credit, during the five years (1936–1941) in which he presided over the Jamestown dig, Harrington reversed this practice and began to record the provenience of recovered artifacts and store them by excavation units, rather than by type.

Harrington’s contributions to the formalization of historical archaeology in the United States, however, go far beyond his methods in the field and lab. Indeed, his greatest contributions, and perhaps the principal reason he is considered the “founding father” of historical archaeology, were his efforts to make this new kind of archaeology at Jamestown publicly visible and legitimate. To appreciate this fully it is important to understand the cultural and intellectual climate in which Harrington’s archaeological work at Jamestown took place. As the nation struggled with the economic woes of the Great Depression, political and intellectual leaders began to promote a usable past, one that sought to inspire the public with a new sense of nationalism and provide a remedy for the depressed morale of the citizenry at large. The passage of the 1935 Historic Sites Act and the historical work assigned to many of the New Deal work programs, including the CCC excavations at Jamestown, can be understood as part of this overall history-making agenda (Hosmer 1981; Pykles 2008; Schuyler 1976). Indeed, all of the historians, archaeologists, architects, and other researchers involved in the historical programs of the New Deal served as “missionaries who gave American history a new dimension” (Hosmer 1981:6).

In addition to participating in the nationalistic proselytizing program of the time, Harrington viewed his work at Jamestown as an effort “to spread the gospel of historical archaeology” (Harrington 1984:41). One of the first things he did upon arriving at Jamestown in 1936 was take down the high board fence erected by his predecessors to keep “the curious and bothersome tourists away from the excavations.” Not only did Harrington recognize that “such an attitude...was quite inconsistent with the policies of and philosophy of both the APVA and the National Park Service,” but he also realized that “the CCC (and the Depression) would not last forever.” Thus, sensing that “the public understanding and acceptance of historical archaeology was essential,” and that “The Jamestown project presented a golden opportunity to promote this cause,” Harrington and his colleagues took various measures to showcase and interpret historical archaeology to the visiting public, providing one of the earliest examples of public archaeology in the United States (Harrington 1984:38; see also Harrington and Harrington 1970, and Pykles 2006). One of the most impressive efforts in this regard was a program developed by Harrington’s future wife, Virginia Sutton (one of the first woman rangers employed by the NPS), called “This Week at the Excavations,” which involved a weekly exhibit of the archaeology work being performed and daily, guided tours of the excavations (Figure 2).
Another important part of this effort involved the construction of a laboratory facility with a public corridor and large glass windows through which visitors to Jamestown could observe the CCC men reconstructing the artifacts coming out of the excavations (Figure 3) (Harrington 1984; Harrington and Harrington 1971).

In addition to exposing the public visitors at Jamestown to historical archaeology, Harrington also used the spoken and printed word to promote the new field among his archaeological, historical, and like-minded peers. One notable example comes from early in his archaeological career when he gave a speech at the American Association of Museums, which was later published as an article in The Regional Review (a monthly periodical of the NPS), in which he extolled the virtues of the new kind of archaeology taking place at Jamestown. The main purpose of the article was to “illustrate the manner in which archeological and documentary research work together, each supplementing, interpreting, and verifying the facts brought to light by the other.” In making this claim, Harrington was well aware of other kinds of archaeology that similarly utilized the written record (e.g., Classical archaeology). But, whereas history and archaeology were often relegated to separate spheres and time periods in other parts of the world, Harrington argued that he and his colleagues were doing things differently at Jamestown. “Here,” he declared, “historical research and archeological research are working hand in hand,” creating “an ever-expanding body of knowledge made possible by the combined activities of several fields of specialization.” Perhaps the most important point made in the article, however, was what Harrington identified as “the most significant contribution of the work at Jamestown,” namely “that a great quantity of historical knowledge can be obtained by careful, painstaking archeological research, no matter how recent the site” (emphasis mine). This was, indeed, a “new approach to the study of historic sites,” and Harrington was at its forefront (Harrington 1940).

Significantly, the Jamestown excavations figured prominently in the continuing development of historical archaeology even after Harrington left Jamestown to become the Eastern Regional Archeologist for the NPS. In that capacity Harrington witnessed the growing numbers of excavations at historic sites across the country, “for the impact of the Jamestown digging had really been felt, particularly in the National Park Service” (Harrington 1984:40). Furthermore, many of Harrington’s early influential publications relied on examples from his work at Jamestown to illustrate the importance of the emerging field (see Harrington 1952, 1955, 1965).

By the 1960s, when historical archaeology emerged as a truly professional discipline, highlighted by the establishment of the Society for Historical Archaeology in 1967, many of the discipline’s leaders at that time, including Harrington himself, had been active participants in one of the various archaeology projects at Jamestown since the 1930s (Harrington 1984). John L. Cotter, the SHA’s first president, for example, directed additional excavations at Jamestown from 1954 to 1956, and did much to further promote and establish historical archaeology as a legitimate scholarly discipline (Schuyler 2003). Given the role his excavations at Jamestown played in the formation and development of the discipline, it is not surprising that, fifteen years after its founding, the Society for Historical Archaeology created the J. C. Harrington Medal to honor those who, like Harrington, have made life-long contributions to the discipline (Figure 4).
Through his fieldwork, publications, and public outreach Harrington did more than anyone else at the time to establish and promote historical archaeology as a viable field of inquiry. But, in the end, it is also important to remember the critical role of federal support and funding in the development of the field. Indeed, without the New Deal there might have never been this new kind of archaeology.
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The New Deal-era collections at the Frank H. McClung Museum at the University of Tennessee (UT) are among the largest of their kind. The majority of the collections were made in conjunction with construction of Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) reservoirs, another New Deal-era program. Many scholars use the artifacts and field records, but few know about the related, large correspondence archive. These letters, exchanged between UT staff and many other anthropologists, illustrate the close personal and professional connections of the still-young discipline. The letters are often typed, but some are handwritten. They discuss topics such as archaeological field and laboratory techniques, interpretations, staffing, and government relations. Many letters chronicle daily project business such as payroll, field equipment and office supply needs, field updates, and logistics, while other letters contain more personal anecdotes. This correspondence, now available in digital form at, provides insights to the personalities and ideas that shaped and continue to influence archaeology in the United States.

Staffing

Thomas M. N. Lewis came to the University of Tennessee in 1935. He was hired to run Works Progress Administration (WPA) programs in the state. Lewis had received his bachelor’s degree at Princeton and attended graduate school at the University of Wisconsin. He also did volunteer work with W. C. McKern at the Milwaukee Public Museum. Once in Tennessee, he began hiring capable supervisors from the ranks of graduate students in departments with which he was familiar. Most of the young WPA supervisors came from upper Midwestern schools like the Universities of Wisconsin, Michigan, and Chicago (Lyon 1996:141–142; Sullivan 1995:xvii, 1999:69–71) (Figure 1). These supervisors were in charge of large crews of untrained laborers, put to work by the WPA (Figure 2). Many of the supervisors had been trained in Fay-Cooper Cole’s University of Chicago field schools, and many also went onto become well-known archaeologists across the country. The correspondence files shed light on their early training and experience with WPA projects in Tennessee. Letters of application, resumes, and letters of recommendation are included in the correspondence files for some of these staff.

