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EDITOR’S CORNER

Jane Eva Baxter

It is hard to believe, but this is my final issue as Editor of The SAA Archaeological Record. I am very grateful to have been given this opportunity to serve the SAA, to work with so many interesting and dedicated people, and to learn so much about archaeology from its diverse practitioners. While it would be impossible to thank every one individually, I very much want to say thank you to everyone who was supportive, generous, and collaborative with their time and energies and who understood fully that the position of Editor is one of volunteer service to the SAA.

Three years ago when I began my term as Editor, I envisioned my role as a facilitator for authors wishing to disseminate materials of broad interest to the SAA membership. I was motivated by the knowledge that The SAA Archaeological Record is the only publication that reaches all SAA members, and was informed by an appreciation for the very diverse group of people who fall under the umbrella of “archaeologist” in the 21st Century. I also wanted to feature regularly forums and articles by SAA Committees, Task Forces, and Interest Groups so the magazine would be a vehicle to keep the membership aware of the types of work and variety of interests that the SAA supports and enables as an organization. Finally, I tried to do some “behind the scenes” work to improve the magazine and its utility, including the establishment of publication guidelines for the magazine and an indexing of the first 12 volumes of The SAA Archaeological Record (coming later this year!).

Never during my time as Editor did I have to develop content. Much effort went into identifying people who were doing interesting things and encouraging them to view the magazine as a place to present it to colleagues. Other efforts were put into nagging, prodding, cajoling and otherwise motivating authors to get manuscripts in to keep the pages full issue after issue. For my final issue, however, I decided I finally would develop some content to share with the membership. The special forum, “I love archaeology because...” is this content.

One of the notable features of archaeologists generally is a genuine love of archaeology that underlies and informs all the day-to-day things that go into being an archaeologist. I have a hard time imagining that practitioners of other disciplines have such a pervasive and widespread sense of loving their field of work. Archaeologists, however, freely admit loving archaeology—sometimes in a passionate and excited way discussing their work and at other times as a reminder clause after describing a difficult aspect of their job (but at least I get to do what I love...). Probably sounds familiar. I asked 25 people (21 came through!) to write a one-page essay that began with the line or sentiment “I love archaeology because” and to include a picture of themselves “doing” archaeology. The result is a series of love letters to archaeology from people at all ages and stages of life and career, from different countries and backgrounds, and with different working relationships to archaeology. Some contributors are people I know quite well, others are people I knew of and wanted to hear from, and many are people I got to know because they were authors or guest editors during my time at The
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As I began to write this piece, I reflected on the significant impact that the SAA and its annual meeting have had on my career and life. I attended my first annual meeting 18 years ago in 1995 as a graduate student, and I gave my first presentation (a co-authored paper) that same year. I remember the excitement and anxiety that I felt as I stepped up to the podium, and my palms sweat to this day just thinking about that moment. I have attended the annual meetings every year since then, with the exception of 2006, when the meetings were held in Puerto Rico. I would have attended those meetings as well if it weren't for the fact that I was eight and half months pregnant and unable to fly.

My membership in the SAA and my participation in the annual meetings have contributed much to my growth as a scholar. When I was a graduate student, attending the annual meetings was always exhilarating. I fondly recall being awkwardly overdressed and trying to meet certain archaeology “rock stars” who had published something significant that inspired me. Of course, being invited to the infamous SAA parties—or crashing them—was also always a thrill. Because I was benefiting so much from my SAA membership, I volunteered to be in a workshop entitled “Surviving Graduate School,” organized by the SAA’s Student Affairs Committee. I enjoyed this volunteer experience, and I vowed to become more involved in the SAA after I actually survived graduate school myself, completed my dissertation, and became settled into a tenure-track academic position.

My lack of poster experience made chairing this committee a learning experience, and an enjoyable one at that. I have been fortunate to work with great, thoughtful colleagues on the Student Poster Award Committee, as well as the chair of the SAA Awards Committee, the board liaison, and the president and executive director of the SAA. In addition to working with great people, I have learned to appreciate the art of putting together a visually stimulating poster that presents innovative research in a concise manner. As chair, I have spent much more time at the SAA poster sessions, and I now recognize the unique and important role that posters play in our annual meeting. A poster allows the presenter to engage directly and in greater detail with his or her audience. In a poster presentation, the author can address a wider variety of questions—both anticipated and unanticipated—about his or her research and ask questions of the audience in return. A good poster presentation stimulates a great dialogue. This high level of intellectual engagement contrasts with the usual research monologue of a spoken paper, and it is rewarding, whether the presenter is an undergraduate attending his or her first SAA meeting or a professor emeritus. The increased opportunities for networking during a poster session are particularly valuable for graduate students. Who knows? An eye-catching poster describing important and interesting research may be just what it takes to meet your personal “rock star” archaeologists. The odds are certainly better than hanging around the hotel lobby! I have come to recognize the valuable role of posters, and I now encourage my graduate students to present both posters and papers.

For me, serving the SAA has been a great experience. Yes, it has added a few lines to my CV, but in reality, it has done much more. As a volunteer, I have been able give back to the professional organization that has been central to my professional growth; I have grown as a scholar and become a better mentor to my students; and I have met excellent, committed colleagues whom I otherwise would not have known. Volunteering provides a broader perspective of our society and a sense of purpose, and I would recommend this experience to everyone committed to our discipline.
In recent years, archaeologists have engaged in much discussion and debate concerning the role that local community awareness and participation should have in archaeological research, particularly in remote indigenous areas where people do not always understand the objectives and activities of archaeology. Partnerships with these communities can promote archaeology and make people aware of the potential benefits of archaeological research. For the purpose of bringing more attention to this topic, we report here on more than three decades of archaeological and anthropological research that the first author and his colleagues have conducted with Mapuche communities in south-central Chile. This research has led to a productive working partnership, mutual respect and understanding, and the employment of archaeological research to foster community-level developmental projects.

The Mapuche are the most numerous of the indigenous peoples living in Chile at the present time. Numbering nearly 700,000 persons, they represent almost three percent of the total population of the country. In the Araucania region of south-central Chile, they constitute roughly 40 percent of the total rural population. A much smaller number live in Argentina near the Andean border with Chile. Until the late 1800s, the Mapuche were independent people. For centuries, they had halted the Spanish conquest and kept their frontier secure along the Bio Bio River. In the 1700s and 1900s, they expanded their culture into the Pampa and Patagonia areas of Argentina and were second only to the Inca Empire in terms of territorial control (Figure 1). Periods of both war and peace, and especially a long frontier existence from the middle 1500s to the late 1800s, allowed the Mapuche to appropriate cultural elements (e.g., horse) from the “huinka” (non-Mapuche) and integrate them into their culture.

Despite the fact that the Chilean state aimed to assimilate the Mapuche quickly, their geographic and social isolation on indigenous lands (reducciones) has allowed them to survive and generally to reproduce their cultural uniqueness even after military defeat and partial assimilation into Chilean society (UNPO 2012). While certain aspects of the culture have changed over the past few centuries as a result of contact with Europeans, especially since the early twentieth century, many of the religious practices and beliefs generally have persisted. As noted by several ethnographers (e.g., Bachiagalupo 1998; Carruthers and Rodriguez 2009; Faron 1964; Ortiz 2009), religion and ideology have helped the Mapuche to survive culturally and ethnically. Today, religious experiences, beliefs, and practices still play a major role in shaping other aspects of their lives (Figure 2), as well as their politics.

The first author has been fortunate enough to teach, conduct research, and live intermittently in Chile since 1975, focusing on academic program-building, archaeology, and ethnoarchaeology (Dillehay 1989, 2007). Many of the challenges of living and working there during the mid-1970s to late 1980s were reminiscent of other countries in the process of rebuilding their social science programs after traumatic military coups. Field research in parts of Chile all but ceased during the early years of the Augusto Pinochet dictatorship; however, since the early 1990s, the amount and scale of...
archaeological research has increased significantly, including a very active program of contract or environmental archaeology.

The initial research projects involved academic training programs at the request of the Inter-American Developmental Bank. The first author was completing his doctoral work in Peru at the time and was contacted by the bank to teach and help develop academic programs in anthropology after the Pinochet military coup. Upon his arrival at the Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Santiago and then Temuco, colleagues invited him to his first nquillatun, a large-scale public agricultural and fertility ceremony. This experience launched his career into Mapuche archaeology and ethnoarchaeology. His first few field seasons in the late 1970s to mid-1980s involved survey and excavation, including work at the late Pleistocene site of Monte Verde, which was constantly monitored by the military during the late 1970s and early 1980s. During these years, he used archaeology to take an activist approach to trying to change most Chilean attitudes towards the Mapuche. Chileans traditionally have taken a colonialist viewpoint that primarily resistance to the Spanish and Chileans stimulated the political structure and cultural achievements of the Mapuche.

The earlier research involved chronology building in areas where little to no archaeological work had been done before in south-central Chile. Later, more anthropological and interdisciplinary research was carried out, involving archaeologists, ethnographers, linguists, geographers, ethnohistorians, geologists, and a wide variety of paleoecological specialists. This work helped to reveal the late prehispanic mound-building cultures of the region and the social complexity of the Mapuche society during the Spanish contact and conquest epoch (Dillehay 2007; Dillehay and Saavedra 2010). Many of the students working with us during this period, including Mapuche, have graduated and become professionals either in archaeology and anthropology or in other disciplines.

Research, Community Partnership, and Development

Initially, our research with Mapuche communities was difficult because they were politically oppressed and trusted few outsiders, Chilean or foreign. In the early 1980s, however, after gaining the trust of a few communities, our research was transformed from studying questions of when, how, and why to working directly with and for the Mapuche. As a result, indige-
nous knowledge of landscape, technology, and history was increasingly incorporated into our archaeological practices and classes, and we began conducting more systematic and problem-oriented research on Mapuche lands.

To conduct research on Mapuche lands, an official permit is required from the Chilean Consejo de Monumentos Nacionales. From a political perspective, it also is important to obtain a written agreement from CONADI, the federally sponsored Corporación Nacional de Desarrollo Indígena. Equally necessary are permits from local indigenous organizations, such as the Unión de Comunidades Indígenas de Purén, Lumaco and Los Sauces, as well as each lof, or kin-based community and family. It is also important to have support from local government and from those who manage local lands. In short, the permit process requires interactions with multiple authorities and diverse political interests. The process simply takes time and patience, which must be viewed as an ethnographic experience itself.

One of our memorable experiences is the willingness of the Mapuche to allow us to intrude in their lives for months at a time over the past thirty-five years. We have established a working relationship with several indigenous communities, especially in the Purén and Lumaco Valley, and the Universidad Austral de Chile, where the first author has been a professor since 1977, has partnered with the communities to award scholarships to Mapuche students. Since the 1990s, we have formed research partnerships with several local communities, to the extent that fieldwork is more than just an academic endeavor but also a community effort with local Mapuche families. We have made many lifetime friends among the Mapuche in several localities. These experiences have been greatly enhanced by learning some mapundungun and attending religious ceremonies each year.

Although the Mapuche practice and intimately know their religion, detailed sacred knowledge is regulated and limited in its distribution to ritual priests (nguillatufe), shamans (machi), and certain elder leaders (lonko, ulmen), with access related to age, proficiency of sacred language, initiation, deeds, and apprenticeship. There are also special stories and spaces that many do not have rights to, and certain information should not be provided to outsiders. Sacred places such as ceremonial fields, cemeteries, and historical sites are generally well preserved, although logging and reforestation, dense growth of underbrush, and road construction are preservation concerns in many locations. Increased logging in some indigenous lands has led to occasional armed conflict between the Mapuche and lumber companies (Carruthers and Rodriguez 2009; Faiola 1999).

Cooperative ventures, earning trust, respect, advocacy, and the presentation of the past have become a large part of doing Mapuche archaeology. Working on a daily and yearly basis with the Mapuche requires respect, patience, and humility, which are not traits of all archaeologists. Some archaeologists ignore the social context of sites, partly because they engage in short-term projects and partly because they are not accustomed to working with the Mapuche and other indigenous people. As a result, some archaeologists lose the opportunity for a basic understanding of the people and culture around them, denying the chance to participate in richer anthropological experiences. Increased interaction with the Mapuche has led us to try to balance scientific evidence with Mapuche beliefs about creation and history. The Mapuche’s oral traditions are very important and make much sense with respect to the written records and archaeological findings (see Dillehay 2007).

Set in this context, it took us more than twenty years to obtain permission to excavate sacred kuel mounds because we first had to gain the respect and trust of local Mapuche communities and demonstrate the importance of opening these sites for archaeological inspection. (We were eventually invited by machi or shamans to excavate a portion of some mounds because they wanted the experience of stepping inside them to more directly communicate with the mound’s spirits.) The issue of the human remains of ancestors buried in mounds and other sites is a delicate issue. Our agreement with the Mapuche is to terminate and fill in a site excavation when a tomb is encountered.

Less sensitive is participation in numerous large-scale public nguillatun ceremonies where we have mapped and studied the movement of people, goods, and services and afterwards interviewed them about patterns of kinship exchange, political and economic alliances, family and lineage histories, and the accumulation and discard of ritual material. After these experiences, it became difficult to interpret the Mapuche past without first examining the indigenous present. In the late 1970s, we thus decided that our archaeological work had to focus on ethnarchaeology to study the material correlates of public ceremony, mound building (Figure 3) symbolic meaning, the use of space, leadership roles, and so forth. In fact, we have argued in several publications that the loss of ethnographic data and, especially, the use of material culture and space in the Mapuche ceremonies are equally, if not more, important than preserving and studying the archaeology of sites. Although many changes have occurred since we began studying these ceremonies, this research has a suggestive value for considering the kinds of material and behavioral variables we should be thinking about. In the 2007 book Mounds, Resistance and Empires: Araucanian Polity and Ritual Narratives, Dillehay recorded and analyzed the pre-Hispanic and Hispanic archaeological and nguillatun sites, but much of the reading of the social and religious landscape came from the Mapuche themselves, who informed us of particular landscape knowledge and worldviews.
This kind of research has led us to a methodological concern that requires more than the conventional single-site or community location. Required for kinship exchange patterns of a larger social and ceremonial order, such as those involving multiple lineages from various communities, are multiple sites of observation and participation that cross-cut dichotomies such as the local and supra-local lineage groups. Logistically and politically, this approach requires years of research working with multiple investigators and communities and a strong commitment to long-term research and an ethnographic patience to wait until local informants are ready to inform, a process often taking months to several years.

**Site Conservation and Ethical Issues**

Although in Chile the conservation of archaeological sites is a formal obligation of the state, it is becoming a shared responsibility with the Mapuche, who often continue to struggle for national recognition and resource rights. Mapuche concerns are slightly different from those of native North American peoples. They are struggling for survival, with resources being removed by lumber companies, lands threatened by the encroachment of outsiders, and other conflicts. To many Mapuche, preservation of sacred areas, ancestral graves, and cultural sites is just now becoming a feasible topic (Figure 4, Dillehay et al. 2007).

Yet ethical practices in working with the Mapuche involve much more than conserving sites and merely following a set of static guidelines, such as those provided by professional associations or Institutional Review Board (IRB) requirements on university campuses. We have had to anticipate and address any ethical dilemmas that may arise. For instance, one unanticipated issue was the depth of conflict between different local Mapuche communities with different political agendas regarding archaeological research on their lands. As a result, we often have delayed fieldwork in order to reach compromises between communities in favor of doing archaeology and those uninformed of the nature of our work and thus dubious of its benefits. It often takes much time and patience to work with communities to gain their trust and respect. We also had to assure equity in hiring practices across communities and within each lineage. Another issue that has developed is who owns the archaeological information once it is collected and analyzed. The Mapuche are aware of micro-units and levels of local-level study but not the macro construction. For instance, when an elder reports that a certain sacred hill was the location of a specific type of cere-
mony and names the lineages worshipping there, this is local knowledge for which we obtain the permission to study, record, and cite in publications. But when we combine data from multiple site locations and communities, we construct macro-scenarios to determine the variability in wider structures. These are patterns not always recognized by the Mapuche. Whether a macro- or a micro-pattern, we gain the permission from informants to study and cite information. Obtaining this permission and working with some Mapuche communities under conditions of sporadic conflict with timber companies and the government has been difficult at times.