The letters also provide insights to prejudices in hiring practices that were typical of the time, such as those against women. Despite limited opportunities for women in the field (Claassen 1993, 1999; Lyon 1996), the letters document that Lewis sought to hire several women to work in supervisory roles in the WPA laboratory and to teach anthropology courses at the University of Tennessee. Lewis hired Madeline Kneberg, a doctoral candidate in biological anthropology at the University of Chicago, in 1938 to run the lab. He also attempted to hire Harriet Smith from the University of Chicago and did hire Alice Hendrick, a student from the University of Michigan. Sexist attitudes at the time are apparent in James B. Griffin’s criticisms of Lewis’s hiring of Hendrick and Kneberg. Griffin states in a letter to Lewis regarding Hendrick, “Even if she has a Ph.D., I would hesitate to bring a woman into the teaching staff or even attempt to” (March 3, 1938). Griffin wrote in regard to Lewis’s hiring of Kneberg, Griffin’s former Chicago classmate, “You certainly have gotten a ‘personality,’ but I recommended a physical anthropologist. I will bet you a dollar that Madeline Kneberg knows more physical anthropology than Dick Snodgrass” (May 3, 1938). Of interest, is that after Kneberg was hired, correspondence between Griffin and the UT staff shifts from Lewis and Griffin to Kneberg and Griffin. By the 1939 Southeastern Archaeological Conference meeting in Macon, Georgia, Griffin and Kneberg appear side by side in the conference photograph.

Archaeological Field and Laboratory Techniques

The correspondence includes informal reports on the progress of fieldwork and the methods being employed, as
well as responses to requests for information about the field and lab techniques the projects were developing. Based on the contents of many letters, Charles H. Nash appears to be the instigator and innovator of many new techniques. For example, in response to a request for information about innovative techniques from Frederick Johnson, editor for the Society for American Archaeology Notebook, Nash describes several methods and equipment used by WPA workers. Nash states that “While every Field [sic] man will, in time, develop a whole series of personal ways to handle his problems, it is, as you say, seldom that these reach distribution, remaining instead unknown ‘tricks of the trade’ “ (November 1, 1940). Nash then lists detailed descriptions of different kinds of stakes, plotting of post molds, drying racks, a ground plan board, and a sprinkling system for wetting features and profiles, all used in New Deal projects. One of the most important field methods used by WPA excavators was the incorporation of horizontal stripping, or peeling (Lyon 1996:149–152; Willey and Sabloff 1974:130). This technique, developed in the Old World, was used at many sites in Tennessee, the most well-known of which was Hiwassee Island where it was employed by Nash (Figure 3).

Letters also show that UT staff solicited help in developing methods from other experts in the field. For example, the standard WPA method for botanical preservation came from Neil M. Judd, Curator, Division of Archaeology, Smithsonian Institution. “In treating charred wood we have found that a saturated solution of paraffin dissolved in gasoline was most satisfactory and I believe you will find it of use in your current work” (Judd to Lewis, October 16, 1935). By the late 1930s a draft field and lab manual (Lewis and Lewis 1995:603–658), compiled by UT staff, was being circulated for comment among many of archaeologists of the day, as is documented in the correspondence.

Interpretations

As the WPA projects progressed, UT staff sought input and ideas for interpretations from numerous colleagues. The correspondence shows who the influential people were in the discipline at the time, including Franz Boas (Figure 4) and those most involved with developing the interpretations in Tennessee (Figure 5). Notably absent in the correspondence files are communications between University of Tennessee staff and those at the central WPA lab in Birmingham, Alabama.

A running correspondence with John Swanton at the Smithsonian focused on relationships between ethnohistory and archaeology. Swanton was particularly interested in the problem of identifying archaeological sites of the Yuchi in eastern Tennessee. His interest influenced J. Joseph (Finkelstein) Bauxar, of the UT WPA staff, to correlate the Mouse Creek phase with the Yuchi (Bauxar 1957). On a broader scale of

Figure 1. Map showing from where the Tennessee WPA supervisors were recruited.
interpretation, Swanton emphasized the role that archaeology could play in anthropological interpretations of the past. On September 26, 1945, Swanton wrote to Lewis, “I shall be glad to take the time to read the chapter of your forthcoming report...The importance of the archaeological approach to narratives of discovery and exploration is self-evident.” Swanton was also heading the de Soto Commission at the time and several letters make references to his research on the de Soto route (Figure 6).

Other major contributions to interpretations included the work being done by James B. Griffin on ceramics in the eastern United States and Frank Setzler on Paleoindians. Griffin started the Ceramic Repository at the University of Michigan during this period and utilized collections from many WPA projects, including the Norris Basin in east Tennessee, the basis for his dissertation. Correspondence chronicles Griffin’s development of ceramic classification and methods of analysis. Setzler wrote Lewis looking for fluted point data from Paleoindian sites in what was an early study in the peopling of the Americas.

Experimental archaeology and public interpretation were also incorporated into Tennessee WPA projects. At the Thompson Village site, excavated as part of the Kentucky Lake project, a Mississippian house was reconstructed by George Lidberg. Development of the Chucalissa site in Memphis, which was designed as a roadside museum for public interpretation, also was planned at this time. These and other public interpretation projects are discussed in the letters.

Government Relations and Professional Organizations
The files contain many letters about routine dealings between the WPA and UT staff regarding administrative matters. They recount the myriad of forms and procedures that were necessary for WPA projects. These procedures had proved so problematic in North Carolina that Joffre Coe wrote to Lewis requesting to come to Knoxville to be mentored in setting up WPA projects (Coe to Lewis, March 9, 1939). Once Coe had learned the WPA ropes, UT and UNC staff maintained a strong working relationship.

Some disputes surrounding the conduct of the work also are documented in the letters. These include the well-known
feud between Lewis and William Webb of the University of Kentucky over control of the Tennessee projects (Dye 2012; Fagette 1996; Lyon 1996:144–145; Sullivan 1999:72–74). The struggle between Florence Hawley and Roy Lassetter over control of the dendrochronology research also is chronicled in letters written by both Hawley and Lassetter. This dispute was ultimately won by Lassetter because of his connections with the TVA (Nash 1999:213–243).

Several letters include reference to the first meeting of the Southeastern Archaeological Conference (known then as the Conference on Pottery Nomenclature for the Southeastern United States) held in Ann Arbor, Michigan, in 1938 (Lyon 1996:193). The arrangements for many subsequent SEAC meetings also are discussed in the letters.

After the WPA projects were terminated because of the war, the correspondence provides insights into the effects of World War II on the UT Division of Anthropology and the discipline. Tom Lewis in response to Francisco Antonio Velez Arango, a prospective student from Columbia, noted “enrollment...has dropped to half of normal since the beginning of war and classes in Anthropology were discontinued in 1942.”

**Personal**

Many of the letters contain references to personal connections and incidents or anecdotes from the field. In fact, the relationships formed during WPA projects continued throughout the careers of many of the involved archaeologists, as is chronicled in additional correspondence which dates from the World War II period and beyond. These letters also are housed at the Museum. Early personal connections are apparent in a letter from Charles Fairbanks to Madeline Kneberg (“rat race” is a 1930s term for a jazz dance).

As you probably know by this time Loyster and we-uns are planning a rat race for the thirteenth. We wondered if you and Miss Hendricks would be in on it. Lidber will probably bring a girl from here—our ex-stenographer. I’m sure you will ahev [sic] a good time if you like parties and it will give it some excuse for being—if all of the gang doesn’t get in on such things they rapilde [sic] get out of hand. Another thing is that the boat ride here sunday [sic] seems to appeal to the boys we invited Loyster and Hendrick, if they decide to come why don’t you truck along? [Fairbanks to Kneberg, August 5, 1938].

---

Figure 5. Map showing the range of professional contacts of the Tennessee WPA staff. This map is not an exhaustive representation of the people who corresponded with the Tennessee staff.
Other letters are more serious in nature (discussing jobs, family, and education), while some report amusing anecdotes such as this one from George Lidberg to Tom Lewis (“Bud” referenced in the letter is Earl Loyster).

Dear Prof:

Will it be possible for you to send me another map of this immediate area. [sic] The map was laying here on the desk and Bud’s dog, a pup newly acquired, was left in the laboratory while none [sic] was here and did a fairly good job of mutilating it. If you cannot get another one, I can perhaps patch this one up in a fashion where it might be more or less legible. The dog, incidentally, will no longer be permitted in the laboratory [Lidberg to Lewis, February 11, 1939].

Accessing the Collection

The WPA period has been referred to as the “Golden Era of Southeastern Archaeology.” This article only scratches the surface of what is available in the correspondence files at the McClung Museum. While most archaeologists understand the continuing research value of the WPA-era collections of artifacts, the value of related correspondence to research on the history of archaeology in America cannot be underestimated. Anyone interested in studying the WPA records at UT can contact the Frank H. McClung Museum (http://mcclungmuseum.utk.edu/). Another important WPA-era resource is the archive of photographs of the WPA/TVA projects in Alabama, Kentucky, and Tennessee that can be viewed online (http://diglib.lib.utk.edu/wpa/index.php).
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The SAA Board of Directors met on March 30 and April 2 at the 76th Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology in Sacramento. The first meeting was chaired by President Meg Conkey and attended by President-elect Fred Limp, Secretary Barbara J. Mills, Secretary-elect Janet Levy, Treasurer Chris Dore, and Directors Barbara Arroyo, Cory Breternitz, Patricia Crown, Karen Hartgen, Alston Thoms, and Melinda Zeder. Incoming Treasurer-elect Alex Barker and incoming Directors, Kelley Hays-Gilpin and Eduardo G. Neves, attended as guests, and Executive Director Tobi Brimsek attended ex officio. The second meeting was chaired by President Fred Limp, and included the new incoming members of the Board of Directors (Barker, Hays-Gilpin, and Neves), while outgoing members (Conkey, Mills, Arroyo, and Breternitz) were released to enjoy a day of participating in sessions.

In her report to the Board, President Conkey first thanked all the Board members with whom she had worked during her terms as President-elect and President. She discussed several of SAA’s new initiatives: the new process for recruiting members to SAA committees inaugurated in Fall 2010; the establishment of a new committee to raise funds for and implement a scholarship program for individuals from groups historically under-represented in archaeology; the early results from the Needs Assessment Survey which had an excellent rate of return (47 percent of those contacted responded to the survey); and exploration of a possible new journal to be published by the Society. President Conkey also summarized progress in planning the Conferencia Intercontinental, scheduled for January 2012, in Panama City, Panama. This is the first of what is planned to be a biennial series of conferences, held in diverse locations, to highlight archaeological research in Latin America. The Conferencia is envisioned as an opportunity for focused interaction among scholars in a more intimate setting than the SAA’s annual meeting. President Conkey also summarized the Society’s healthy financial situation and upcoming financial challenges, and closed with praise for SAA’s extraordinary staff and Executive Director, Tobi Brimsek.

Executive Director Tobi Brimsek then discussed the highlights of her report to the Board. The biggest news is that she has finalized a lease on new space for the SAA offices. In late June, 2011, the staff will be moving to a downtown location in Washington, D.C. (1111 14th Street NW, Suite 800, Washington, D.C. 20005). This new space is more appealing (windows!) and better organized than the current office, and is located in a more easily accessible downtown part of Washington, D.C. Furthermore, the new lease will save the Society money. The Executive Director went on to discuss activities in Government Affairs, which have been especially challenging with the election of the new Congress. SAA has worked on several cultural resources issues in collaboration with partners in the archaeology and historic preservation communities. She discussed potential challenges to the Society’s fiscal stability. Membership numbers are down slightly, but pre-registration for the meeting in Sacramento exceeded expectations. Advertising in the journals has declined a great deal, and will probably never recover; similarly, institutional subscriptions are declining and probably will continue to do so. The Executive Director also discussed her activities in planning the Conferencia Intercontinental, including a trip to Panama to negotiate with the convention center there. She closed by summarizing activities by herself and SAA staff in the areas of Education and Public Outreach, Publications, and Marketing.

The Secretary, Barbara Mills, reported the results of the elections. Alex Barker was elected as Treasurer-elect; Kelley Hays-Gilpin and Eduardo G. Neves were elected as new Directors; and Christine Szuter and Kim Carpenter were elected to the Nominations Committee. Total ballots sent out were 7,805, and 1,628 (20.8 percent) were returned.

SAA Treasurer, Chris Dore, reported on SAA’s currently good fiscal condition. Budget year 2010 was profitable for the Society because of income from dues, meeting registration from the 75th Anniversary meeting, and investments. At the same time, there are increasing expenditures needed for information technology and compliance requirements (such as to legally process credit card payments). He also highlighted those income areas
that are declining, such as institutional subscriptions and advertising. While membership and the annual meeting are the most significant revenue sources, SAA also depends on these other revenue lines and will have to develop strategies to overcome losses. Treasurer Dore urged the Board to put a significant part of the 2010 surplus into the Reserve Fund.

Following reports from the officers and Executive Director, the Board turned to consideration of agenda items. Board members were pleased to be able to allocate enough of the 2010 surplus to the Reserves Fund to raise reserves to 90 percent of our goal, which is one year’s operating budget. The Board also allocated surplus funds to the Technology Fund, the Moving Fund, the fund for the Conferencia Intercontinental, the Education and Outreach Staffing Fund, and a new fund to support childcare (see below).

The Board reviewed the new process for recruiting members for SAA committees, and discussed the relatively minor glitches that occurred in the first implementation of the process. There will be a slightly revised call for nominations in the next cycle, and new information about each committee will be posted on the members’ side of the SAA website. The new process appears to be successful in expanding participation and diversity in the appointment of committee members.

The Board discussed an initiative to establish a new scholarship fund, paralleling the successful Native American Scholarships fund, to encourage participation in archaeology by other historically under-represented groups. Diane Gifford-Gonzalez, the first chair of this new committee, met with the Board to discuss fund-raising and implementing the new scholarships. The Board was able to start the fund with $3000 received from the Cotsen Institute of Archaeology at UCLA.