Future Considerations

Despite the recent influx of archaeologists working in the Araucanía region and the success of several recent projects, there are still several major challenges facing researchers today—funding for research, education and training, depositories for material and artifacts, and improved collaboration with the Mapuche, to mention a few. Ethnoarchaeological fieldwork is urgently needed to document patterns currently being lost at an alarming rate due to modernization, evangelization, and the gradual migration of the Mapuche to Chilean towns for economic opportunity. In some ways, the fairly recent development of “salvage” archaeology has opened south-central Chile to more collaboration, but it is still isolated in some ways, with most archaeologists working in the north, where the Tiwanaku and other complex societies existed, and in central Chile.

Finally, researchers must ask: what benefits accrue to the Mapuche from archaeological research? We believe that we have established greater trust and respect for archaeologists by presenting our plans and finds and especially by hiring and working with local Mapuche for employment. We also have worked with local shamans and leaders to better understand the meaning of sacred sites and to protect them. We also hope to have contributed to a better understanding of Mapuche history by outsiders and to the teaching and interpretation of that history to huinca.
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Archaeology is a global enterprise. Its discipline has been defined as the place where the present and past meet and interact in the study of material evidence. Even though we archaeologists often consider the various ways in which politics affect the study of the past, nothing can prepare us for the time when current politics—the seeming collision of the present and past—impact our ability to do fieldwork or even offer us a new responsibility.

Background

As a graduate student, I began my doctoral research in Libya in the mid 1970s, working with Professor Donald White of the University of Pennsylvania’s American Archaeological Mission to Libya. White started working in Libya in the 1960s, and in 1969 he began excavating the extra-mural Sanctuary of Demeter and Persephone in the Wadi bel Gadir at the UNESCO World Heritage Site of Cyrene (Figure 1). In 1981, political problems between the U.S. and Libya led to a cessation of relations between the two countries, which resulted in the project’s unanticipated and unwelcome suspension. When we left in the late summer of 1981, we had no idea that we would not be returning to Libya for almost 25 years. Our project was left unfinished. White published his data in a series of articles in *Libya Antiqua* and the *American Journal of Archaeology* between 1971 and 1977, and, from 1984, a seven volume Final Reports series was published by the University Museum, University of Pennsylvania, but some aspects of the project are still unpublished.

Following resumption of relations between Libya and the United States in 2004, the American Mission was reconstituted under my direction. At first it seemed as if the project could begin again from the point where it had stopped, but it quickly became clear that many things had changed in the intervening 23 years. For one thing, political relations, while technically resumed, were still tentative, and visas were not forthcoming on the predictable and regular basis necessary to do our fieldwork. For another, the Libyan Department of Antiquities had suffered greatly over this period from the political embargo of the 1980s and 90s, which greatly reduced Libya’s ability to engage with the world. It had sustained governmental neglect (most visible in the lack of funding), and it had a greatly reduced staff, many of whom had no modern training (foreign languages were banned from the schools in the 1980s, and few of the young archaeologists had any experience outside of Libya).

*Figure 1. The American Mission site in the Wadi bel Gadir, 2004.*

*Figure 2. Temple of Zeus at Cyrene.*
The extent of this situation was known—the UNESCO site reports of 2003 and 2006 (Giovanni Boccardi, World Heritage Centre Mission Report, March 2003; François Souk report, June 2006) graphically pointed out the many issues that Libya, a country with five UNESCO World Heritage sites (Figures 2–5), faced in order to bring management of their cultural heritage sites up to modern standards. First and foremost on that list was the lack of adequate documentation of sites on appropriate cartography and the designation of identified buffer zones around their World Heritage sites: “It is essential that the Libyan Department for Antiquities develop a nation-wide initiative to this effect, giving priority to this aspect of documentation as fundamental for the suitable management of the sites inscribed on the World Heritage List” (Boccardi 2003).

Discussions in 2005–2006 about these UNESCO reports with old friends at the Department of Antiquities at Shahat (Cyrene), most notably the then-controller Abdul Kader el-Muzeine, resulted in a plan for the American Mission to begin a series of capacity-building and infrastructure improvement projects in collaboration with the Department of Antiquities at Shahat. Since 2006, with the support of the U.S. Embassy in Tripoli and the Ambassadors Fund for Cultural Preservation (AFCP), the American Mission has been awarded a series of grants for capacity-building initiatives. Initial work included the acquisition of equipment for the Department’s computer laboratory and the training of staff in computer systems and the English language. Building upon this basic training, work is now focusing on training in the inventory, mapping, and documentation of archaeological sites in the Cyrenaica and Tripolitania, as well as on the development of an integrated inventory of archaeological sites and museum objects. From 2005–2011, even though we were able to enter Libya only on a sporadic basis, we managed to sustain our training. But politics intervened yet again.

The Libyan Revolution

When the American Mission team left Libya on February 3, 2011, the series of protests and demonstrations in neighboring counties (known as the Arab Spring) had not yet begun in Libya. That changed dramatically from February 17 onwards as protests in Benghazi became transformed into active resistance following the killing of protesters by security forces of the Qaddafi regime. Over the next few weeks, the conflict quickly escalated as the regime’s attempts to quell the incipient revolution were met with clashes of increasing violence that spread across Libya. As fighting intensified and the deaths mounted, the rebels called for help to protect the Libyan civilian population.

On March 17, the United Nations Security Council passed a resolution to impose a no-fly zone in the airspace over Libya. The initial air campaign included strikes by French and Italian planes coupled with missile attacks on Libyan air and ground defense systems by the British and American forces. On March 31, NATO took command of the allied air operations over Libya. Intense fighting continued throughout the spring and summer until the killing of Muammar Gaddafi and several other leading regime figures on October 20, 2011.

American Mission Concerns

At the outset of the revolution, our immediate concern was for the safety of our Libyan friends. We followed developments as closely as we could, although international reporting was often spotty and communication with people in Libya was difficult. The Cyrenaican cities of al Bayda and Shahat fell to the opposition during the first few days. Facebook pages, YouTube videos, and email messages from friends graphically outlined the bloody conflict. In addition to our concerns for our friends in Libya, we also began to worry about the NATO air campaign and how the war would affect the archaeological heritage of Libya.
Development of the “No-Strike” List

We were not alone in our concern for the archaeological heritage of Libya. On March 14, 2011, Corine Wegener, President of the U.S. Committee of the Blue Shield, contacted me asking for assistance in compiling a list, with coordinates, of important archaeological sites and museums in Libya. This list was for distribution to the U.S. military. These coordinates were to be placed in all targeting information systems so that the sites might be avoided during military operations.

We were happy to comply with this request, as it would help to protect Libyan cultural heritage. It was fortunate that our work with the Department of Antiquities in mapping sites in the Cyrenaica made it possible to provide a list of sites, drawn from the archives of the Department of Antiquities at Shahat and supplemented with other information.

The group of foreign archaeologists working in Libya is small enough so that it was easy to spread the word that something must be done to protect archaeological sites during the conflict. In the UK, Andrew Wilson at Oxford University and colleagues from the Society for Libyan Studies in London were working closely with their Ministry of Defense. Once we were aware of each other’s work, we agreed to collaborate together on the production of one comprehensive list for all of Libya. Tom Elliot, Associate Director for Digital Programs and Senior Research Scholar at the Institute for the Study of the Ancient World at New York University, was asked to coordinate the consolidation of various lists that had been compiled. On March 24, 2011, the Cultural Heritage Center (U.S. State Department, Bureau of Education and Cultural Affairs) forwarded four lists to Elliot, Kane, and Carrier—two from UNESCO via the U.S. Committee of the Blue Shield, one from ICOMOS, and one via UNESCO, probably from an Italian source. The Cultural Heritage Center requested that the group check these lists for accuracy, differentiate the most important sites from the less important ones, and add non-archaeological sites such as museums, historic buildings, libraries, and other culturally relevant properties.

Elliot established a closed (private) Google Group for exchange of information and secured student labor from ISWA. Group members included Tom Elliot (Institute for the Study of the Ancient World, USA); Susan Kane and Sam Carrier (Oberlin College, USA); Professor Andrew Wilson and Dr. P.M. Kenrick (Institute of Archaeology, University of Oxford, UK); Professor David Mattingly (University of Leicester, UK); and Paul Bennett (Society for Libyan Studies and the Canterbury Archaeological Trust, UK).

Over the course of the next two weeks (March 25–April 9, 2011), the sites on these lists were reviewed, updated with improved coordinates, provided with short descriptions, and ranked in order of importance. That final list contained 242 records with coordinates (42 most important, 79 important, 121 least important). The final list was transmitted by the U.S. State Department to NATO in early April 2011 (Figure 6).

Post Conflict Assessment

Blue Shield and the International Military Cultural Resources Work Group (IMCuRWG) conducted two Civil-Military Assessment Missions: the first in September 2011 to the Tripolitania and the second to the Cyrenaica in November 2011. Both of these missions found that relatively little damage had been done to archaeological sites and museums. Virtually all damage was attributed to small arms and anti-aircraft fire, and in some cases the use of heavy equipment. Their online reports may be accessed at: http://www.blueshield.at/libya_2011/09-2011/mission_report_libya_09-2011.pdf

Libyan Reaction

In January 2012, I returned to Shahat, and the first thing my friends did was take me to the military base in the center of the town. It was the first Gaddafi stronghold to fall in eastern Libya, and they were delighted to point out to me that all archaeological remains within the camp were still intact. At a meeting dur-
ing that visit, the town of Shahat presented me with a plaque and their formal thanks for the work we did to create the no-strike list for Libya. I was made an “honorary martyr” for my efforts, which, as my husband says, is probably the best type of martyr to be.

A post-conflict study by NATO’s Joint Analysis and Lessons Learned Centre (2012) concluded that they were so successful at avoiding damage to cultural property in Libya that the operation could form the basis for strengthening NATO’s approach to cultural property protection in future operations.

Lessons Learned

On September 20, 2011, Sam Carrier, Tom Elliot, and I attended the Fourth Annual Meeting of the Combatant Command Cultural Heritage Action Group (C-CHA G), organized by Dr. James Zeidler (Associate Director for Cultural Resources, CEMML, Colorado State University) and Dr. Laurie Rush (Cultural Resources Manager, IMCOM, USAF Fort Drum). During the meeting, we academics learned a good deal about military matters and how NATO used the list of archaeological sites we had prepared.

From a military perspective, the no-strike list “is a list of geographic areas, complexes, installations, forces, equipment, capabilities, functions, individuals, groups, systems, or behaviors that will not have action planned against them... Targets on this list require national-level approval to strike.” Archaeological sites and museums are only a part of a large number of features on the list. Others include hospitals, schools, libraries, diplomatic offices, religious facilities, dams, and water treatment plants.

The no-strike list is a part of the Modernized Integrated Database (MIDB), which is maintained by the Defense Resources and Infrastructure office of the Defense Intelligence Agency and is “the primary repository for data production and dissemination of military intelligence involving worldwide orders of battle, facilities, command and control networks, targeting, battle damage assessments, and other related information required for strategic assessments and national decision-making.”

Lesson 1: Close Is Good Enough

Military targeteers used the coordinates we had provided as a basis for determining the actual coordinates entered into the database. Our data enabled them to examine higher resolution, military-grade imagery to identify more precisely archaeological features that were off limits.

Lesson 2: It Is Not Just about Munitions

The MIDB is used for more than targeting weapons. Archaeological sites are to be avoided, for example, during the construction of forward operation bases and other operations during relief operations.

Lesson 3: MIDB Is Archaeologically Sparse

At the outset of the Libyan revolution, the MIDB held information about no more than about 30 archaeological sites in Libya. This is typical.

Questions Raised

Meeting attendees (including Dr. Fred Limp and Dr. Jeff Altschul, President and President-Elect, respectively, of the SAA) discussed how the military and academic communities might work together more effectively. Among the questions discussed were:

1. Now that the United States is a signatory to the Hague Convention, how should military training be revised to protect cultural heritage?
2. How can the MIDB’s cultural heritage information to be expanded?
3. How can the MIDB be structured so as to provide public access to unclassified information about cultural heritage records?
4. How can the academic community be engaged to partner with the military in these areas?
5. What role can special interest groups in the Society for American Archaeology and the Archaeological Institute of America play?

The Way Forward

The Defense Intelligence Agency is interested in expanding the
scope and content of its cultural property data and would welcome contributions from professional archaeologists. For inclusion on the list, prospective sites should meet the criteria for listing on the United States National Register of Historic Places (see the criteria for inclusion in the brochure below). In addition, there may be other site types that are highly valued or sacred at the local level; such sites are also candidates for inclusion. Any format is acceptable as long as a data set is internally consistent. Archaeologists interested in contributing information should contact:

Laurie W. Rush  
Cultural Resources Manager, U.S. Army  
85 First Street West  
Fort Drum, New York 13602  
Laurie.w.rush.civ@mail.mil  
Office: 315-772-4165
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C-CHA G  
The COCOM Cultural Heritage Action Group (CCHAG) provides global operations, planning, training, and reach back support that promotes Cultural Property Protection (CPP) for Combatant Commands and Joint Force Planners and Engineers worldwide. CPP is more than a legal requirement; it serves as a force multiplier that enhances battlefield awareness and contributes to mission success.  
http://www.cchag.org

AIA-CHAMP  
The Cultural Heritage by AIA-Military Panel (CHAMP) is dedicated to improving awareness among deploying military personnel regarding the culture and history of local communities in host countries and war zones. Education and training of military personnel is a critical step in preserving and safeguarding historical sites and cultural artifacts and will promote greater understanding and improved relations with local communities. http://aiamilitarypanel.org

The Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict and its protocols:  
It saddened all of us to learn of George Hamley Odell’s (1942–2011) untimely passing in October 2011 (Figure 1). At age 69, he was much too young. This article honors Dr. Odell, who was formerly a professor of anthropology at the University of Oklahoma, Tulsa, and brings together the themes and issues from a recent Society of American Archaeology (SAA) symposium that I organized for the 2012 meetings in Memphis (Figure 2). The Prehistoric Quarries and Early Mines Interest Group sponsored the symposium, in which George was to have been a discussant. A number of the papers from the session will be the topic of a forthcoming thematic issue in *North American Archaeologist* as well. Dr. Odell’s work greatly influenced each of the session participants (Figure 3) and their own work on archaeological lithics.

All of the archaeologists participating in the 2012 session shared Dr. Odell’s interests in quarries and raw material sources and the ways that acquiring raw material can vary from one cultural situation to the next. In this essay, I describe the broader value that these themes and issues have not only for lithic experts, but also for archaeologists with other specialties. Experimental archaeology, optimal foraging, regional or local procurement, mobility and sedentism, and ethnic identity were among the presentation themes in the session that connect lithic specialists to a broader audience.

One important issue that concerned George Odell (1996:11) was the question of how people organized their trips to collect raw materials. Were such trips planned as part of their seasonal round to hunt or gather a variety of foods and other resources, or did they go to a toolstone source area as a separate visit, expressly for the purpose of reprovisioning? Many different systems of procurement existed within this continuum. A second issue that George Odell (1984) found important was the careful examination of material sources: a problem that is of growing importance in archaeology today. Third, Dr. Odell was also interested in the behavioral context of material use, specifically how technology was organized. Odell (1996) was one of the early proponents for modeling lithic procurement systems (Dowd 1998:209), and this symposium points to his legacy, as each participant advanced Odell’s efforts by collecting and interpreting information about raw materials and the context for their use.

**From Source to Center**

Quarry locales are often separate from where people lived. In such cases, toolstone procurement may require organized task groups to obtain the raw material and bring it to reduction areas or ultimately to use and then discard zones, rather than *ad hoc* opportunism. Now that material sourcing and identification are more common techniques, archaeologists can discuss the pathways toolstone takes from source to center, making distinctions between down-the-line and direct exchange, for example. Water transported materials may take unusual or distant trajectories from the source to population centers. A related question is how diverse or restricted are toolstone material types? An experimental archaeology approach shows that certain material properties, such as holding a durable edge, make a material attractive to one group, while a different property, such as flakability, may be more attractive to another.

In the 2012 symposium, Daron Duke used data from Nevada to illustrate one example in the technology organization spectrum evident among hunting and gathering groups. Fine-grained volcanic stone, which lithic technologists consider coarse and hard to flake, was distributed at a greater distance away from the source area than archaeologists expected. People selected materials like dacite, andesite, or trachyte because the stone’s durability was prized for holding a sharp edge and required little resharpening. This quality made the stone particularly useful for certain cutting and scraping tasks related to hunting or game processing in Nevada’s Great Basin pluvial lakes and wet-
lands during the Paleoindian Period. The stone’s distribution also tied to extensive hunting and gathering ranges in an area that had a dearth of lithic raw materials, making this “undesirable” toolstone a frequently used resource. The cobble quarries for these stones were over 60 km away from Great Salt Lake Desert, but they were closer and more accessible than the nearest obsidian sources located up to 200-400 km away. Procurement may have been embedded in seasonal rounds that made returning to source areas infrequent. Duke used experimental archaeology approaches to establish the stone’s durability over its flakability, which enabled an assessment of how the stone’s physical properties fostered raw material conservation.

David C. Harvey, who presented another 2012 session paper, described how obsidian distributions in the Wyoming and Upper Green River Basin regions conform to optimal foraging models. Glassy obsidian is fine and easy to flake with precision, contrasting with local raw materials that may not fracture as easily. A spatial caloric model of the energy needed to make a round trip visit was applied to the source areas under study. The sources that could be accessed with the least distance and elevation, such as Jackson Hole, Wyoming, or Malad, Idaho, were used before sources that were farther away or uphill, like Obsidian Cliff in Yellowstone National Park or Idaho’s Bear Gulch. Harvey employed an optimal foraging model to understand procurement choices among a time-averaged sample of the region’s archaeological sites. The results were consistent through the time periods represented in the sample; that is, the inhabitants of southwestern Wyoming more consistently chose Jackson Hole and eastern Snake River Plain obsidian sources, which were both lower in elevation and a shorter distance away.

Why transport rock on foot if you can go by boat? In another paper, co-authors Gabriel Cooney, Torben Ballin, and Graeme Warren explored the ramifications of stone procurement in island settings. They described stone (phophyry or porphyritic andesite, porcellanite, and felsite) quarried for axe production in Ireland’s Shetland and other islands, e.g., Lambay and Rathlin. These highly sought-after materials were ethnic markers, part of a cosmological complex that signified what it meant to be a Neolithic farmer. The materials were transported long distances without the loss of mass associated with down-the-line exchange, indicating purposeful trips by boat to the islands where the quarries were located. Cooney and his colleagues related stone quarrying to ethnic identity. For certain materials like felsite, the color and luster of the stone itself was prized, in addition to the tie with a particular island or quarry locale and the meaning ascribed to these special places.

Meeks Etcheison and Mary Beth D. Trubitt’s paper discussed Spanish Diggings, an important Arkansas quarry complex, which produced Novaculite-type chert during the Middle and Late Archaic (and other) periods. Situated between two major river drainages (the Saline and the Ouachita), its location eased downstream transport. In contrast to stone for Neolithic axes from Ireland, discussed in the paragraph above, artifact size and weight classes steadily decreased at distances away from the quarry complex. Similar to the quarry examples from Ireland, the high quality Novaculite material traveled long distances from the source in Arkansas. Etcheison and Trubitt looked carefully at regional procurement practices to better understand down-the-line exchange. Their Novaculite cherts were in demand for the predictable flaking characteristics that made them one of the region’s more valuable raw materials.

Figure 2. Anne S. Dowd photographing raw material concentrations on top of Obsidian Cliff, Yellowstone National Park, Wyoming (National Register Number: 96000973). Photograph by Mary Beth D. Trubitt.

Figure 3. April 19, 2012 SAA Symposium participants in Memphis, Tennessee. Shown from left to right: David C. Harvey, Daron Duke, Robert G. Elston, Anne S. Dowd, Mary Beth D. Trubitt, Meeks Etchieson, Karen B. Supak. Photograph by Thomas Green.
An even more pragmatic procurement strategy is to have your own material source right on site. Then, getting the raw material is a breeze. Karen B. Supak's paper explored local river cobble procurement from streams running across the Fort Campbell Military Reservation in Kentucky and Tennessee. An exception was found at the Noahs Springs Cave Site, which is a quarry, habitation, and burial site occupied between the Early Archaic and Mississippian periods. A stream runs through several sinkholes formed of limestone containing chert cobbles at the site. Each sinkhole contained bedrock quarries that the site occupants had used to obtain chert for the manufacture of bifaces and other tools. Secondary chert deposits were not available at the site, resulting in the use of these primary bedrock sources. Relatively sedentary groups had access to local materials for a long time period, and little targeted or disembedded procurement was required. In this case then, Supak investigated procurement that was exclusively local, without any long distance transport.

As the session chair and discussant, Robert G. Elston suggested that specific cultural boundaries might be evaluated based upon raw material use as traced through time. Elston's long experience with the Tosawhi Quarry Complex in Nevada is a point of departure for ideas that each of the presenters in this symposium may use for refining their work. According to Elston, stone tool procurement has a role in discussions of human evolution, as procurement strategies have very long cultural histories.

While mobile hunting and gathering populations occupied both the Nevada and Wyoming regions under analysis in two of the papers, distinct procurement strategies emerged, which were based upon fairly straightforward considerations of stone durability and raw material proximity in the first example, or flakability and ease of access over longer distances in the second. In each of these cases, ways to reduce resharpening or retooling played a role in the choice of material.

The two papers on quarries from Ireland and Arkansas showed the contrast in the range of procurement practices between settled farmers and hunting and gathering groups. In the Ireland example, the visits to island quarries by boat were a separate activity from farming (unless trading farm produce was in some way related to the trip). In the example from Arkansas, visits to a major upstream quarry site may also have been disembedded from hunter-fisher-gatherer subsistence activities, although fishing along river drainages has been seen to structure chert procurement in other regions (Dowd 1998:176). In both examples, trips to the quarry for reprovisioning or importing raw material to more distant settlements were planned, and water transport permitted organized quarry extraction activities by larger groups of people over longer distances. We have greater insight into embedded versus detached economic production based on each of the papers presented in the symposium.

I see artifacts of some materials, like the felsite used for Neolithic axes from Ireland, as a prestige good, similar to Mesoamerican jade celts. Prestige goods, which are used as wealth or status markers in exchanges that define and maintain social ties, frequently are found far from their original source and may be traded long distances. The Neolithic axes may also be imbued with special significance attached to the quarry locations, similar to the stones aborigines in Australia carried away from sacred areas on the landscape (Gould and Saggars 1985:122). Besides pragmatic considerations, social or ideational ones are important to evaluate in understanding the reasons that people go to great lengths to obtain and use a certain raw material.

Archaeologists are benefiting from techniques that exist for characterizing raw materials and aiding in tracking them from quarries to living areas or other special activity areas and using optimal foraging or procurement system models to assess choices. The participants in this symposium examined pattern- ing and cases that diverge from the expected to understand better the relationship between places where populations use their tools and the locations where raw materials are found. In turn, by looking closely at these relationships, archaeologists have come to new conclusions about the technological systems within which tool making plays a key role.

**Looking Back, Looking Forward**

Quarry research is timely because techniques for identifying material types have become more sophisticated, and such methods, particularly chemical characterization, are being used more routinely by a variety of archaeological researchers. Stone sourcing methods are gradually becoming more precise, and new data are available for comparing quarries and the tool production sites associated with them. Information on raw material distributions is becoming more complete as geologists and archaeologists recognize important distinctions among sources.

Chemically characterizing stone tools using methods such as Macroscopic or Microscopic Petrology, Electron-Spin Resonance (ESR) Spectroscopy, Instrumental Neutron Activation Analysis (INAA), Isotopic Composition Analysis (ICA), X-ray Diffraction (XRD), X-ray Fluorescence (XRF), and Laser Ablation Inductively Coupled Plasma Mass Spectrometry (LA-ICP-MS) are used to separate raw materials and hone our interpretations of their use and distribution. For this reason, the Prehistoric Quarries and Early Mines Interest Group is gaining a greater following, as information exchange among lithic specialists is becoming more critical.

Besides characterization techniques, archaeologists who are recording and analyzing raw material distributions are benefit-
available for producing regional maps of raw material sources and areas where the materials were used. Regional databases are more commonly shared on the Internet, so that people interested in certain stone raw materials can compare or contribute information about types and sources (http://arkarcheology.uark.edu/novaculite/index.html). Type collections are being digitized for accessibility to a larger group of interested lithic specialists.

As is shown in an early study, Odell (1984:45–67) did not shy away from collecting new field data on chert distributions to supplement background information on regional geology and for evaluating the available raw materials. To correctly identify raw materials, Odell (1996:16) suggested developing a “key” for correctly characterizing stone categories. Both for identifying materials and for ranking them qualitatively, such an approach is useful. Another early example of this trend was Luedke and Myers’ (in Henry and Odell 1989:238) trace element analysis on Burlington chert in and around the Macoupin Site on the Illinois River. Luedke and Myers (in Henry and Odell 1989:237–44) suggested that interplay between method and application helped to create the ideal scenario for developing new techniques for lithic analysis. In this year’s 2013 Prehistoric Quarries and Early Mines Interest Group-sponsored symposium, Sarah D. Stuckey and Juliet E. Morrow have expanded on this research direction by reporting on recent efforts to chemically characterize Burlington chert.

Held in Honolulu, Hawaii, the morning of April 5, 2013, the session was titled “Quarries and Early Mines: Settlement Context and Transportation Network Relationships.” Dr. Adrian L. Burke of Département d’anthropologie, Université de Montréal, was the discussant; Juliet E. Morrow and Peter R. Mills were co-chairs. A Prehistoric Quarries and Early Mines Interest Group business and social meeting was held from 6:00 to 7:00 on the evening of April 4, 2013, during the SAA 78th Annual Meeting, and details about what transpired are available in The Quarry. The group sends out the newsletter The Quarry to over 700 members, meets annually at the SAA, sponsors symposia, field trips or workshops, and coordinates with international colleagues interested in quarry and mine research, among other activities (Figure 4).

To summarize, George Odell came from the processualist school of archaeological thought, commonly known as “New Archaeology,” which emphasized scientific approaches and testable hypotheses to develop models of past social systems. His work in procurement is rooted in the organization of technology approach. With remarkable tenacity, George built on his strengths in lithic studies for his entire archaeological career, creating an impressive body of work on the subject. We are fortunate to have the publications that Dr. Odell left behind to stimulate future work in the field. Nevertheless, we will miss such a tireless and energetic scholar, whose work will continue to inspire archaeologists for many years to come. We will use Odell’s life’s work as a compass for reminding us that patience and precision are necessary components of quality stone tool analysis. Like George Hamley Odell, we all hope to one day speak “lithics” fluently.
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Mobile devices can be transformative in the way we approach archaeological field research. During the summer of 2012, we incorporated iPad instruments and GIS applications in a geochemical rock-sourcing project in the Upper Columbia River system of the interior Pacific Northwest. In this paper, we detail the functionality of the instruments, how they were used to collect and share archaeological data during survey, articulate an integrative software approach, and at the same time try not to sound like a commercial.

It is no doubt that perhaps the most iconic tool in the discipline of archaeology is a pointed metal trowel with a wooden handle. Historically, archaeological methods have been taught predominantly with either a WHS or a Marshalltown trowel as the guiding blade for students to learn techniques for making straight walls and flat floors. In every sense, the trowel was a transformative technology, and it quickly became a standard tool in archaeological practice. It was cost effective, so every dig kit had a trowel. A trowel was easy to use in repetition, results were easily replicated, and students were easily trained. From our experience, the iPad has every possibility of influencing the way we approach fieldwork, just as much as our favorite trowel.

The suggestion here is that computational transformative technology will be adopted in the field when it intelligently enhances, rather than hinders, workflow. Most of us were (and are) trained in paper and pencil archaeology: drawing field maps with compass, protractor, and ruler, carrying bulky topographic maps on survey, and essentially having one instrument for every task. Digital tools widely adopted for use in archaeological fieldwork include digital cameras, handheld GPS technology, and total stations. In general, technology is useful when it works, is cost effective, and is easy to use. However, in many instances technology is more a hindrance than a help. For example, technology is not useful when an instructor has to be a full-time customer service representative in the field. Rather, useful technology—especially cost-effective, easily deployable technology—needs to work for us, giving us more time to do what we are there to do (in this case, reliably collecting archaeologically related data/samples).

In our first field endeavor with iPads, we geospatially documented volcanic rock outcrops in a 20,000 km² survey area over a period of four weeks. Our goal in this paper is to demonstrate how we incorporated iPad mobile devices into the field survey, recording our pursuit of outcrops of fine-grained volcanic rocks in the Upper Columbia River system that could have been used for stone tool production in the past. The survey was associated with the Slocan Narrows Archaeological Project (SNAP) co-directed by two of the authors (Goodale and Nauman) and part of the Digital Humanities initiative at Hamilton College. SNAP also functions as the Hamilton College archaeology field school where students from Hamilton College and Selkirk College are trained in archaeological methods during a six-week intensive field course. Colleagues in the Hamilton College Geosciences Department introduced us to using mobile devices in the field.

Digital Methods in Field Archaeology

Field computing is not a new endeavor in archaeology. Harold Dibble, a pioneering archaeologist in the development of computer software for use in archaeological research, has decades of experience writing geospatial applications, and much of the software is freely available online (Dibble 2011). In the Archaeological Record, Steward and Johnson (2011) demonstrate using laptops and tablet PCs in excavation to train students in field methods. Recent projects that are using iPad mobile devices for field recording are at Pompeii (Archaeological Research Project “Porta Stabia” [Ellis and Wallrodt 2011]) and PIARA in Peru (Proyecto de Investigación Arqueológico Regional Ancash [DeTore and Bria 2012]). These examples demonstrate the need for computation in the field, but what archaeology has yet to see
is a true transformative digital technology, like the trowel for excavation, that can be easily adopted as part of regular field practice.

Traditional laptops have limitations that make them difficult to use in the field: delicate screens; exposed ports susceptible to invasions of detritus; and moving parts such as platter-based hard drives that be can be easily damaged, potentially leading to catastrophic data loss. Solutions that ameliorate some of these shortcomings exist, but are still plagued by short battery life (typically less than four hours), especially if peripherals like GPS modules are activated. In addition, complicated operating systems often require significant, expensive, and distracting maintenance and training. Rugged solutions, like the brand Toughbooks, compound these problems by adding an exponential price tag.

But the real transformative agent for our efforts was the iPad, which has robust features to support field research: rich connectivity (WiFi, Bluetooth, cellular data, and GPS); 10-hour battery life; different interaction modalities; a high-resolution, high-fidelity IPS (In-Plane Switching) screen; a user-facing camera (enabling high-definition video conferencing, bandwidth permitting, even in the field) and an outward-facing, five-megapixel camera; a digital compass; an accelerometer; and a gyroscope. An important addition to the instrument came in the form of a hardened case, (e.g. Otterbox), that permitted our iPads to be tossed into backpacks with rock hammers and other tools without suffering damage; it also protected them from intermittent rain. The cost for each field-ready iPad, including hardware (iPad 3rd Gen with rich connectivity), application software (GISPro), and peripherals (rugged Otterbox case), totaled approximately $1,200.