In another initiative, the Board agreed to support three consecutive years of childcare at annual meetings (2013–2015; there is no available space at the 2012 meeting in Memphis), followed by an assessment of the success of the program. Funds were set aside in the Childcare Fund for this purpose. At the same time, the Board established a Task Force on Childcare to create a plan for sustaining childcare at annual meetings beyond 2015.
During lunch on March 30, the Board met with Wayne Donaldson, Chair of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP). On Saturday, April 2, the Board had breakfast with chairs of SAA committees, reviewed the process for recruiting new members, and discussed other issues. That day, the Board met during lunch with Alison Rautman, editor *American Antiquity*, Chris Pool, co-editor of *Latin American Antiquity*, Ken Ames, editor of The SAA Press, and Deborah Nichols, chair of the Publications Committee. (Jane Eva Baxter, *The SAA Archaeological Record*, and Gabriela Uruñuela, *Latin American Antiquity*, were unable to attend.) We discussed strategies to ensure that editors turn over no more than 2 issues of a journal to an incoming editor. In other publication news, the Board discussed ongoing market research about a potential new electronic journal. The tentative title of this proposed journal is *Archaeological Practice*, and it would probably be delivered electronically.

Dra. Nellie Robles García, of the Consejo de Arqueología of INAH, brought greetings to the Board from Alfonso de Maria y Campos Castello, Director General of the Consejo. The Board discussed opportunities for collaboration with her. T.J. Ferguson, chair of the Government Affairs Committee, and SAA staff member David Lindsay, Manager, Government Affairs, reported to the Board on current and future issues in government affairs, including possible changes to the Section 106 process, the growth of government affairs concerns at the state level, and the final stage of implementing NAGPRA, the regulations for disposition of unclaimed remains. John Norder, chair of the Repatriation Committee, also visited with the Board and discussed future plans for the Committee.

The Board discussed plans for its Fall meeting, when the Needs Assessment Survey and the marketing research for a possible new journal will be discussed in detail. In closing, the Board sincerely thanks outgoing committee and task force chairs for their service to the Society: Susan Bruning, Virginia Butler, Kim Christensen, David Cushman, Deborah Olszewski, Sannie Osborn, Jennifer Petty, Mario Rivera, Barbara Roth, Katharine Schreiber, Sissel Schroeder, Rebecca Schwendler, Wendy Teeter, Kirsti Uunila, Paul Welch, and Renata Woyne. We also thank the outgoing members of the Board for their exemplary service: Meg Conkey, Barbara Mills, Cory Breternitz, and Barbara Arroyo. Finally, we thank Jon Muller for his long-time service as Chair and only member of Ceremonial Resolutions Committee, and welcome Dean Snow as the new chair of that committee.

### SAA 2012 CALL FOR NOMINATIONS

The 2012 Nominating Committee of the Society for American Archaeology requests nominations for the following positions:

- **President-elect** (2012) to succeed to the office of President for 2013–2015
- **Secretary-elect** (2012) to succeed to the office of Secretary for 2013–2015
- **Board of Directors member, Position #1** (2012–2015), replacement for current member Patricia Crown
- **Board of Directors member, Position #2** (2012–2015), replacement for current member Karen Hartgen
- **Nominating Committee Member, Member #1** (2012)
- **Nominating Committee Member, Member #2** (2012)

If SAA is to have effective officers and a representative Board, the membership must be involved in the nomination of candidates. Members are urged to submit nominations and, if they so desire, to discuss possible candidates with the 2012 Nominating Committee Chair Dean Snow (drs17@psu.edu).

Please send all nominations, along with an address and phone number for the nominated individual, to:

Chair, 2012 Nominating Committee  
c/o SAA Executive Director  
900 Second St., NE #12  
Washington DC 20002-3560

or fax to 202 789-0284  
or email to tobi_brimsek@saa.org

Please note that nominees must be current members of SAA. Nominations should be received no later than September 1, 2011.
President Margaret Conkey called the SAA’s 76th Annual Business Meeting to order at 5:10 PM on Friday April 1, 2011 after a quorum was determined to be present by the Secretary. She asked for the minutes of last year’s business meeting in Atlanta to be approved. The motion was moved, seconded, and approved by the membership.

President Conkey presented her report to the members. She thanked the Nominations Committee for their work on putting together an excellent slate of candidates. She thanked the outgoing Board members and all outgoing committee chairs, including Jennifer Perry (Program Chair) and Sannie Osborne (Annual Meeting Local Advisory Committee Chair), and their respective committees. She especially noted the work of Executive Director, Tobi Brimsek, and the SAA staff.

The President then reflected on her term in which there were challenges predicted and unpredicted and how she depended on past and present officers for their wise counsel. The past two years have been a time for exceptional activity. A new meeting submissions system is in the works and will be in place by Hawaii. A new call for committee members was begun, a member survey conducted with 47 percent response rate, planning for a new journal was begun (including focus groups at the annual meeting), and a new scholarship fund for historically underrepresented members was established. The Conferencia Intercontinental, to be held in January 2012, is open for submissions. Financially, the reserves target has been moved to 95 percent of the operating budget and for funding several new initiatives. Although we are financially healthy there are things to watch for and which require funding. There are new regulatory measures that the SAA must comply with, equipment that needs to be replaced, and there is a decline in the amount of revenue from several sources including advertising and journal subscriptions. Treasurer Dore announced a modest increase in dues for members, but that students will see a decrease in their dues.

Barbara Mills, Secretary, gave her report. She announced the results of the elections: Alex W. Barker as Treasurer-elect, Eduardo Neves and Kelley Hays-Gilpin as new members of the Board of Directors, and Christine R. Szuter and Kim Carpenter to the Nominations Committee. In addition, the bylaws amendment to remove the Membership Development Committee as a standing committee was passed.

Executive Director, Tobi Brimsek, gave her report. She noted that this year the Board has hit a great balance of action and conservatism. The SAA is on the move in more ways than one. The SAA’s lease in the headquarters office expired, necessitating a move but the move will actually save money. The annual meeting submission system is being revised with input from staff,
The President reminded the membership that the Editors’ reports are posted on the web. She thanked the editors for their work and acknowledged Alison Rautman (American Antiquity), Chris Pool and Gabriela Uruñuela (Latin American Antiquity), and Jane Baxter (The SAA Archaeological Record). She also thanked the outgoing editor of The SAA Press, Paul Minnis, and welcomed Ken Ames to that position as well as Ken Sassaman as Editor of American Antiquity. She noted that two new publications have come out of the SAA Press, Madonna Moss’s volume on Northwest Coast: Archaeology as Deep History; and Archaeology in 3-D: Deciphering Buried Sites in the Western US, edited by Matthew Seddon, Heidi Roberts, and Richard V.N. Ahlstrom.