**Pre-field Preparations**

Before venturing into the field, our preparation involved getting our iPads outfitted to be the most useful tools possible. First, we decided on the software application GISPro by Garafa LLC, which makes several versions of the application scaled by supported file types and cost. We utilized GISPro because it would handle most of the file types we planned to use, and it had the most flexible data export capabilities (compared to the less capable and also less expensive GISKit). GISPro allows for the direct and easy import of digitized satellite, topographic, terrain, and geologic maps (with metadata) from map servers (e.g. Google and Bing). As a result, in the field we had every map needed to cover our survey area of ~20,000 km² on our iPad. We were also able to import .kmz, .shp, WMS and raster files from ArcGIS to GISPro (Figure 1). Exposures of volcanic rocks in the survey area were located using digital geological maps of southeastern British Columbia (downloaded from the British Columbia Geological Survey website) and Washington State (downloaded from the Washington State Department of Natural Resources Geologic Information Portal).

Another approach that optimized our field time was a virtual survey of our project area in Google Earth and Google Street View prior to going out in the field. This was a wholly unique effort independent of the iPad, conducted on a desktop computer in a research lab. Most roads in the survey area, including all major north-south running highways, were available in Google Street View. Because we were interested in sampling as many rock outcrops as possible in search of fine-grained volcanic rocks that would be good for stone tool making, we decided that vehicle survey would be mostly adequate for this initial exploration for rock sources. Catherine Prescott, at the time a recent graduate of Hamilton College who had been trained in GIS, virtually “drove” on all the highways in our study area in Google Street View with an overlay (exported from ArcGIS) of...
all the previously mapped geological units of volcanic origin. She added map place marks for roadside rock outcrops for us to inspect and sample and then exported the file to GISPro for us to take into the field on our iPads (Figure 2). Having the annotated map of rock outcrops, paired with the iPad, allowed us to streamline the field survey process, permitting us to survey the area more efficiently (Figure 3). Thakuria et al. (2013) provide another example of the usefulness of Google Earth in effectively and efficiently conducting field survey.

GISPro also required us to set up attribute tables in advance of field survey (Figure 4). This required us to know something about the area we were going to survey and to carefully consider and plan what data we wanted to collect in the field. The attribute tables consisted of geographic locations we would visit, pull-down menus with rock types we were likely to encounter, text boxes for outcrop descriptions, an attribute box to link photographs and descriptions, and other specific data we were interested in collecting from each outcrop. Although we have yet to test it, we imagine a similar approach could be used in excavation. Once the attribute table is built in GISPro, it can be used as a template for each observation, which streamlines and provides consistency of data collection in the field.

**In-field Survey**

Our field camp (equipped with reliable electricity) was centrally located within the project study area, approximately a five-hour drive to both the northern and southern extents of the survey area. Field conditions included heavy tree canopy over much of the study area, so dense it actually limited use of far superior (and way more expensive) handheld GPS units. There were limited cellular towers and none near the base camp. We had access to WiFi at camp with good bandwidth, and there were several public hotspots where we could access data and download additional maps, if needed. The iPads functioned for up to 10 hours with a single battery charge; although we did bring extra power.
supplies (e.g. Mophie), we never needed them. Despite the rugged terrain and dense forest canopy, the internal GPS always functioned and provided accurate locations to approximately <10 m.

With consistent WiFi connectivity at camp, we cached all of the maps we needed in GISPro the night before we visited a planned location. Other than making sure the iPads were charged, caching maps was our only requirement for the ensuing day of work. Over the course of four weeks, we visited 115 rock outcrops, sampling 66 of them for further laboratory study. We successfully recorded everything with our iPads and routinely backed up the data in Dropbox. We were able to export and open the entire survey in Google Earth (Figure 5), on both an iPad and desktop computer, which permitted the team to share the results with pretty much anyone, anywhere, on the day data were collected.

Figure 4. Source locations shown on Google Terrain map with associated attribute table and linked photograph. (Map data © 2013 Google attribute table displayed in GIS Pro.)

Future Developments/Modifications

One current limitation of this approach is a weak facility for true, effective collaboration. Transferring field data between iPads is not straightforward: data, viz. photos and custom views, are disassociated from records, requiring some post-survey cleanup work. However, most types of data can be exported and shared in a completely intact state.

Amelioration of this shortcoming is easily within grasp: true multi-user collaboration can be built with the addition of a central repository (i.e. an inexpensive, field-grade server) and a project management/versioning system that permits data sets to be “checked out,” forked, and resubmitted with clear provenance. (A similar solution—GitHub—is already extant.) Further improvements would include applications that permit desktop computers to directly access and make slight modifications to pre- and post-survey data structures.

Garafa LLC has been responsive to feedback; we hope that articulating a concrete vision for future development and providing evidence of broad need will convince them to integrate features that further facilitate this approach. Another issue is that GISPro is slow to read raster files, which otherwise display efficiently in Google Earth or other similar platforms.

Conclusion

The approach outlined here is integrative rather than fragmented: instead of utilizing four or five apps, each of which contains quanta of the data set instead of the complete data set (Ellis and Wallrodt 2011 and DeTore and Bria 2012), the GISPro approach permits virtually all of the data to be stored in one relational database that can be shared with other researchers through several different formats. For example, the metadata can be exported as a .csv file that can be read by most spreadsheet software programs, or geographic data as well as the metadata and photographs can be exported as .kmz files and viewed in Google Earth (Figure 5). The data can even be exported and used in more sophisticated geospatial and analytical software such as ArcGIS.

Relying on multiple apps creates other potential problems: updates to individual apps can create incompatibilities, the rectification of which can take valuable time that could otherwise be spent doing archaeology. Also, training collaborators on multiple apps, each of which has a different interface, different ways of storing data, and requires a unique configuration to fit the needs of the project, can be labor-intensive, time-intensive, and might be a daunting system for any neophyte to master. An integrated solution means fewer incompatibilities, less time spent on training, more time in the field, and the ability to scale the approach to fit many different archaeological projects.
Indeed, GISPro and the iPad permit scalability on many axes: it can be used in a virtually identical fashion by undergraduate students and professional archaeologists; for small projects and for multi-week, 20,000 km² projects; and for one-day projects or for months at a time.

Of course, mobile technology continues to evolve and new solutions may be forthcoming. However, we suggest that the combination of extensive flexibility, formidable battery life, easily operable interfaces, integrated tools, and rapid recovery in a durable and cost effective solution could make mobile devices the next transformative technology in archaeological field research. While there are hurdles to overcome, at the moment there is perhaps no better candidate for a transformative digital technology in field archaeology than the iPad.
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I love archaeology because it inspires me to understand the world around me with nuance. I do not just have tea in my favorite mug: I know that in choosing each other, the mug and I have developed an intimate relationship rooted in the everyday. In that choice, we have reinstated certain cultural and economic choices and changed others. I know that in the creation of that habitus we have or will let those choices merge into nothingness, into the visible affects of the vernacular, into just something we do every day—and not every thing in the everyday can always have meaning. In making that decision about the meaning (or lack thereof) of the everyday, there is a new plane of understanding between the mug and myself—one in which we can take each other for granted, one that indexes a more intimate relationship.

My passion for archaeology is not all cerebral—in a very visceral way, when I touch, hold, examine, and sort the materials from excavations or collections, I feel a certain amount of affection for the things themselves. It has been this way since my first encounter with an ancient object in my first archaeology class in my first year as an undergraduate. Even after all these years, I vividly recall holding on to a Mesopotamian beveled-rim bowl that was being passed around. My thumb landed in the same place where a rushed potter 6,000 years prior had quickly scooped up the bowl off the wheel to start the next. It was an uncanny moment—being taught the value of antiquity in a monetary and cultural form, but realizing and recognizing it as the everyday act of an individual from the past, an act whose meaning that individual may have already erased because it was an intimate practice (much like my tea drinking). And yet, this act maintained meaning for my reconstruction of the past, my contemporary moment with the object, and my recognition of the paradoxical situation. I can only think back to that one beveled-rim bowl of the thousands that are out there still in circulation 6,000 years after production, albeit in different contexts, as an interaction I had with an other that made me think about the world in a different way... and I am sure I was just another student with whom BRB 3849 spent a few moments. Would we recognize each other if we met again?

It is precisely because I love archaeology that I define, deconstruct, and decolonize it. If I had no affection for this practice and thought process I would have left archaeology a long time ago. This discipline has proven to be expansive and generous in its ability to take on other disciplines to critique it, to help move it into new directions, and to embrace new methodologies. But we cannot be fooled into thinking it is infinitely malleable—it too changes the practitioners: we are disciplined into our subjectivity, into ways and modes of thinking and interacting with the world that shape us as archaeologists. It was through the practice of archaeology—a practice steeped in teamwork, that I learnt the value of collaborative action. It is through the process of decolonizing methodologies that I learnt how to work, dialogue, and organize with communities and publics on meanings related to heritage and the politics of the past. And it was through these processes that I realized that regardless of its colonial pasts, archaeology has the potential for a reflexive and critical future—a future that I could be a part of, help shape, and, in turn, be shaped by. Falling in love with a discipline is not entirely difficult to imagine. However, as with other relationships, it is staying in love with it that has its own intimacy.
jectory into Shovelbum Hell, Grad School Blues, Adjunct Wasteland, then a position as an academic, CRM professional, or heritage manager got stunted. Why? Well, I got a job.

This job was as an editor with an academic publishing house, one that publishes widely across the social sciences. My passion for archaeology was overtaken by the need to become an ethnographer of other academic tribes—learning the jargon, kinship system, structural hierarchy, values, warring theoretical camps, and drinking patterns of sociologists, education researchers, gerontologists, and museum professionals, among others. I became a participant observer in hopes that it would give me an edge in deciding who and what to publish.

I learned to talk the talk and walk the walk well enough to appreciate the contributions of each field and really like many of its members. Some would welcome me into their tribe. But my heart still belongs to archaeology. Here are four reasons why:

**Surprise.** Archaeologists never know if our conventional wisdom about the past is stable. I’ve seen more universally accepted theories overturned in the past three decades than one would find in any other field. The first archaeology book I published confidently demonstrated the primacy of the Clovis theory. Today, it’s laughably wrong. I’ve helped deflesh a few sacred cattle in publishing—Steve Lekson’s Chaco Meridian theory and Terry Jones’s Polynesians in California hypothesis among others. When I teach undergraduates, I always discuss newly published findings that upend long-established theories about the past with surprising new data. There’s a different one each week. I can’t think of any other discipline in which The Canon is so fragile and transitory.

**Vastness.** Archaeology is about everything. To be a good archaeologist, you need to be equally conversant in physics and public policy, materials and mythology, history and hermeneutics, oral tradition and organic chemistry. I haven’t played in any academic sandbox where the need for transdisciplinary work across sciences, social sciences, and humanities has been so acute. No one can be expert in every field that archaeology touches. There are just too many moving parts for anyone to play puppet master.

**Sociability.** As a result of its vastness, archaeologists have to play well with others. Given the long-standing acrimony between various moieties in the archaeological tribe, that statement will cause a snort or two. But, for example, one of my contacts in nursing research describes her field as, “they eat their young.” Archaeologists are sociable animals in comparison. And how could we not be? Anyone who has been on a field project knows who snores, who puts ketchup in their ice cream, and who needs to shower more. We have the dirt on each other. We need each other and those many outsiders too much to be snarky. It’s the ultimate group endeavor.

Finally, it’s **magical.** We invent entire social worlds out of bits of old broken dishes, scraps of discarded bone, microscopic starch molecules embedded in ancient hearths, stone walls robbed of every stone. The archaeologist’s skill at reconstructing the past out of almost nothing is nothing short of magic. Even when we’re wrong, it’s still a pretty decent parlor trick. No wonder snake oil salesmen, charlatans, and religious fanatics mishandle our methods and twist our data attempting to prove their outlandish theories. It’s too remarkable to pass up and sounds too convincing to disprove.

It’s surprising, vast, sociable, magical. That’s why I love archaeology.

---

**Rick Butler**

Rick Butler is a graduate of DePaul University (B.A. in Anthropology, 2011) who is currently preparing to apply for graduate study in archaeology.

---

I love archaeology because the tangible evidence of our history fascinates me. The ability to sift through layers of time in the form of soil and discover pieces of our past long since forgotten is a unique experience that greatly expands our knowledge of human culture and history. When I was seven years old, I began digging up my family’s backyard, marveling at the small treasures I would find. Every old toy, every bottle, every shard of dishware was an amazing new discovery. This childhood pastime was not like digging for gold or some monetarily valuable treasure; it was the delight of holding these items and feeling a connection to the past of that place—a connection to the people who had
lived there before me. It was in these moments that I first realized my childhood home was not merely the place I lived, but a structure that had been there long before me. My house had housed numerous families who filled their lives with countless moments both routine and meaningful. The remnants of some of those moments fell to the ground and were lost to time, waiting until I came along and uncovered them.

That tangible connection is one of archaeology’s great strengths. It takes the physical evidence and uses it to answer questions about the way people used objects, utilized their environment, and lived their daily lives. While the historical record is a truly valuable resource in understanding humanity’s past, it relies on witness testimony, information that is acquired through first- or second-hand sources and then transmitted by an author who may or may not apply their own perceptions and biases. Just as historical documents can enhance archaeological research, archaeology enriches the historical record. It can verify and expand upon the accounts of historians and shed light on how events of the past occurred.

But where historical texts often recount major events such as wars, political intrigue, and the rise and fall of empires, archaeology can examine how ordinary people lived during these times. The day-to-day existence of people—how they lived, what they ate, the tools they used, and how they experienced their culture—are all in the scope of archaeology. I love that in archaeology a garbage pit is as valuable as a treasure chamber because a garbage pit can tell you a myriad of details about the people who used it. The “how” is something I love. It is one thing to understand the “what” of history, to know significant events and their dates. But I find myself more compelled by the culture of a place and time—all of the little details of life left in the footprints of material things waiting to tell a story about their former owner’s experiences. The objects that play a role in our lives, however seemingly mundane, tell a story about us.

Archaeology looks at the things we leave behind and reconstructs who we were; it can revive some aspect of our lives after we have been gone for generations. This is possibly one of the things I love most about archaeology. Most of us will never be mentioned in the annals of history, but we will all leave some material goods behind. The archaeologists of the future may one day discover some object that we possessed. This long buried item will tell them things about our lives and the times we lived in, and through that we will be connected to those people and their time. All of these are reasons why I love archaeology, but it is important to mention one more reason: it’s fun. Whether working in the field conducting an excavation, cleaning artifacts in the lab, or spending time in the library researching documented sources, I cannot think of an academic pursuit or profession I would find more fulfilling. That is why I love archaeology.

Julia Carvajal

Julia Carvajal received her bachelor’s degree in anthropology (CRM) from California State Polytechnic University of Pomona in 2010. She works as a field technician for a variety of CRM firms, mostly in California and Nevada.

I love archaeology because it is a combination of all things I enjoy: culture, the past, traveling, new experiences, and hard work. I have been a professional archaeologist for two years, but it’s been my passion since my first field class as an undergraduate at California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, in 2007. I have always been fascinated by culture and the past because they open doors to the unfamiliar, shedding light on how people once lived. Traveling to changing landscapes allows me to meet new people and have experiences that help me grow personally. Hard work has been an important component of archaeology for me; I want to deserve the privilege of learning the fascinating aspects the past has to offer. The work is definitely not for the faint of heart. Long hours, extreme weather conditions, and chaotic schedules can be a real challenge sometimes, but I wouldn’t change my career for the world.