Following the presentation of the awards (see below), President Conkey asked if there was any new business. Being no new business, President Conkey asked the Chair of the Resolutions Committee, Dean Snow, to present the ceremonial resolutions, which were approved by the membership. The Chair thanked the retiring officers, President Margaret Conkey and Secretary Barbara Mills, and Board Members Barbara Arroyo and Cory Breternitz for their service. He then thank all of those engaged with the planning of the annual meeting including the staff, especially Tobi A. Brimsek, the Executive Director; all the volunteers who worked at Registration and other tasks; the Program Committee, chaired by Jennifer Perry, including Mark Allen, Michelle Buzon, John Douglass, Ernesto Gonzalez-Licon, Colin Grier, Holley Moyes, David Robinson, Fraser Sturt, Christina Torres-Fouff, and Gregory Wilson; and the Annual Meeting Local Advisory Committee, chaired by Sannie Osborne, and including committee members Dana McGowan and Susan Stratton. All other committee chairs and members completing their service and other members who have served the Society on its committees and in other ways were also thanked. Sincere wishes were expressed for the safety of those members of the society who are now serving in the armed forces as well as to all those affected by the recent tragedy in Japan. Last, a resolution of sympathy to the families and friends of J. Richard Ambler, Donald Brockington, Alan L. Bryan, Thomas Charlton, Karen Dohm, William Duffen, Robert Dunnell, Joaquin Garcia-Barcena, William R. Farrand David A. Gregory, Brenda Dorr Guldenzopf, Laurence C. Herold, Juan Pedro Laporte, Paul S. Martin, JoAnne Medley, Robert Rands, E. Gene Riggs, James T. Rock, Kenneth Rosen, Dee Ann Story, H. Trawick Ward, Joseph C. Winter, and Gary Yancy.

President Conkey then passed on the gavel to incoming President Fred Limp after acknowledgment of the staff for their work. President Limp took the podium and added his thanks to the staff, committee and interest group chairs, and committee members. He also thanked the outgoing members of the Board. He noted how high the bar has been set by President Conkey for his own term as president. Standing ovations were given to both President Conkey and Tobi Brimsek.

The President called for a motion to adjourn, which was made and seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 6:15 PM.
shrinking revenue streams, we are now at 90% of our goals, which is one year’s operating budget.

The call for submissions is out for papers and posters for the all-new first time ever Conferencia Intercontinental in January 2012; look for the information on the inside covers of this issue and the March issue of The SAA Archaeological Record (now always available in full electronic format on the home page of the SAA website). The hard work of Dan Sandweiss, Tomás Mendizibal, and SAA Executive Director Tobi Brimsek in planning and preparing for this meeting in Panamá mean that this will be a reality and will bring the SAA to Latin America in a new way. There is much excitement and enthusiasm for this initiative.

And lastly—although there are other activities and initiatives— I am pleased to note that the SAA offices are moving to centrally located and with windows (!), still in Washington DC. This is expected in late June 2011 and the staff is ready for a new venue.

As we all welcome Fred Limp as the next President, we have developed a metaphor for what several creatively ambitious and yet fiscally prudent Boards have done to and for our incoming President. Fred realizes that he may be like one of those tennis players at practice with an automatic ball machine on the other side of the net, just shooting all sorts of balls (i.e., SAA initiatives) at him all at once. But believe me, he has not only been a part of this activity this past year, but also he can surely react to each and every new exciting initiative and has a number of new ones already bubbling, as the SAA has been able to move forward without losing our foundational fiscal and organizational support. It has been an extraordinary privilege to serve as the President for these past years; an impossible task for anyone if there were not Tobi Brimsek and the SAA staff. I was learning new things right up until the very last days, was more than pleased to find each and every Board member to have been so engaged, thoughtful, and yet willing to forge ahead with ideas and actions to keep the SAA a dynamic, nimble, and responsive organization well into the second decade of the 21st century. Thank you for your participation, your support, and your loyalty to this premier organization.

The 2010 Needs Assessment Survey is currently under analysis by the Board and will be a major action item for the Fall Board meeting. You, our members (47%), responded to our request for input that will guide some future directions for the Society. Thank you for your time and participation and the guidance that it will provide to the Board.

**REMARKS OF THE INCOMING PRESIDENT**

Fred Limp

The Sacramento meeting was the 4th largest SAA meeting ever! Each meeting reminds me again that it is the incredible work of SAA's hundreds of volunteers that makes the Society what it is. Without all of the committed people that we have, there would be no SAA. The wonderful work produced by our committees and task forces are the building blocks of the Society. To be at an annual meeting is to see it all in action. Annual meetings are a keystone component of the Society and it was a pleasure to see things go so well.

If you aren't already, think about how you would like to get more involved in SAA. In the recently completed needs assessment more than half of you said they were interested in serving on a committee. We want to take you up on that offer! The next Call for Volunteers will be out in late fall. This last fall we put in place a new system to make it easier to serve. To apply to serve on an SAA committee you only need to fill out and submit a brief form on SAAweb. Over 100 members volunteered through the open call process initiated this past fall and we want to grow that number in 2011. Also—remember, if you are eligible and would like to be reappointed, you must apply through the call as well. We hope that you will want to get involved!

Coming in January 2013 is SAA's first Conferencia Intercontinental, a meeting with a one plenary session, an attendance limited to 250, and a select group of peer reviewed papers and posters. The Conference is designed to bring SAA to Latin America (Panama City, Panama) and to provide a supplemental avenue of engagement for SAA members and non-members in Latin America. Submissions are due by June 15, 2011. Check it out on SAAweb www.saa.org and click on the “Conferencia Intercontinental” logo.

If you submitted a paper for Sacramento—thanks—and you know that the current SAA Annual Meeting Submissions System could use some improvement! An all-new SAA submission system is under development and will be inaugurated for the 2013 meeting in Hawaii. Only one more year with the current system!

Under discussion is the role of SAA in professional development. This was another topic that was identified as an important one in the needs assessment. Two task forces will be examining the kind of professional development that members have expressed a need for and that the Society can provide. Watch for more on this critical topic and new opportunities to build your skill sets at the Memphis meetings next year.
2011 AWARDS

SAA award recipients are selected by individual committees of SAA members—one for each award. The Board of Directors wishes to thank the award committees for their hard work and excellent selections, and to encourage any members who have an interest in a particular award to volunteer to serve on a future committee.

Presidential Recognition Award

PAUL MINNIS

For his unstinting attention to the SAA Press and for your creative approach to bringing the most current ideas and issues to the membership through our publications. Despite the challenges at a transitional time in print publication, your humor, your good sense, and your flexibility have made this a productive time in SAA publications.

Presidential Recognition Award

JONATHAN MULLER

For his dedication to the memorializing of our deceased members over many years, for your always reliable and comprehensive gathering of their names, and for your appropriately serious and reverent presentations at the annual meetings.

Presidential Recognition Award

SUSAN B. BRUNING

For her dedication to the understanding of and advising on one of the most important, always evolving, and challenging issues, namely, repatriation; her articulate and fair insights and assessments; her committee leadership and willingness to travel for the best interests of the Society; and for her professionalism, sense of equity and balance, and always timely advice.

Gene Stuart Award

DAN VERCANO

Dan Vergano, an award-winning science reporter for the national daily newspaper USA TODAY, has earned the 2011 Gene S. Stuart Award for his interesting, thoughtful, and authoritative writing about problem-oriented archaeological research in the Puuc region of the Yucatan Peninsula, Mexico. “So long, said the Maya” and its online version present the reader with a no-nonsense yet engaging view of important research questions explored from the perspective of the Kiuc site in the Yucatan. Vergano blends his astute reporting with the authority of individual archaeological investigators and their assessment of archaeological evidence to involve the reader in exploring rapid abandonments of some Maya sites. His discussion of archaeological evidence in the contexts of time, physical and social environments, and culture enable the reader to connect the analysis of the site with the complex processes of change in the Yucatan and elsewhere.

Student Poster Award

RECIPIENTS: ALEXANDER SMITH AND DANIELLE RAAD

Alexander Smith and Danielle Raad have earned the 2011 SAA Student Poster Award for their poster submission entitled “The Metallurgy of Iron Mine Hill: The Use of Cumberlandite in Colonial Iron Artifacts from Rhode Island.” The poster presented original research on colonial iron artifacts from Rhode Island that utilized new technologies for examining the chemical signature of a particular local iron ore, cumberlandite. Iron artifacts from two archaeological sites, Green Farm and Potowomut, were
examined and the relative frequencies of certain elements were compared allowing the authors to make arguments about the use of certain iron ore sources. This innovative research project will provide a platform for future studies and contributes to our understanding of colonial metallurgy.

Ethics Bowl

WINNER: UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA-SANTA BARBARA

State Archaeology Week Poster Award

Each year the State Archaeology Week Poster Contest is held at the annual Meeting, sponsored by the Public Education Committee and the Council of Affiliated Societies. Winners are decided by a vote of those viewing the posters and turning in a ballot included with their registration packets. The winners are:

First Prize: WYOMING
Second Prize: OREGON
Third Prize: CALIFORNIA

Fred Plog Memorial Fellowship
WILLIAM REITZE, UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

Douglas Kellogg Fellowship
TERESA WRISTON, UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA – RENO

Arthur C. Parker Scholarship for Archaeological Training for Native Americans and Native Hawaiians
KAMAKANA CHRISTIAN FERREIRA (NATIVE HAWAIIAN)

NSF Scholarships for Archaeological Training for Native Americans and Native Hawaiians
ROBERT JAMES DAVID (KLAMATH)

KEVIN J. BROWN (NAVAJO NATION)
THAN NIVERSARY MEETING

LIANA STACI HESLER (PONCA)

SAA Native American Undergraduate Archaeology Scholarship
GARRETT W. BRIGGS (SOUTHERN UTE)

SAA Native American Graduate Archaeology Scholarship
FRANK JAMES RASLICH (SAGINAW CHIPPEWA)

Student Paper Award
RECIPIENTS: MELANIE BEASLEY, JACK MEYER, ERIC J. BARTELINK, AND RANDY MILLER

Through their well-written and argued paper titled “Human Bone Diagenesis in a Prehistoric Burial Mound from the Central California Delta: Bioarchaeological and Geoarchaeological Approaches,” Melanie Beasley, Jack Meyer, Eric J. Bartelink, and Randy Miller contribute to both site-specific and potentially discipline-wide archaeological investigations. Using real world examples, they demonstrate the utility of geoarchaeology for selecting viable samples of human bone for stable isotope analysis. As they state explicitly, their methods are useful not just for understanding cultural and geological histories of individual sites; they also enable archaeologists to make the most of limited funding and field time, and to select only the most information-rich human bones for invasive analyses.

Dissertation Award
SCOTT G. ORTMAN

Scott Ortman’s dissertation, Genes, Language, and Culture in Tewa Ethnogenesis, A.D. 1150-1400 (Arizona State University, 2010), is a multistranded study of the depopulation of the Mesa Verde region, and the origins of the Tewa People. Through meticulous study of archaeological material, skeletal remains, ethnography, and linguistic data, the author establishes that Tewa origins lay in a massive migration from the Mesa Verde region. This exodus likely stemmed from the rise of a religious movement against the increasing social hierarchy at Mesa Verde. To reconstruct Tewa ethnogenesis, the author traces Tewa biological, linguistic, and cultural inheritance, weaving diverse bodies of contemporary theory in multiple disciplines with original approaches, including a pioneering method for discerning conceptual metaphors in material culture. The dissertation exemplifies how a study focused on a particular question in prehistory can be a basis for a signal theoretical contribution to the anthropology of social change.

Book Awards

The Society for American Archaeology annually awards a prize honoring a recently published book that has had, or is expected to have, a major impact on the direction and character of archaeological research, and/or is expected to make a substantial contribution to the archaeology of an area. The Society for American Archaeology also annually recognizes a book that has made, or is expected to make, a substantial contribution to the presentation of the goals, methods, and results of archaeological research to a more general public.

Book Award
VERNON JAMES KNIGHT, JR., MOUND EXCAVATIONS AT MOUNDVILLE: ARCHITECTURE, ELITES, AND SOCIAL ORDER

Mound Excavations at Moundville: Architecture, Elites, and Social Order presents the results of a long-term research project at this major center of monumental Mississippian architecture. Ver-
non James Knight, Jr., synthesizes a vast amount of data, ranging from the results of innovative mound-excavation methods to the analysis of artifacts, faunal remains, features, and paleobotanical material, to reveal the rise and subsequent evolution of the Moundville chiefdom. His conclusions have far-reaching implications for the worldwide study of monumental architecture and its role in the emergence and maintenance of socio-cultural complexity. As the sole author of the principal text, Knight gives a coherence and unity to the narrative that is often missing in many modern site reports. The University of Alabama deserves recognition for the high quality of this landmark contribution to American Archaeology.

Public Audience Book Award

STEVEN SIMMS, TRACES OF FREMONT: SOCIETY AND ROCK ART IN ANCIENT UTAH

Traces of Fremont: Society and Rock Art in Ancient Utah brings to vivid life the infrequently celebrated Fremont culture of Utah. Steven Simms seamlessly weaves the material remains of the Fremont culture, and especially the stunning rock art, into a marvelous tapestry that includes eloquent and accessible descriptions of how archaeologists have learned what we know of these people and fictionalized vignettes of what their lives must have been like. Simms’ prose is engaging and the text is complemented by the spectacular photographs of François Gohier. The University of Utah Press and the College of Eastern Utah Prehistoric Museum have done well by Simms and Gohier with a well-produced volume exhibiting effective design and high-quality reproduction of the photography.

Award for Excellence in Archaeological Analysis

STEVEN SHACKLEY

Steven Shackley has earned the SAA’s Award for Excellence in Archaeological Analysis for his analytical and technical contributions using raw material sourcing in the interpretation of the social relations underlying lithic assemblage patterning. Dr. Shackley’s achievements combine outstanding scholarship in XRF analysis, geoarchaeology, archaeometry, flintknapping, and lithic technology with an anthropological perspective on a diversity of cultural processes and interactions, including quarrying, long-distance trade and exchange, ethnicity, migration, style and group identity, and gender interaction. His published work on these topics spans both cultural resource management and academic projects, and focuses on regions as diverse as the North American Southwest, Mexico, South and Central America, Ethiopia, the Middle East, and the Russian Far East, as well as temporal periods from the Middle Stone Age to Paleoamericans to the Neolithic to the ethnographic present. This award recognizes Steven Shackley’s significant role in advancing archaeological research in the field of lithic analysis.

Award for Excellence in Cultural Resource Management

NELLY ROBLES GARCÍA

Nelly Robles García has earned the SAA’s award for Excellence in CRM for her long and unwavering history of service and contributions, both in publication and presentation, to the administration of cultural resources in Oaxaca and Mexico. Her development of a center in Oaxaca for the documentation of best practices in site management from around the world will benefit heritage managers for years to come. Over the past twenty-five years, she has provided exemplary leadership in planning for site management, and advocacy for dynamic management of cultural resources by state and national governments. Her leadership has provided direction and guidance for cultural resources management that will benefit both the resources and their managers long into the 21st century.