I love archaeology because it exists everywhere and I get to travel all over the country to be part of recording the past. In my experiences, I have explored California to a great extent, allowing me to learn firsthand how
I love archaeology because it brings people together from all walks of life. I love to come together with people of all ages with shared interests, whom you can bond with over similar experiences and who can teach you new things about your field. Not only do I get to spend time with other archaeologists, but I also get to work with other professionals I never would have expected, like construction workers, biologists, and geologists. The privilege to work with native communities also reminds me why protecting the archaeological record is so important. Interacting with these professionals helps to form a better plan for the work we are trying to accomplish.

I love archaeology because there is always something new to learn. Whether it’s how to keep your sidewalks looking great or a new colleague sharing their specific archaeological interests, there is so much depth to archaeology that continuously fascinates me. From the people and places to the methods and theories, archaeology is a continuously evolving field that keeps my mind open and always moving. The different professions we work with help us to incorporate varying factors in our attempt to recreate the past, and in return archaeologists can teach others appreciation for what we are trying to do.

I love archaeology because it’s hard work. I get asked a lot why I chose to become an archaeologist. My answer is that I always knew I wanted to be part of the process that preserves the past from being lost. That process happens to be hiking up to 12 miles a day in the middle of nowhere to find and record sites, monitoring for hours around heavy machinery, digging in difficult terrain, and taking extensive notes and doing a lot of research. But at the end of it all, I have walked through forests and deserts with views that bring peace to the weary surveyor and where history has been hidden for countless years. I have heard stories and songs of people’s ancestors and have been to sacred places where people once carved the images of things that meant the most to them. I have read the documents of miners who have claimed their land and have seen structures long abandoned. We can all relate to people who are long gone through archaeology. I love archaeology because it connects us all.
been all about in the human past. With a strong emphasis on collaborating, on connecting with others in the field, in scholarly activities and events, and with an awareness and commitment to “group,” I have long found archaeology to be such an engaging world, unlike many of the fields that are more individualistic and even more “I centered.” It’s hard to be a single researcher in archaeology, and it has gotten even more collaborative over the past decades. I love team-teaching and I love collaborative writing projects from which I learn so much. I have been fortunate to have colleagues with whom to do such things!

But I was also fortunate to participate in the early stages of what became post-processualism, to once again be engaged with a rethinking of what we do as archaeologists, with what kinds of visions of the human past we are creating and what the impacts of our narratives are and have been. Some of my previously relatively untapped concerns with social issues, with inequalities, and with gender justice seemed to “fit” with the changing landscape of archaeological practice and archaeological theory. And these were all collaborative projects and engagements. At the same time, I was able to embark on a field project that was so off the mark and also somewhat marginal that I loved it—it was different, it might not succeed, but it was an adventure that I could share with family, with an excellent cadre of graduate students, and with the support (if not of a somewhat quizzical nature) of colleagues in France: our Between the Caves open air survey project in the French Pyrénées.

In the end, what I have loved most has been the increasing expansion of archaeology’s conscience: our evolving ethics, our engagement with more and more stakeholders and our attempts to democratize archaeology while maintaining its rigor. We study change; I embrace the changes that have fueled my archaeological passions.

Thomas Emerson

Thomas Emerson is Director of the Illinois State Archaeological Survey and Adjunct Professor at the University of Illinois.

Archaeology is a passion that only came slowly into my life. I am always amazed at people who tell me that they always wanted to be archaeologists. Growing up in northern Wisconsin I wanted to be a forest ranger, when working in construction with my uncles I wanted to build houses, and when I joined the Navy I thought perhaps I would make a career of it. Going to college I found myself interested in so many disciplines it was hard to choose a major. I was fascinated by history but not by being a high school history teacher. Almost by default I ended up with a double major in political science and sociology (emphasis in criminology). Graduating in the immediate aftermath of the Tet Offensive, I found myself in Vietnam. It was only after returning to civilian life that I discovered anthropology. But I was attracted to ethnography, not archaeology. It was a rude awakening when I arrived at the University of Wisconsin to find that ethnography (at least as I envisioned it from reading the classics of the late 19th and early 20th centuries) was distinctly out of fashion. To suggest I was naive about the discipline is an understatement. But it did not take long at UW for me to become immersed (given my interests in history and human societies) in archaeology and ethnohistory.

Why archaeology? Who isn’t drawn by the allure of making new discoveries, the desire to create histories of unknown people, to be tested daily by perhaps unsolvable mysteries, to face ever-changing challenges and obstacles, to work as part of a collaborative team, to contribute to our understanding of past human societies, or even to help today’s world better cope with change? As I write, I realize these reasons sound highly ambitious! Few of us will discover the unlooted tomb of an Egyptian pharaoh or a lost Mayan city. But we still, in our everyday work, have the ability to rewrite history albeit on a less grandiose scale. You think not? Perhaps it is perspective—let me provide some examples from my own experience.

When I was in graduate school, my colleague Larry Conrad became aware of a large Mississippian town about to be destroyed by strip mining. With no laws to protect the site, we created a not-for-profit organization and used its field schools to salvage hundreds of houses and pits. Later, I was surveying along the Missouri River when we noted human bones at Crow Creek. Ultimately we excavated over 500 men, ...
I love archaeology because... I read countless historical novels and loved nothing more than getting lost in an ancient, forgotten world. By the time I got to high school, history was still my forte, yet I don’t think I knew much about archaeology beyond what I’d seen on TV. Suddenly, in 2008, high school was over and I had to go off to college. Without hesitation, I chose anthropology as my major and archaeology as my minor. There was never one moment of doubt or uncertainty in this, and unlike many of my peers, I never changed majors. Every year, I was able to explore more, take more specific, advanced classes, and work or volunteer in areas where I received hands-on experience. When I did my archaeology field school the summer before my junior year, I was ecstatic because I knew I had chosen the right thing—this was my path. In that sense, I was fortunate; there are enough problems, fears, and uncertainties to deal with at that age without adding on the big decision—what should I do for the rest of my life?

Now, still in my early twenties and having hardly dipped my toes into the pool of my future, I am starting to experience a deeper meaning in my career. Sure, I absolutely love getting paid to hike, explore places that most people don’t know exist, and put my knowledge of tin cans to use in a (somewhat) meaningful way. I am also still an academic, pursuing my own scholarly interests for most of the year and spending the summers in the field. I am one of a small and privileged group of people in this world who get to discover history in a deeply personal, direct way. Every time I hold an old object in my hand, I can close my eyes and try to connect with those people who last touched it. These moments have led me to discover even more significance in my profound love of archaeology.

I can justify my career choice in many ways, but most sincerely in one respect. By doing archaeology, I am in fact dealing with the impending confrontation with my own inevitable mortality. It is not death that I confront, but the thought that one day I will die, and eventually every thought and everything I ever did will fade away as well. All the pain and all the joy will die with me, and so what was it all for? What was the point of pulling my hair out to write a thesis that only a handful of people will ever read? And please, tell me how recording this non-diagnostic flake will make any...
impact on my, let alone anybody else’s, life? Eventually, the existential crisis gives way to acceptance (crossing my fingers!). Yet I am comforted by the thought that someone may, in the future, find meaning in my life, try to see the world the way I saw it—for this is what I do when I do archaeology. I love archaeology, and with it I embrace the forgotten and the lost, the sorrow and the joy of the past.

I love archaeology because it enables me to give back to my community through advocacy and mentoring. However, that’s not why I got into archaeology to begin with. Like so many archaeologists, I was drawn to the discipline because I enjoy learning about cultures and the fascinating ways that people make sense of the world around them and act upon those understandings. Trying to comprehend the hints of past lives left on the landscape is incredibly challenging. The fieldwork necessary to locate these past activities is physically demanding as well. These aspects of archaeology combine to create a perfect amalgamation which exercises your mind and body, and I love that.

I went into archaeology as an undergraduate looking to understand other cultures, and it never occurred to me that I could look at my own culture, Hawaiian culture, anthropologically—that is, until the later years of my college studies, when I began to look more critically at the discipline and its relationship with native peoples. It was then that I decided that my participation in archaeology would focus on Hawaiian culture, which turns out to be a pivotal step in the path that got me to where I am today.

Remembering where you come from and giving back to those communities that nurtured you is a value held by many cultures, and in Hawaiian culture this message is emphasized. Growing up in Hawai‘i I learned early on that this includes not only the community of family and friends who care for me, but also the land, ocean, biota, and ancestors as well. Therefore, the teachings gained from past generations through various means such as stories, crafts, chants, genealogies, dance, and cultural sites serve to nurture us. Enter archaeology. By protecting cultural sites from indiscriminate destruction due to land development and other activities, we act to protect these sites, but more importantly we protect a means of connecting to our ancestors. In this way, archaeology can contribute to contemporary Hawaiian communities because the discipline’s preservation ethic overlaps with Hawaiian cultural values of aloha ʻaina, love and respect for the land. In caring for these places, we nurture not only today’s Hawaiian people, but future generations as well.

I currently teach at the University of Hawai‘i at Hilo, in my hometown. I’m incredibly grateful, and lucky, to have secured a teaching position in the very community that helped me to get where I am today. When I entered the field, “doing” archaeology meant summer fieldwork and getting dirt under my fingernails; it was for my own benefit. Currently, “doing” archaeology entails teaching about the discipline, trying to instill an excitement for archaeology in my students, and stressing the need for more Hawaiian and local students in our field. My passion for the discipline is now focused on mentoring a new generation of practitioners and on the potential benefits to Hawaiian communities that can come from archaeology.

I find great joy in working with other institutions and individuals to encourage students to take up the kuleana, responsibility, of doing archaeology. Seeing students literally skip down the hall in excitement, after getting word they were accepted into a graduate program in archaeology, reminds me of my own passion for the discipline. My colleague Dr. Peter Mills and I were thrilled about the interest shown by our students in attending the local Society for Hawaiian Archaeology conference last fall. That so many students, only half of whom are pictured here, would dedicate their free time to attend a professional conference was very
I love archaeology because it is outdoors, down and dirty. Growing up a “nice girl” in the 1950s, I wanted to slip out, feel free, unconstrained. My parents saw I did well in school, was polite and obedient, and so when I rolled off on the heavy Schwinn they bought me, they never asked where I went. We lived just north of the Bronx in Westchester—still full of marshes and woods, and I explored them, found ruined cabins, walked along dunes and estuary. Then when I was fourteen, my ninth-grade science teacher suggested I go to a Saturday science career lecture on archaeology at the American Museum in New York (for a class assignment on “my science career,” I focused on archaeology). My first trip to the City alone! Junius Bird lectured, with slides of his wife Peggy and little sons at Huaca Prieta, the boys in the backdirt with their toy trucks. A revelation: I could be an archaeologist; wives could go into the field!

My first field experience was at eighteen—Angel Mounds, that year devoted to an eroding Yankeetown burial site upriver. Wonderful view. Slow steady troweling. The field assistant, a medical student, telling us not to worry about eating sandwiches with unwashed hands—it was clean dirt. No crowds, no pollution, no parents. Fried baby catfish on rye at the roadhouse. Archaeology—I’m loving it.

Back at school—Barnard—the intellectual excitement of archaeology complemented the physical pleasures of outdoors and slow steady troweling. Richard Woodbury was my principal teacher, a modest, kind man who understood science well, along with Nathalie Woodbury, his wife, who taught at Barnard—a role model of a fine critical intelligence literally wedded to an excellent field man. Nat wrote a recommendation for me for my first job, assistant at the Museum of the Plains Indian in Browning, Montana, on the Blackfeet Reservation. Mentioning that I could cook, she guessed correctly that the director behind the job ad might be a young man lonely for a wife. Tom Kehoe fulfilled my hope of emulating the Woodburies by partnering a good field man. Besides our projects at bison drives, tipi rings, and boulder effigies, and my excavation of a fur trade post, we did some ethnography, and Tom got us to Europe volunteering one summer at Solutré (horse drive), and later with colleagues he met through museum groups.

Meanwhile, the intellectual side of archaeology became increasingly interesting. To put it bluntly, why in my generation were so many archaeologists declaiming theory instead of working inductively from field data? Why were statistics privileged over logical argument? This was Binford’s heyday; I began reading history/philosophy of science to assess his claims. From that standpoint, I did ethnography on SAA, as did Nat Woodbury. Sociology of science, especially the Edinburgh School (Barnes, Bloor, Shapin) let me continue loving archaeology in spite of seeing rampant ego trips at SAA. My 1989 sabbatical at Edinburgh, researching Daniel Wilson and prehistoric archaeology in its societal context, encouraged by Barnes and Bloor, yielded my 1998 Land of Prehistory and validated this turn to studying the discipline.

I love archaeology because the archaeological record is, as Derek Turner observes, not manipulable, a major difference from most other sciences (Turner 2007:24). I value my independence; I love that the past sits there, partially retrievable but independent. I love that we can never know the whole past; seldom can we definitively reach an unassailable interpretation, yet we can work out chains of signification from data to conclusions compatible with richer ethnographic and historical knowledge. I love that there’s no limit to how widely we may search natural sciences and humanities for relevant information. Thinkers without borders, that’s us.

For me personally, growing up when gender set powerful boundaries, archaeology liberated me. It let me be physical instead of ladylike, think like a scholar instead of living as Mrs. Consumer. And I could take my kids into the field.
Ashley McCuistion

Ashley McCuistion is an undergraduate at Virginia Commonwealth University and writes a great blog “Digging Anthropology: Tales from the Sandbox” (http://diganthro.wordpress.com).

I love archaeology because it reveals the footsteps of those who came before us and allows us to tell their stories. I began my journey as an archaeologist only a year ago, when I applied for my first field school at George Washington’s Ferry Farm in Fredericksburg, Virginia. I was uncertain of what the future held for me at the time, and knew only that I wanted to pursue some kind of career in anthropology. I took a few archaeology classes that year and was captivated by the indiscriminate honesty of the field and the excitement of uncovering the many secrets of the past that lie just beneath our feet. I expected that field school would be a good learning experience for me, but I could never have imagined that it would have such a profound and lasting effect on my life as a whole.

I learned to like archaeology in the classroom, but I fell in love the moment my shovel first hit the soil. Ferry Farm is a fantastic place to begin a career in archaeology. With the helpful guidance of my wonderful field directors, I learned everything I could possibly hope to know about excavation, and the more I learned the more I wanted to learn. One of the things I was most moved by in terms of where I was digging was the fact that Ferry Farm, while being best known as the boyhood home of George Washington, has a history that dates back over 10,000 years. As I stood on the hilltop that overlooks the Rappahannock River, I could imagine what the world must have looked like to the countless individuals who had stood there before me. Prehistoric groups frequently inhabited this land, which had yet to be modified by the brick and concrete that dominates the world today. George Washington played there and witnessed the city of Fredericksburg grow just across the water, not knowing that he would one day become the Father of Our Country. Nearly a century later, in the cold winter of 1862, Union soldiers would stand on that same hilltop and prepare for a battle that would devastate the city and cost many of them their lives. Echoes of these individuals remain in the earth, waiting to be uncovered and interpreted by those who discover them. I love archaeology because it allows me to hear those echoes and share their stories.

It is difficult for me to define in words what I love about this field. It is simply a feeling—an emotion that stirs deep in my core every time I hold an artifact or pick up my trowel. I have always had an insatiable desire to understand the past and a longing to be a part of it. Archaeology offers a unique glimpse into a world that existed long before any of us were born and allows us to follow the movements of past peoples by examining the impressions that they unknowingly left in each layer of the earth. By following these movements and studying the artifacts that are recovered through excavation, I feel connected to those people, and by sharing what I’ve learned I feel I can give them a voice.

Another reason I love archaeology is that it is an honest science, dedicated to finding the truth as it is written in the soil. History is often biased and most accurately reflects the views of those who wrote it, not necessarily what actually happened. Archaeology reveals the true history of the world and speaks out for all individuals, not just those worthy of being mentioned in the history books. I love archaeology because it reveals the footsteps of those came before us and allows us to tell their stories. Archaeologists are time travelers, detectives, scholars, and advocates for truth, and I feel so incredibly fortunate to have found my niche in this world alongside them.

Bernard K. Means

Bernard Means is Instructor, Anthropology, at Virginia Commonwealth University.

I love archaeology because I get to share my passion for exploring the past with my students and colleagues. I’ve been long fascinated with the idea of traveling into the past, and I grew up avidly reading H. G. Wells’ Time Machine (and many, many works of much more dubious value) and watching Kirk, Spock, and McCoy from Star Trek journeying to Depression-era New York city or shooting it out with gun-
I love archaeology because...
Further, like a lot of kids, when I was young I loved taking complex things apart and then putting them back together, attempting to get all the parts back in the correct place and order. It occurs to me that the experience of archaeological excavation and analysis is a lot like that. Excavation is definitely a process of taking apart something complex—an archaeological site—and analysis involves taking all the bits and pieces learned through excavation and attempting to put them back together, in a virtual way, into a functioning representation of some aspect of an ancient society. Alas, I still often end up at the end of the putting-together part of the process with some extra parts that don’t seem to fit, which means, just as it did when I was a child, that I have made some mistake in the putting-together process. But that’s both frustrating and challenging—if doing it were easy, it wouldn’t be as appealing.

Finally, my specific interest in archaeology itself dates back to when I was around eight years old, when I was forced to stay home from school with some mild but contagious childhood illness. My mother went to the public library to find some books to keep me amused and one of them was about Howard Carter and the discovery of Tutankhamen’s tomb. I found it fascinating and then proceeded to devour every book I could find on ancient Egypt and other archaeological topics—there was simply something amazingly compelling about learning about ancient and very different ways of life. I mention this because my love affair with archaeology is constantly being renewed by interacting with students who clearly feel the same way about archaeology that I did at their age—their enthusiasm for the topic renews my own and makes teaching archaeology incredibly rewarding.

Thus, I’m still having fun doing something that excites and fascinates me on a personal level and that also contributes in a concrete way to improving our understanding of something that is valuable to humanity as a whole: the long-term history of our cultural diversity.

I love archaeology because it is the one discipline that can permit me to study ancient cultures and evolutionary processes while also having a positive impact on contemporary society. But I also love archaeology because of a range of intangibles that are more difficult to convey. In order to help get there, I begin with a short story.

We were in the field at Bridge River, British Columbia, in 2004. It was early July and roasting hot. The forests on the nearby mountainsides were literally on fire and waves of smoke drifted across the site. There was discussion among some locals that climate change and its resulting droughts, beetle infestations, and fires could eliminate much of the region’s lower elevation forests. Our excavation strategy that year was to excavate narrow test units (50 x 50 cm) into deposits thought to contain hearth features with dateable material as indicated by magnetic susceptibility testing. Some of these units were quite deep, requiring field school students to stretch downward from the surface into the site’s strata to collect the desired sediments. One student, who had been consigned to a particularly deep and challenging unit, raised himself from his small window into the ancient past, sat up in the grass and gazed at the surrounding landscape. Trees were exploding on a nearby mountain. Wiping sweat and dirt from his face, he grinned and said, “It doesn’t get any better than this.”

My student’s experience at Bridge River encapsulates some of the best aspects of our discipline. The Bridge River project was designed as collaboration with the local indigenous people, descendants of the original site occupants. The Bridge River or Xwisten people were interested in learning about their past from archaeology, and they had a variety of needs for archaeological information. They, along with the greater St’át’imc Nation were at the time locked in a legal negotiation with BC Hydro over compensation for impacts of past...
damming of the Bridge River. Like many First Nations groups, they were also desperate to impart appreciation and knowledge of their traditional culture and language to the younger generation. Finally, Xwisten leadership sought sustainable employment opportunities for their members. Archaeology was one way to help them get there. Drawing from the efforts of my students, we were able to develop a new chronology for village establishment and growth that tied critical developments to regional cultural and ecological factors. Our research outcomes were used in the BC Hydro negotiations and they helped provide a foundation for Xwisten’s award winning heritage education and tourism program. Probably the best part for me was simply witnessing the wonder in the faces of the young children as they saw for the first time the long-lost house floors of their ancestors.

Archaeological research spans the ancient past to the present, and research has significant impacts on a range of contemporary discussions, whether adaptation to climate change or indigenous histories and land rights. We are encouraged to think creatively about the past, to propose new ideas about life experiences of the ancestors, to examine complex ecological processes in human adaptation, and to model the grand cultural transitions of human history in the longue durée. Archaeology has its own long history of debates over appropriate theory, and these on occasion have been more than a little vitriolic. And yet archaeology has always been about a very real empirical present, the archaeological record. The archaeological record is a place we can visit, record, excavate, describe, measure, and ponder. It is a place where we engage with evidence for past realities in a physical way that other disciplines can rarely even approximate. And so, for me to truly answer why I love archaeology, I must return to that hot smoky day in British Columbia where all of these linkages between human past, archaeological present, and visions of the future suddenly clicked for an undergraduate field school student.

Christina Perry Sampson

Christina Perry Sampson is a Ph.D. candidate in anthropology at the University of Michigan.

first loved archaeology in the field. It was a simple enough attraction because I love to work outside: in the blazing hot desert valley and hills of California; in Atlantic coastal forests thick with oak trees, vines, and wriggling creatures; in the still-brisk winds of early spring in Michigan. And if the immersion in nature was not enough, there was the draw of experiencing history in new ways. Since my first survey through the Rio Grande Gorge, I have enjoyed exploring the places once inhabited by those past peoples I wanted to study. When these adventures were also filled with the unique, vibrant joy of camaraderie in the field, it was easy for me to love archaeology.

Fieldwork was rewarding even in its challenges. After years of heading the wrong direction on city streets and highways, archaeology gave me a new motivation to orient myself in space and to grasp the contours of the landscape in ways that had not been intuitive for me. Trying to keep multiple transects straight as I set locations for test pits in an old growth forest winding along a marsh, I learned how to utilize a compass, GPS, maps, and a walkie-talkie all at once, and soon enough I was comfortable finding my way. Chasing tumbled layers of ditch fill and post molds down a test pit in Appalachian North Carolina, I found myself imagining the sequences that created those two-dimensional profiles, and I realized how much archaeology had compelled me to think differently.

These experiences also impressed on me the potentially diverse educational benefits of archaeology. As a student who had once been drawn primarily to narratives of human behavior, I can see now how exposure to a field that integrates science, history, and social theory could have broadened my perspective early on. When I introduce lithic reduction and principles of mortuary analysis to visiting middle school students, I try to emphasize these connections between method and knowledge, an aspect of archaeology that made my love for it both immediate and lasting.

Sound and innovative methodologies have allowed archaeologists to press beyond the aesthetic appeal of artifacts and the sensory experiences of exploring ancient sites. There are infinite links to be made between material traces and their implications for the past, and I now love the diversity and
I LOVE ARCHAEOLOGY BECAUSE . . .

Margarita Sánchez Romero

Margarita Sánchez Romero is Senior Lecturer in the Department of Prehistory and Archaeology at the University of Granada, Spain.

I love archaeology because I have always been fascinated by the relationship between people and objects; material culture is a unique way to understand the lives of men, women, and children, and the means to connect with people not only as members of a group, but also as particular individuals living in particular circumstances.

Objects have not only an economic value, but also significant emotional meanings. If we were forced to save only a few of our own things, they would probably not be the most economically valuable, but those with the most emotional meaning. And even if we cannot attribute our modern ideas about emotions to past societies, at least we can guess that many of the things that come to us from the past, whether from domestic or funerary contexts, were imbued with emotions, feelings, and/or creativity from those who made, used, or maintained them.

Through objects, we show who we are, the different faces of our identity, how we see ourselves, and how we want other people to see us. An ornament that shows the transition from childhood to adulthood, a dress with gender connotations, a figurine that symbolizes beliefs, a bone in the context of a ritual, a tool that made work possible—all these remain give us a much richer and more nuanced understanding of the past than socioeconomics alone.

I am convinced that archaeology has a distinctive social nature; archaeologists work in order to produce knowledge about past societies, and that knowledge also has broad and deep connections to our present reality. In my case, I work with those groups usually forgotten in archaeological research: women and children. If we do not include them in our archaeological discourse, we are not only faking our history, but also denying these people their history and genealogies. In such an important task, to try to reach understandings that go beyond the material facts, we need to have a strong theoretical and methodological framework; we need to be honest and explicit in how we make links between our theoretical premises and the material culture we work with.

During the last few years, I have been exploring the multiple dimensions of the discipline; from fieldwork to political administration, I have been able to explore the possibilities of a science attempting to remove and transform the status quo. In an excavation, you can check the adequacy of methodology and create new ways to observe material culture—it is exciting and intriguing, as you only get a single opportunity in this destructive process. On the other hand, work in the lab and the office allows you the time to think about the objects, bodies, and places you have been working on.
And then dissemination, either in academic publications, in lecturing with your students, or in other spheres with the general public—all our work must be directed at this major and big responsibility: to spread knowledge. And, finally, political administration: taking care of the relations between cultural heritage and society. From this position, you can understand how important it is not only to create an adequate legal framework for the preservation of archaeological remains, but also to explore the ways in which we help people to identify with landscapes, monuments, or sites—and the ways we use archaeology to construct present and past identities, and therefore relationships.

Laura W. Steele

Laura Steele has honed her interest in archaeology working as a field technician and is currently in the M.A. Program in Anthropology at Eastern New Mexico University.

I love archaeology because it takes me to sequestered spaces and gives great rise to the imagination. As one of my professors once said in an introduction to archaeology course when I was an undergraduate, “You can’t be one of those people who needs to look in the back of the book to check your answers.” I have always been in favor of the imagination and jigsaw puzzles. As I see it, by doing archaeology I am given the liberty to let my imagination run wild (the Solutrean Hypothesis) to try to solve one of the greatest puzzles of all time: human existence.

Archaeology is romantic; it is the ruthless swashbuckling pirate of disciplines that unabashedly steals scientific means to achieve its ends. I love being able to apply the phenomena of physics, theories of biology, and laws of chemistry to validate broad overarching ideas concerning the development and processes of man. As Boris Pasternak stated about literature, it is “the art of discovering something extraordinary about ordinary people, and saying with ordinary words something extraordinary.” Archaeology gives us the gift to say something extraordinary about humankind through the analysis of ordinary objects. We take the most ordinary things that at one time or another might have been incidental or stupendous and look at them as if they were tiny treasures, or messengers, linking us to our enigmatic past.

Let’s not forget the adventure tied to our grand scheme. No one gets into archaeology because they have a low need for novelty, or a lack of questions. Herein lies the conundrum: once you start down the dark path of asking questions, forever will your destiny be dominated by larger and more complicated problems. Thus, you become entrapped by the lure of solving small mysteries of what it means to be human prehistorically—what things or ideals are present during the time and how they were being utilized. Although we are entangled (I’m picking up what you’re putting down, Hodder), I have never heard anyone complain about finding a Folsom point or a Mayan tomb, for that matter. They are, respectively, residual materials of different but equally fascinating systems. Archaeology allows us to reconstruct a picture of one small aspect that reflects one facet of life. I can take comfort in knowing that the processes in which I participate are never lost, long after I have gone the way of the Dodo, someone will be finding my material footprints to reconstruct my life and saying, “She must have been a bellicerent alcoholic, look at all of these beer bottles.”

We all love archaeology for the adventure. No one ever criticized Harrison Ford for trekking across a barren wasteland on a hunch of finding the key to our civilization, or for being a whip-toting, revolver-wielding, fedora-wearing badass who fights to keep rare antiquities out of the hands of villains and in museums for the world to share. I love archaeology because it lets me be that whip-toting, revolver-wielding badass fighting to preserve culture and reconstruct past lifeways from bits of retrospective data, if only in my mind.

Science, and archaeology included, can never explain everything, and I will never presume to comprehend how things have come to be, but I can try to elucidate the process. I love archaeology because it allows me to do just this in good company or solitude wherever I am. Very little else brings me the same kind of joy as finding an arrowhead, bone awl, or ancient hearth and letting my mind plummet into the depths of time. What I’m saying is that I love archaeology because I am a hopeless romantic who is also a scientist, captivated by the past.
I love being an archaeologist because of the constant opportunity to learn something new. People past and present always surprise us—every archaeologist has their “what the heck” moment in the field or laboratory. As a CRM archaeologist, the variety in sites and time periods results in the opportunity to learn about various facets of the prehistoric past, be it subsistence, land use, or shifts in settlement focus. For the historic period in North America, I can examine nineteenth-century landscape reorganization, the development of transportation networks, and the wide array of data on the abundant material culture. As a non-traditional graduate student, I have to master the latest information on Paleolithic subsistence and the Middle to Upper Paleolithic transition (and I get to participate in excavations in France!). Archaeology provides me with a means to grow intellectually as new data and new theoretical approaches to the past emerge. In addition, I value the opportunity, in a small way, to add to that knowledge and to our understanding of how people lived their lives hard not to enjoy working alongside others who share common interests and research goals, even when the corn is pollinating ... plus, they are archaeologists because they love their work, too.

Probably the most important aspect to me is the opportunity to connect to people in the past and people in the present. After all, archaeology seeks to reconstruct how people lived in the past, how they organized their lives and interacted with each other on a large and small scale. As an archaeologist, I am in direct and indirect contact with people in the past, as I collect the remains of their past behavior in the form of lithic debris or blue shell-edge whiteware. The fun of analyzing a site to understand the way people interacted with each other and their environment is one of the most fascinating ways to earn a living. Archaeology gives us a direct link to people's lives in the past, albeit filtered through taphonomic processes. I also love to talk about archaeology to living people—teaching students, talking to passers-by at a project site, or giving site tours at more formal excavations. I’ve learned a lot from talking with people about the local landscape and history.

Since I was a young child in the UK, I’ve never thought of being anything but an archaeologist. I was always interested in history, and archaeology is a career that combines an interest in history with a more “hands-on” or perhaps “shovel-ready” approach. It is also an avenue to explore the lives of a far broader range of social strata or cultures than the pursuit of history itself. Ground-truthing, if you will, but giving a voice to those outside the history books.

I count myself extremely fortunate to be able to follow a career in archaeology. I intend to continue to enjoy direct contact with the past in the field until my knees give out. But I’ll never stop enjoying it all.

I love archaeology because it is another way to learn about the history of my tribe, the Diné or Navajo, and other Native Americans and to share that history. As a child born and raised in northern Arizona, I realized that my ancestors had lived in America for a very long time, and that made me proud.
I LOVE ARCHAEOLOGY BECAUSE... I often daydreamed about how life was for Navajos and Hopis, before Anglo-Americans came into our homelands. I thought how my life was so easy compared to my ancestors because I could turn on the faucet for water or hop into a car and travel quickly to wherever I needed to go. But what about my ancestors—how did they live? I often felt robbed of that opportunity. I listened attentively to my mother’s stories of how she used to cook an entire meal and fry bread on a woodstove by the time she was ten. She told me of my great-grandfather Ashiihi and how it would take one week on a horse drawn wagon to get to Flagstaff, Arizona, from Birdsprings on the Navajo Reservation.

As a child, my mother attended the Flagstaff Indian Pow Wow with her grandfather Ashiihi, a major event for many tribes and tourists throughout the Southwest in the 1940s-1970s. Since my great-grandfather was a medicine man, the Flagstaff Indian Pow Wow was the place to trade with other tribes for all his medicinal herbs and animal parts. I often fantasized about doing some archaeological testing in the former Flagstaff Indian Pow Wow grounds to find the place where my mother and great-grandfather camped and to reveal other stories buried in the ground. The stories of my mother’s childhood fascinate me, and she experienced many historic moments that I will never, but with archaeology and oral history, a more intricate history of my people appears—breathing life into the hundreds of historic archaeological sites across the Navajo Reservation.