Crabtree Award

GEORGE POETSCHAT

George Poetschat has earned the SAA’s Crabtree Award for his outstanding focus on archaeology as an avocationalist. He has not only participated in archaeology, but he has also done archaeological research, published the results, and reached out to the public to engage their interest in the subject. In addition to his participation in 80 plus projects over more than two decades, Mr. Poetschat has authored or coauthored more than 35 publications in professional journals and monograph series. He was a founding member of the Oregon Archaeological Society (OAS) training program and has helped develop and conduct both the OAS’s “Basic Training in Archaeology” and the “Rock Art Recording” classes from 1993 to present. As an OAS training program leader, he has taught archaeology to students every year since
1991 in both museum and public school venues. Mr. Poetschat has provided admirable service to the field of archaeology as avocationalist.

**The Fryxell Award for Interdisciplinary Research**

**R. Lee Lyman**

No single person has brought such strong taphonomic and paleontological rigor to the discipline of zooarchaeology as R. Lee Lyman. His work has been instrumental in convincing Quaternary scientists and conservation biologists on the value of archaeological records to understanding past ecosystems. Early in his career, Lyman initiated leading-edge research by devising rigorous methods for measuring animal bone density, which greatly increased our ability to assess the role that human and nonhuman forces play in creating faunal assemblages. His research on cervids was immediately embraced by the archaeological community, and later expanded to include numerous taxa from diverse geographic locations and temporal periods. His problem-oriented research revolutionized the study of marine mammals with regional-scale analysis of butchery, prey demography, biogeography, and modern conservation. His publication record by any measure is extraordinary. Lyman’s meticulous, quantitative methods have become the gold standard to which his students and peers are always striving to achieve. It is for these reasons and more that we honor R. Lee Lyman with this award.

**Lifetime Achievement Award**

**W. Raymond Wood**

W. Raymond Wood is the 2011 recipient of the SAA Lifetime Achievement Award, in recognition of his enduring recognized scholarship and his extensive service to the profession. Dr. Wood is an eminent figure in North American archaeology whose work in the Great Plains has deepened archaeological and ethnographic scholarship in the region. His many contributions to Plains archaeology range from Quaternary paleoecology and prehistoric settlement to historical cartography and the early fur trade. His early interdisciplinary collaborations set the standard for research on the human component of the Quaternary period. In addition to his own extensive publications, he has served as a highly effective editor of *Plains Anthropologist* and *American Antiquity*. In his teaching, research, and service-related activities, Dr. Wood has conveyed the importance of archaeological ethics and has emphasized engagement with avocational archaeologists.

**Award for Excellence in Latin American and Caribbean Archaeology**

**Jeremy A. Sabloff**

Jeremy A. Sabloff has earned the Award for Excellence in Latin American and Caribbean Archaeology for his contributions to method and theory in archaeology, and to the construction and dissemination of archaeological knowledge. His outstanding research at Seibal, Cozumel and Sayil provide important models for theoretical and methodological approaches and have influenced many generations of students. His role in the development of the successful Latin American Archaeology Program at the University of Pittsburgh is an example of the way in which he has been a positive force within archaeology during his entire career and has made a lasting contribution theoretically, empirically, methodologically and in other ways that directly affect the continued vitality of the discipline and of Latin American and Caribbean archaeology specifically. His long service to the SAA, together with a successful blend of administrative responsibilities and research commitments, continue to mark his professional trajectory.

**CEREMONIAL RESOLUTIONS**

The Resolutions Committee offers the following resolutions:

Be it resolved that the appreciation and congratulations on a job well done be tendered to the Retiring OFFICERS

Margaret Conkey, President
Barbara Mills, Secretary

and the retiring BOARD MEMBERS

Barbara Arroyo
Cory Breternitz

To the Staff, and especially Tobi A. Brimsek, the Executive Director, who planned the meeting, and to all the volunteers who worked at Registration and other tasks;

To the Program Committee, chaired by
Jennifer Perry

and to the Committee Members of the Program Committee
To the Annual Meeting Local Advisory Committee, chaired by

Sannie Osborne

And to the Committee Members

Dana McGowan
Susan Stratton

And to other committee chairs and members completing their service and to the many members who have served the Society on its committees and in other ways;

And sincere wishes that those members of the society who are now serving in the armed forces return safely, as well as to all those affected by the recent tragedy in Japan.

Will the membership please signal approval of these motions by a general round of applause.

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

A resolution of sympathy to the families and friends of

Richard Ambler
Donald Brockington
Alan L. Bryan
Thomas Charlton
Karen Dohm
William Duffen
Robert Dunnell
Joaquin Garcia-Barcena
William R. Farrand
David A. Gregory
Brenda Dorr Guldenzopf
Laurence C. Herold
Juan Pedro Laporte
Paul S. Martin
JoAnne Medley
Robert Randt
E. Gene Riggs
James T. Rock
Kenneth Rosen
Dee Ann Story
H. Trawick Ward

Joseph C. Winter
Gary Yancy

Will the members please rise for a moment of silence in honor of our departed colleagues.

Respectfully submitted,
Dean Snow
on behalf of the Resolutions Committee
POSITIONS OPEN

POSITION: ARCHAEOLOGIST
LOCATION: MUNCIE, INDIANA
Archaeologist, Applied Archaeology Laboratories, Department Of Anthropology, Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana.

Professional contract position available immediately for one year with possibility of renewal. Responsibilities: implement the Applied Archaeology Laboratories’ contract archaeology program; train and supervise students in the field and laboratory techniques; generate income through contract projects; conduct AAL field projects; prepare survey, testing, and subsurface reconnaissance proposals. Minimum qualifications: master’s degree in anthropology, archaeology, or related field; at least one year of full-time professional experience or equivalent specialized training in archaeological research, administration, or management; at least four months of supervised field and analytic experience in general North American archaeology; at least one year of full-time professional experience at a supervisory level in the study of archaeological resources of the prehistoric period; experience in Midwestern archaeology; familiarity with budgeting and coordinating archaeological projects, including development of estimates, coordination of field and laboratory personnel, and billing. Preferred qualifications: course work in related fields such as historic preservation, geology, soils, history, natural resources, and geography; course work or degree in accounting, marketing, or other business related fields; experience preparing bids and budgeting for contract projects as well as supervising fieldwork, familiarity with collections management, record of involvement in Public Archaeology projects; technical familiarity and proficiency with GIS, GPS, statistical analysis, word processing, spreadsheets, databases, and remote sensing techniques; demonstrated ability to successfully conduct and complete cultural resource management projects; specialization in the analysis of at least one prehistoric or historic artifact industry or human remains; at least one year of full-time professional experience at a supervisory level in the study of archaeological resources of the historic period; experience in public archaeology and programs; teaching experience at the undergraduate level. Send cover letter, resume, transcript of highest degree earned, and the names and contact information for three professional references to: Dr. Mark A. Hill, Director of Applied Archaeology Laboratories, Department of Anthropology, Ball State University, Muncie, IN 47306. Review of applications will begin immediately and will continue until the position is filled. (www.bsu.edu). Ball State University is an equal opportunity, affirmative action employer and is strongly and actively committed to diversity within its community.