Navajo history is embedded in the landscape, and in working with the Navajo Nation Archaeology Department for 14 years, I experienced firsthand that history within the majestic country that comprises Dine Bikéyah, or Navajo land. My happiest memories of working in archaeology include traveling all over the western Navajo Reservation and walking the land, identifying and recording archaeological sites prior to development projects; seeing how the ancient people, as well as my Navajo ancestors, used the land; and interacting with local Navajos on a personal, daily basis. I traveled to many places and met many Navajo people on the Navajo Reservation, who I never would have known had I not worked for my tribe as an archaeologist. Another happy memory was teaching curious and vivacious middle school students in Tuba City, Arizona, about the Archaic people who once lived in their community 6,000 years ago. Public outreach and teaching about Native American history is something that I truly enjoy and feel strongly about, and being an archaeologist allows me the opportunity to do so—not only with Navajos but even with students here in Indiana, where I currently reside. Connecting what I find on the ground with oral history, documenting and analyzing archaeological sites and artifacts, and writing about what I learned is a process that brings me joy. I desire to do more of that on the Navajo Reservation and to continue with public outreach and teaching about archaeology and Native American history.

Archaeology is a challenging field for Navajos to participate in because of our taboos against disturbing places where people once lived; but I think that by becoming an archaeologist, my research, combined with teaching, will help me to contribute to the longevity of my tribe and to Native American history for all to appreciate.

John Whittaker is Professor of Anthropology at Grinnell College.

I have always loved archaeology, which creates and shares understanding of the past. As a kid finding fossils and 19th-century bottles in our woods, archaeology was about adventure and discovery. These are still important themes, especially to the non-academic public, although the professional’s narratives of discovery are strangely muted, as if having fun was slightly disreputable in a scholar. As I pursued an anthropological education and eventual career, I realized that what I loved discovering was different ways of life, the almost infinitely varied but sensibly patterned ways we humans put our lives together. Growing up as an awkward youth at the end of the civil rights and anti-war era left me aware that there was much wrong with the society I lived in. Exposure to other societies offered not so much answers as recognition that there were other ways worth learning from, and that most societies struggled with the same issues and generally made life work for most members most of the time. A deeper tolerance for other people within each culture and appreciation of the diversity of cultural solutions to human problems seemed not only a basically good path, but...
I LOVE ARCHAEOLOGY BECAUSE . . .

also one that anthropology was uniquely suited to promote.

Adventure remains. Even student jobs excavating in dusty deserts and sweaty cornfields beat pushing a mop or shuffling papers indoors. Now I get my share of dull grading and useless committee work, but not all of my career is behind a desk. Field science is a source of anticipation and social connection—my friends in chemistry and physics don't tell exciting stories about their research, but almost everyone is amused by the biologists' and anthropologists' experiences with snakes, odd foods, and unfamiliar people. Then there are the unusual skills you acquire. I work with prehistoric technologies. Some of my best friends are non-academics who share odd passions for flintknapping and spearthrowing, and these skills enhance my value as a classroom performer, as well as my research. Taking students into the field involves teaching them many skills. Only some are archaeological. The curiosity to wonder what is beneath the grass, coupled with thoughtful excavation procedures and the ability to think through hypotheses and findings to interpret what you see, applies beyond the site. So do the ethical obligations of being part of a team working and living together, seeing the work through even when it is tedious and conditions are far from pleasant. Knowing how to change a tire, cook an enchilada, swing an axe, take a clear photo, disdain scorpions, and talk pleasantly with suspicious landowners does not handicap you in other pursuits either. The field is where you teach students that there is a world beyond classrooms and electronic screens, if they want to find it.

Archaeological research is interesting to others, too. I freely admit that my obsessive analyses of small bits of stone are beyond tedious, but again I have the advantage over most academics when I talk about my work in the right way. The old lady who works the garden next door in Iowa actually wants to hear where her squash came from and how people in the southwest grew corn without the rains of the Midwest. My hunting friend found me because he wanted to learn to make arrowheads and asked for some fairly technical articles after I explained recent work with genetic information from prehistoric turkeys. It is no coincidence that thousands of people pick up arrowheads from fields, or that millions visit Stonehenge and Mesa Verde. They all want to connect with the past, understand something of an alien way of life. We archaeologists have a privileged position—we get to see things and go places that most people do not and share what we learn in a field that has enough glamour and excitement and general interest that it can support ludicrous movies and the History Channel.

I still love archaeology because I see in us a mission. Archaeology has been a tool of colonial appropriation, but a modern archaeology, properly used, turns that around. We have the unique skills to interpret the evidence, actively creating a shared past that all of us can use in many ways, from prideful identity, to scientific contemplation, to reverent awe, even for fantasy and entertainment. The very existence of a field of archaeology, researching, teaching, says that those around us are in fact interested in the past and want to know what we can tell them. Archaeology says that there is yet much we can learn from those broken pots, that those dry bones lived lives that were both humanly like us and fascinatingly different. We speak for the value of diverse cultures, for remembrance of the ancient messages, for the voice of those who can no longer speak themselves. American archaeology says that America did not begin with Columbus, that those who dwelt here earlier are also a part of us, as important and worthy of understanding as the ancient Greeks, the Pilgrims, and George Washington. This is the archaeology I love to share.

Justin Woods

Justin Woods is a junior at Harold L. Richards High School in Oak Lawn, Illinois. Justin met with Jane Baxter to discuss careers in archaeology and left the meeting with some advice and an assignment to write this essay for The SAA Archaeological Record. He happily obliged!

I love archaeology because the rare opportunity it provides is unlike any other profession out there, and it offers a chance to uncover history. To see something at an exhibit in a museum is an experience most of us have had at least once, but what many people fail to realize is that many of those items were found by archaeologists all around the world.

The most amazing part about the whole field is that it’s not just finding the past; it’s also the journey to uncovering the artifact and finding out where it came from, who owned it,
I love to enter a place that has long been abandoned and forgotten and try to imagine what life could have been like back then. To have a career in a field like that is something I dream of doing. There are thousands of years of history just waiting to be uncovered, and as we grow into the technological age, it helps lead us in the search and discovery of many artifacts. As in King Richard III’s case, the person might be buried beneath us. That is why I love archaeology.

Many items found have given us an idea of what type of methods and machinery ancient people had. What tools might an artisan have used back then? What weapons did a warrior have for hunting? I find that fascinating. We think of archaeology as looking to the past, but I find myself wondering what future generations might think of us.

From Rome to ancient Greece to Lucy in Africa, history is just sitting there in the dust and dirt of the world, waiting to be uncovered. For me, I see this as a challenge: to try to find out what items, people, and creations have been lost to time. To find out how our species came to be what it is today is something I strive to look for in the past. It’s not just the physical part of archaeology either; it’s the anthropology that is the most intriguing. What made some of the ancient people, our ancestors, build what they built and travel how they traveled. The small questions like these make me want to search for the answers.

The opportunity to travel and visit places you may have never gone—whether across the globe or in a different part of our country—is another reason why I love archaeology. Very few professions allow for such, and with archaeology, I find that it offers the best deal, doing what you love, and being able to see different cultures and people that you may have never seen before in your life. Archaeology is around us everywhere. Who knows what else we might find in the future? Or where it might be. It is all the unknown questions that float around in my mind that pull me towards this career.

Finally, another reason I love archaeology is the people you meet along the way. So many people you work with share common goals, and in a field like this, you can’t do it unless you love it.

Norman Yoffee

Norm Yoffee is Professor Emeritus of Near Eastern Studies at the University of Michigan.

As the cast member playing Pete Rose put it on Saturday Night Live a few decades ago (in a comic book Spanish accent), “Baseball been bery bery good to Petey Rose.” The actor playing me might well say, “Archaeology’s been very good to Norman Yoffee.” Let the actor continue: Yoffee was lucky to have gotten his first job as lecturer in the Department of Anthropology, University of Arizona, in 1972, joining a distinguished, hard-working, and extraordinarily collegial subdisciplinary band (no neo-evolutionary taxonomy intended) of archaeologists. Thanks to a generous reduction in teaching load his first year, he managed to finish his dissertation and ascend to the rank of assistant professor.

His first lecture in Mesopotamian Archaeology was a catastrophe. He had never taught anything, having had a variety of fellowships, not teaching assistantships—since the Department of Near Eastern Studies at Yale, which had its own captive NE archaeologist, taught only one undergraduate course in Egyptian archaeology. For his first real class, Yoffee prepared meticulously for a week, eventually typing up his notes, which he assumed would carry him through two or three lectures. Unfortunately, he basically read his notes, which lasted about 20 minutes. In a panic, he announced that he had forgotten the rest of his notes in his office two floors above the lecture room in the Anthropology building. He then left the room to get the scribbled outline he was going to use to prepare his next week of lectures. He took two steps into the hall when he remembered that the scribbled notes were at home. He re-entered the lecture room and announced that class was dis-
missed for the day, so see you next time. He then went up to his office to wait for the expected visit from the department head telling him that his contract was voided and that he should find something else to do with his life.

Among the students in his first year of teaching at Arizona are now two “Distinguished Professors,” one museum curator and professor (now retired!), a head of a region in the National Park Service (also now retired!), and other successful professional archaeologists. In his career, Yoffee was fortunate to have learned from brilliant, energetic, irreverent, and congenial students at Arizona and Michigan (and some other places, too). He is proud to think that his teaching has led, in some smaller and larger ways, to their career development and in less tangible ways, to a sense of curiosity about their world.

As a Fulbright professor in Sydney, Australia, in 1985, Yoffee was asked in an interview what was the most unexpected thing that happened to him in his career. The answer was, of course, that he never expected that an academic life could result in so many bonus miles. He was invited to Australia to teach and also to comment on a panel at the AAA (Australian Archaeological Association) on “trends towards social complexity in prehistoric Australia and Papua New Guinea.”

Now it is common in archaeology for organizers of panels at the SAA and advanced seminars (such as at the SAR) to enlist a discussant from outside the region being explored to comment on the (hoped for) importance of the research to those not inculcated in the region’s mysteries and therefore relatively unbiased/unmired in intra-regional debates. Apparently, Yoffee was solicited to come to Australia because he was perfectly unbiased: he knew almost nothing about prehistoric Australia or PNG. Further lack of knowledge afforded him trips to Brazil, Taiwan, China, India, Israel; Yoffee has also gained bonus miles by lecturing in distant universities on subjects on which he actually professes knowledge (or at least on subjects for which he has a lot of slides).

Because of all the great archaeological students and amenable colleagues (and omitting the dysfunctional ones), Yoffee blushes to confess his love of archaeology. And for those students at UNLV, UNM, and ISAW/NYU who now work with him after his retreat from Michigan, excelsior!
The SAA Board of Directors met on April 3 and 6, 2013, at the Annual Meeting in Honolulu, Hawaii. The April 3rd meeting was chaired by SAA President Fred Limp and attended by President-Elect Jeffrey Altschul, Treasurer Alex Barker, Secretary Janet Levy, Secretary-Elect Christina Rieth, and Directors Sarah Herr, Eduardo Neves, Kelley Hays-Gilpin, and Suzanne Fish. Guests included Treasurer-Elect James Bruseth and Directors S. Terry Childs and Rodrigo Liendo Stuardo. SAA Executive Director Tobi Brimsek attended ex officio. Directors Melinda Zeder and Alston Thom were absent. The April 6th meeting was chaired by SAA President-Elect Jeffrey Altschul. Secretary-Elect Rieth, Treasurer Barker, Treasurer-Elect Bruseth, Executive Director Brimsek, and Directors Herr, Neves, Hays-Gilpin, Fish, Childs, and Liendo Stuardo were in attendance.

President Limp provided a brief summary of his written report to the Board, highlighting the accomplishments of the past year. The SAA has had a particularly active year, especially in the areas of Publications, Annual Meetings, Government Affairs, and Member Services.

In the area of Publications, the current and past two years of American Antiquity and Latin American Antiquity are now available online on the Member section of the SAA website. The editors of both journals have also significantly reduced the turnaround time between submission and publication of manuscripts.

The Society has launched a new online journal, titled Advances in Archaeological Practice. This online, peer-reviewed journal will publish short articles on all areas of archaeological practice. The articles will be of interest to all archaeologists, especially those in the consulting and government sectors.

Current Research Online (CRO) will return in 2013 and will provide a forum for archaeologists to share their research with entries that are searchable by geographic location. Although only SAA members will be able to post their research, the postings will be accessible to everyone.

The SAA Press is expanding the range of monographs and edited volumes that it publishes, with a new volume on Hawaiian archaeology released in time for the Annual Meeting in Honolulu.

In 2012, the SAA launched a new Annual Meetings submission system. The new system will assist the Program Committee in organizing the annual program, and it has the added benefit of increasing the size of submitted abstracts.

The Board has also eliminated the Thursday evening sessions and expanded the poster sessions, beginning with the 2018 Annual Meeting. Student Day, an event designed to expose high school and undergraduate students to the Annual Meeting and archaeology, in general, debuted with a series of learning labs lead by noted professionals.

Building on the success of the 2012 Conferencia Intercontinental, the 2014 meeting will be held in Lima, Peru. The Government Affairs Committee has continued to represent archaeology in state and federal settings, advocating for the preservation of cultural remains and providing expertise when needed. Among the committee’s notable accomplishments was continued advocacy for the creation of Chimney Rock National Monument in Colorado.

A new committee, International Government Affairs (IGAC), was formed in 2012 to address similar issues occurring beyond the Americas, and it has written letters in support of the protection of archaeological resources in Egypt, Syria, Libya, and Mali.

In the area of Member Services, the Board approved the creation of an online and workshop-based professional development program, developed recommendations for Data Management Plan content for NSF Proposal Submission, and oversaw the development of a new Historically Underrepresented Groups Scholarship (HUGS). Finally, in 1996, the SAA Board set a new fiscal goal that the Society would have reserves that equal 100 percent of the current operating budget in the event of a major fiscal crisis. President Limp announced that the society has achieved this goal and thanked past Boards—and especially past Treasurers—for their careful stewardship of the Society’s resources.

Executive Director Tobi Brimsek provided a summary of her written report to the Board. She began by reviewing staff changes, including the addition of an editorial specialist, a new manager, Publications, and new manager, Memberships and Marketing. The coordinator of Memberships and Marketing has
been changed to coordinator of Membership and Meetings to align the position more closely with tasks related to the Annual Meeting. The Executive Director provided an update on developments in government affairs, especially those relating to budget cuts and the protection of cultural resources both within and outside of the Americas.

In the area of information management, the new submissions system was successfully launched in the fall of 2012. Enhancements for the system are being considered and will be discussed by the Board in the future. Feedback from the membership indicates that the electronic election continues to be well received. Membership continues to remain strong, with membership in the Society at 7,182 for 2012. Of these, 26.5 percent were student members. Membership renewals for 2013 are currently below renewals this time last year.

SAA continues to have a presence on social media, including Facebook, Twitter, and LinkedIn. Registration for the Annual Meeting in Honolulu is expected to be on budget with advance registration at 3,119. All of the scheduled field trips were full and the luau at the Bishop Museum sold out quickly.

The Publications program continues to be strong, although institutional subscriptions to journals have continued to decline and will probably not rebound. The Executive Director provided a summary of other activities carried out by her and her staff, including the process of registering the society in all states to allow it to carry out fundraising activities, marketing of the new online journal, the development of the online seminar series, and public education and outreach efforts aimed at developing a new brochure for middle and high-school audiences on careers in archaeology.