NEWS AND NOTES

Announcement of Archaeology Prize. A consortium of Southwest research centers announces an annual prize for an innovative public education or outreach program that brings archaeological knowledge about the past to inform issues and problems of the present. The award seeks to stimulate innovative historical scholarship that is relevant to issues of contemporary concern, such as sustainability, immigration, human responses to climate change, ethical relations, war and peace, technological change, and other issues facing contemporary societies. The prize carries a cash award of $5,000 and will be announced each year at the Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology. Nomination forms and a summary of selection criteria will be posted on participant organization websites by June 1, 2011. The consortium that is sponsoring the prize formed earlier this year to explore collaboration among non-profit anthropological and archaeological research centers and museums in the Southwest and northern Mexico. Our goal is to encourage outstanding scholarship in anthropological archaeology and disseminate knowledge derived from archaeological research to an interested public. Member organizations include the Amerind Foundation (www.amerind.org), the Center for Desert Archaeology (www.cdarc.org), Crow Canyon Archaeological Center (www.crowcanyon.org), the Museum of Northern Arizona (www.musnaz.org), the National Institute for Archaeology and History (INAH Sonora), the School of Advanced Research (www.sarsf.org), and the SRI Foundation (www.srifoundation.org).

Announcement about a free new resource for archaeology students and archaeologists around the world. Colin Renfrew (born 1937) retired from the Disney Chair of Archaeology at Cambridge University in 2004. After joining the Department of Archaeology at Sheffield University as a lecturer in 1965, he became successively Professor of Archaeology at Southampton and then, in 1981, Cambridge, where he was also Master of Jesus College from 1986 to 1997. He was appointed a member of the House of Lords (Upper House) in the British Parliament in 1991, to serve as a ‘working peer’ on the Conservative side, taking the title Baron Renfrew of Kaimsthorn. He is the co-author of the widely used textbook “Archaeology. Theories, Methods and Practice” (with Paul Bahn). The interview was conducted in London on 15 October 2008 by Professor Anthony Harding, at the time President of the European Association of Archaeologists. These are the unedited original recordings of the interview, published with permission of the European Association of
Archaeologists, Professor Anthony Harding and Professor Colin Renfrew. The transcription of the interview was published in revised form as follows: Anthony Harding (2008) A Conversation With Colin Renfrew (Professor Lord Renfrew of Kaimsthorn). European Journal of Archaeology 11(2/3): 143-170. Listen to the interview at http://lnu.se/amnen/arkeologi/an-interview. No fee, no log in, just listen and bookmark. Provided by Archaeology @ Linnaeus University, Sweden.

The 2011 Pecos Conference of Southwestern Archaeology will be held in the Kaibab National Forest on the “Arizona Strip,” north and west of the Colorado River, August 11-14. The site is an open park at Mile-and-a-half Lake, southwest of Jacob Lake, which is located at the intersection of US 89A and SR67 in northern Arizona. The conference website is now live at http://www.swanet.org/2011_pecos_conference. It includes information about the conference location, amenities, and the presentation submission form. If you are not planning on camping at the conference, please visit the Notes and Accommodations sections soon to plan your hotel stay. Early Registration and Vendor Registration will open about April 1, so please make sure to periodically check the website for new information. Individuals and organizations interested in assisting in the organization as partners, sponsors, or vendors may contact organizer David Purcell at davidepurcell@gmail.com. The 2011 Pecos Conference will feature special sessions on the archaeology and history of the Arizona Strip, southwestern Utah, and southern Nevada, including a workshop on Arizona Strip ceramic traditions. Please join us for a special event!

Multidisciplinary Perspectives in Archaeological Heritage Management. ICAHM is delighted to announce its new book series, which is being published by Springer Press. Books will appear simultaneously in print in soft cover and on-line within 8–12 weeks of final manuscript receipt. Volumes will be 50–125 typeset pages (20,000 to 45,000 words), including images and references. The series is ideal for scholars whose manuscript is too long for an article yet too brief for a full-length book. We welcome single authored, co-authored, or edited submissions. Each volume is peer-reviewed. The series will address critical contemporary problems and illustrate exemplary work in archaeological heritage management in countries around the globe. The series will take a broad view of the concepts of archaeology, heritage, and management in accordance with ICAHM’s mandate itself. Contributing authors will see archaeological heritage management as a dynamic interface between professional practice, scholarly investigation, and the public sphere. We seek manuscripts that are grounded, practical, applied, theoretically engaged, and problem-solving. Send Inquiries To: publications@icahm.icahm.org.

CALENDAR
2011

SEPTEMBER 17
The Pre-Columbian Society of Washington, DC will hold its 18th annual symposium on Saturday, September 17, 2011, at the U.S. Navy Memorial and Naval Heritage Center, Washington, DC. This year’s topic is “The Dawn of Andean Civilization.” Speakers will include Richard Burger, Tom Dillehay, Christine Hastorf, Tom and Sheila Pozorski, and John Rick. For details and information about registration, please visit www.pcswdc.org.

NOVEMBER 16-20

2012

JANUARY 13-15
Conferencia Intercontinental. SAA is launching the first-ever Conferencia Intercontinental in Panama City, Panama. The official language of the 2012 Conferencia is Spanish, the language of our host country. All information regarding the Conferencia will appear in Spanish. See http://bit.ly/SAAConferencia

APRIL 18-22
¡La SAA viene a América Latina!

En la ciudad de Panamá, Panamá
13-15 de enero de 2012

Presenta la primera Conferencia Intercontinental de la SAA, una conferencia única diseñada para unir a la SAA y los Latinoamericanos. La Conferencia abrirá con una sesión especial por la tarde del viernes, seguida de un día completo de sesiones plenarias el sábado y terminando con medio día de sesiones plenarias el domingo. La capacidad máxima para la Conferencia es 235 asistentes.

Tiemas de la Conferencia:
• Interacción Inter-regional en las Américas
• Arqueología, Desarrollo Sostenible y Turismo
• Últimos Descubrimientos

Fechas Importantes:
• 15 junio 2011 - Fecha límite para proponer una ponencia o un cartel
• fin de julio de 2011 - Notificación de decisiones
• 1 agosto 2011 - Apertura de inscripciones
• 16 septiembre 2011 - Apertura para asociarse/renovar afiliación para 2012
• 29 septiembre 2011 - Fecha límite para la inscripción de ponentes
• 1 diciembre 2011 - Fecha límite para la solicitud/renovación de afiliación para 2012
• 9 diciembre 2011 - Fecha límite para la inscripción de asistentes (no presentadores)

Para más información visite SAAweb a www.saa.org

¡Nos vemos en Panamá!

No se olvide de anotar en su calendario la 77º Reunión Anual de la SAA,
18-22 abril, 2012, Memphis, Tennessee, USA
JOIN US IN SACRAMENTO FOR THE 77TH ANNUAL MEETING
APRIL 14–APRIL 18, 2012

The online submission system is now open.
If you have questions, please contact the SAA staff at 202-789-8200 or meetings@saa.org