Secretary Janet Levy reported the results of the election. James Bruseth was elected as Treasurer. S. Terry Childs and Rodrigo Liendo Stuardo were elected as Board members. Stephen Silliman and Maria Nieves Zedeno were elected to the Nominating Committee. A total of 8,190 ballots were distributed, with 1,570 (19.6%) returned. This percentage is down from last year’s.

Treasurer Alex Barker reported on the SAA’s current fiscal position. For 2012, the Society had an annual operating budget of approximately $1.5 million. Overall, the Society enjoyed a healthy year, with SAA investment accounts up and growth seen in several funds. Despite growth, costs continue to rise and some sources of revenue (i.e., institutional subscriptions to journals) continue to decrease. Several committees and task forces, including the Investment and Finance Committee, the Endowment Planning Task Force, and the Fundraising Com-
committee, continue to work hard to develop new investment strategies and priorities for the Society. Treasurer Barker recommended that surplus be allocated to the SAA Reserves Fund and to the Special Projects Fund to support several technology-related initiatives.

The Board considered several agenda items, including the allocation of endowment interest to technology, Native American Scholarships Temporarily Restricted Fund, and the General Endowment Preservation Fund. The Board also allocated funds from the 2012 surplus to the Reserves Fund. The Board approved a dues increase of $5 (excluding student and discounted rates) beginning in 2014, filled vacancies in board liaison assignments, and set the normal terms of members of SAA committees at 3 years, beginning with appointments made in 2014. The Board established the SAA Award Status Task Force to add SAA awards to the National Research Council list of highly prestigious academic awards and to recognize books and monographs in assessments of scholarly productivity.

The Board was joined by Gordon Rakita, Program Chair for the Honolulu meeting, who made some useful suggestions that will help future program chairs with the organization of the Meeting. President Limp thanked the 2013 Program Committee for their hard work in organizing this year’s program.

The Board had breakfast with the chairs of the SAA committees and organizers of interest groups on Saturday, April 6. The Board discussed with the committee chairs the process for submitting reports and budget requests, the process for recruiting new committee members, the process for nominating members for awards, and the posting of committee information and committee activities on the SAA website. During lunch, the Board met with Ken Sassaman, editor of American Antiquity, Chris Pool, co-editor of Latin American Antiquity, Ken Ames, editor of The SAA Press, Anna Prentiss, editor of The SAA Archaeological Record, Christopher Dore, editor of Advances in Archaeological Practice, and Deborah Nichols, chair of the Publications Committee. We had a general discussion of on-going initiatives for the SAA’s publication program.

The board discussed plans for its fall meeting, when it will discuss budget requests for 2014. Finally, the Board thanked outgoing committee and task force chairs and SAA representatives for their service to the Society: Jeffrey Altschul, Alex Barker, James Bayman, Wesley Bernardini, Susan Chandler, Jon Czaplicki, William Doelle, Christopher Dore, William Fitzhugh, Diane Gifford-Gonzalez, Patricia Gilman, Paul Goldberg, Kathleen Kawelu, Shereen Lerner, Mary Ann Levine, William Lovis, Jeanne Moe, John Norder, Gordon Rakita, Jo Reese, Christina Rieth, and Laura Short. President Limp also acknowledged the contributions of outgoing directors Melinda Zeder and Alston Thoms, as well as outgoing Secretary Janet Levy, and thanked them for their exemplary service and contributions to the society.

Patricia Lyons and Jennifer Richman of the Committee on Repatriation and David Lindsay, Manager, Government Affairs, met with the Board on Saturday [April 6] to discuss reconciling SAA’s position on the definition of “Native American” for the purposes of NAGPRA and the new federal regulations/processes regarding Culturally Unidentified Human Remains (CUHR) under NAGPRA. President Altschul thanked the committee for their informative report on the subject, and drew the Board’s attention to the complexities of the issue. The board also met with Julie Stein, chair of the Fundraising Committee. Priorities and options for future fundraising were discussed. Susan Chandler, SAAs representative to the Register of Professional Archaeologists (RPA) provided the Board with an update on the activities of RPA, including changes in the way the RPA Field School Scholarship is administered.

Christian Wells, coordinator of Current Research On-line (CRO), provided the board with a very informative presentation on CRO. CRO will have the member benefit of bringing information about research to a wide audience in relatively short order. Current Research On-line will be available to the membership during the summer of 2013.
President Fred Limp called the SAA’s 78th Annual Business Meeting to order at 5:10 pm on Friday, April 5, 2013, after a quorum was determined to be present by the Secretary. He asked for the minutes of last year’s business meeting in Memphis to be approved. The motion was moved, seconded, and approved by the members present.

The President thanked the members of the Nominations Committee, chaired by Christopher Dore, for their work on putting together an excellent slate of candidates. He thanked the outgoing Board members, including Secretary Janet Levy and Board members Melinda Zeder and Alston Thoms.

The President thanked the many members who participate in governance of the SAA through volunteer work on committees and task forces. He especially thanked all committee and task force chairs who are cycling off this year: Wesley Bernardini, Susan Chandler, Jon Czaplicki, William Doelle, Christopher Dore, William Fitzhugh, Diane Gifford-Gonzalez, Patricia Gilman, Paul Goldberg, Shereen Lerner, Mary Ann Levine, William Lovis, Jeanne Moe, John Norder, Jo Reese, Laura Short, and Julie Stein.

The Society is a volunteer organization that depends significantly on the contributions of its members to governance, outreach, meetings, and other projects.

The President thanked Gordon Rakita (Program Chair) and Jim Bayman and Kathy Kawelu (Annual Meeting Local Advisory Committee Co-Chairs), and their respective committees, for developing a successful meeting.

The President especially noted the excellent work of Executive Director, Tobi Brimsek, and the SAA staff, including Shelley Adams, Eleanor Umali, David Lindsay, Maureen Malloy, Meghan Moran, Alyssa Barnett, and Cheng Zhang, and welcomed new staff member Russell Bahorsky. The Society is extremely fortunate to have a truly exceptional professional staff.

The President reviewed the success of the publications program and thanked the editors of the journals: Kenneth Sassaman, editor of *American Antiquity*, and Christopher Pool and Gabriela Urúñuela [*Latin American Antiquity*]. He reminded the meeting that all issues of the journals are immediately available online to members. He thanked Kenneth Ames, editor of The SAA Press, and reminded the meeting of the newest monograph available from the SAA Press, focusing on the prehistory of Hawaii. He also reminded the members of the new digital journal, *Advances in Archaeological Practice*, edited by Christopher Dore, whose first edition will be published in summer 2013. He thanked outgoing editor of *The SAA-AR*, Jane Eva Baxter, and welcomed the new editor, Anna Prentiss.

Turning to financial matters, the President was happy to tell the membership that the SAA is fiscally healthy and has reached a Reserves target of 100 percent of annual operating budget. The Chair was able to announce at this point that registration for the Honolulu meeting had reached 3,318 individuals. Registration for the meeting as of 12 pm on Friday [April 4] was 3,119.

Alex Barker, Treasurer, gave his report. The SAA is in robust financial health. SAA’s investments are well managed and grew by 10.5 percent in the past year. The treasurer explained why reaching our long-standing goal of 100 percent of one year’s operating budget in the Reserves Fund is an important accomplishment. A healthy reserves fund supports the Society’s sustainability, moderates fiscal shocks, and allows the Society to go forward on new projects with confidence.

Janet Levy, Secretary, gave her report. She announced the results of the elections: Jim Bruseth, Treasurer-Elect; S. Terry Childs and Rodrigo Liendo as new members of the Board of Directors. Steve Silliman and Maria Neves Zedeño were elected to the Nominations Committee. A total of 8,190 electronic ballots were distributed and 1,570 (19.6%) were returned.

Executive Director, Tobi Brimsek, gave her report, including
quotes from Franklin Roosevelt, Buddha, and Henry Kissinger. SAA is a society that is focused, balanced, and nimble. From the staff’s perspective, this has been a year of challenges. She noted that reaching the goal of 100 percent in the reserves has taken 17 years.

She described transitions in the staff, and thanked the staff for their work, including Meghan Moran, outgoing Manager, Membership and Marketing; Cheng Zhang, Manager, Information Services; Alyssa Barnett, Coordinator Membership and Meetings; John Neikirk, former Manager, Publications; Maureen Malloy, Manager, Public Education; David Lindsay, Manager, Government Affairs; and Shelley Adams, Coordinator, Financial and Administrative Services. She welcomed our new staff, Eleanor Umali, Manager, Publications, and Russell Bahorsky, Manager, Membership and Marketing.

The Executive Director continued by describing a number of initiatives for the coming year, including updates and revisions to various IT initiatives to provide new services for members. The Society will inaugurate a series of online seminars in the last quarter of this year. There will be updates to the online submission system for the annual meeting, and Current Research Online will be initiated. She closed by encouraging members to attend the 79th Annual Meeting in Austin, TX.

Following the report of the Executive Director, President Limp presented Presidential Awards to acknowledge special contributions to the Society and to the field of archaeology. He then asked the chair of the Awards Committee, Kelly Knudson, to present the Society’s awards and fellowships. Jon Driver presented the Arthur C. Parker Scholarship and the other Native American scholarships. President Limp introduced the Lifetime Achievement Award, and asked Keith Kintigh to make the presentation of the award to Prof. Henry Wright. The President recognized all members of awards committees who do the essential work of choosing deserving individuals for each award. The citations of all Awards and Scholarships follow this report.

After presentation of awards and scholarships, the recipient of the Lifetime Achievement Award, Prof. Henry Wright, spoke briefly. He closed by saying to students: “Dig more, survey more, analyze more, publish more.”

The President then asked for new business. Hearing no new business, he asked for presentation of ceremonial resolutions. Ceremonial resolutions were read by chair of the committee, Dean Snow. The first resolution thanked the retiring members of the Board of Directors, President Fred Limp, Secretary Janet Levy, and Board Members Alston Thoms and Melinda Zeder, for their service. The resolution then thanked 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 Gordon Rakita, and including Keith Ashley, Jane Eva Baxter, Caryn M. Berg, Virginia Butler, Ethan Cochrane, Liam Frink, Brett Hill, Terry L. Hunt, Joseph Lehner, Ernest Lohse, Desiree Martinez, Jerry D. More, Juliet E. Morrow, Marit Munson, David L. Peterson, Sean Rafferty, Kathryn Reese-Taylor, John Rissetto, Kari Schleher, Rebecca Schwendler, Miriam Stark, Christina Torres-Rouff, Mary Beth Trubitt, Christian Wells, and David Yesner, and student assistant, Shaza Wester Davis; and the Annual Meeting Local Advisory Committee, chaired by Jim Bayman and Kathy Kavelu. 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: may they return safely to their homes and families.
Last, a resolution of sympathy was proposed to the families and friends of Christopher Peebles, Janet Spector, Lawrence W. Meier, William Rathje, Elizabeth Ann Morris, Marcia Donaldson, Betty Meggers, James Mellaart, Roderick Sprague, Daniel E. Shea, Mark Mack, Gregory Possehl, Robert Sharer, Leslie Shaw, Bernard Wailes, John Weymouth, Verna L. Cowin, T. Patrick Culbert, Linda Cordell, David Brugge, and Rachel Horlings. The members rose for a moment of silence in honor of our departed colleagues.

President Limp introduced new President, Jeffrey Altschul, and passed the gavel to him. President Altschul expressed his thanks to outgoing President Limp.

President Altschul called for a motion to adjourn, which was made and seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 6:15 pm.

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

Fred Limp (Outgoing President)

I want to share with you news on how the SAA has been focused on increasing the value of the Society to our current members and also identifying ways to provide value to archaeologists who are not currently members without impacting our current members. In these efforts, we have been guided by the Society’s needs assessment in 2010—answered by one-half of the membership—and by a focused analysis of just under 4,600 individuals who are archaeologists but are not members. The keys to membership for our members (not surprisingly) are the annual meetings and the publications, but there are other major areas as well. Those who are not members largely requested targeted materials that would help them in their current jobs—an objective they did not think American Antiquity or Latin American Antiquity accomplished effectively, though they did feel that the SAA’s Archeological Record did have much content that was useful.

Before I go to the specifics of our activities this last year, I am delighted to advise you that we have met a major financial benchmark. In 1996, the SAA Board set anew a fiscal goal that the Society would have reserves that were equal to 100 percent of the current operating budget. The idea was (and is) that this would insure that the basic Society functions could continue in the event of a major fiscal crisis or other unanticipated external event. Each Board since then has reaffirmed this objective and allocated funds from the operating budget to the reserve. We have now achieved that objective! Not only does that mean that we have the security that the reserves provides but it means that revenue from the interest on the reserve, when not required to sustain the balance, can be used to invest in current Society operations. Achieving this objective has been the result of the hard efforts of our past Boards and especially the Treasurers—who have been careful stewards of the Society’s resources.

2012–2013 Activities

Here is a quick summary of some key landmarks. Details for most follow in the text below.

Publications
1. On-line availability of current and last two years of American Antiquity and Latin American Antiquity.
4. Return of Current Research—online.
5. Board and editors of American Antiquity and Latin American Antiquity have substantially reduced the time from submission to publication and eliminated the backlog.
6. A new release from the Press Hawaii’s Past in a World of Pacific Islands which will be available for the Honolulu meetings.
7. Kindle sales of SAA Press books continue to slowly grow.

Annual Meetings
8. New annual meetings submission system.
9. Childcare at annual meetings.
10. Student day at annual meetings.
11. Conferencia Intercontinental in Panama and planning for 2014 in Lima Peru.
12. Presidential sessions on archeology and the media and descendant communities and the future of archaeology.
13. Based on member input the Board has eliminated the Thursday evening sessions and substantially expanded the poster sessions—effective in 2018.

Growing the membership
14. Successful NSF proposal to continue funding of Native American Scholarships.
15. Development of new Historically Under-represented Groups Scholarship Program.
16. Funding of a Field School Scholarship annually through RPA.
17. Student days, new journal and CRO—see above.
18. Taskforce on increasing our value to senior and retired members.
19. Creation of an on-line and workshop-based professional development program.

**Governmental affairs**
20. Formation of International Governmental Affairs Committee.
21. Development of taskforce to address implications of cultural resources and hydraulic “fracking.”
22. Supported international efforts to preserve antiquities in Egypt, Syria and Mali.
23. Monitored and sent letter of support or concern (as matters required) to Field Museum, Wal-Mart International, Discovery International and Discovery Channel España y Portugal and a number of federal and state agencies.

**Other initiatives**
24. Collaboration with SHA, RPS, NCSHPO, NATHPO, metal-detectorists and other to assist National Geographic TV in developing ethical guidelines for metal detecting.
25. Development of task force to investigate gender differences in senior proposal submission rates to NSF.
27. Registration of the SAA in all 50 states—permitting requests of support to be placed in the Archeological Record and via other means for national development and other fund raising efforts.

**Improvements in Publications**
Responding to the needs assessment data we have taken major steps to improve and expand our publications. The most recent publication development has been the creation of the *Society for American Archaeology’s Current Research On-Line*. From 1962 to 1994 a valuable part of *American Antiquity* was the section “Current Research.” It was used to provide rapid reports of recent field results—long before they might be accessible through standard publications. Due to increasing manuscript submissions to the journal and publication costs, Current Research was ended in 1994. Now, nearly two decades later, we can take advantage of the economies of on-line systems to bring it back. Under the guidance of Christian Wells and a group of some 20 regional coordinators, Society members can now provide rapid updates on their research and fieldwork. While only SAA members can post information, the results will be accessible to everyone. We are particularly hopeful that this venue will provide a vehicle for consulting archaeologists and those in government agencies to quickly bring the results of their projects to the attention of the wider field, especially where access to other publications outlets may be limited. CRO will support hypertext linkages so that the CRO entry can also serve as a gateway for the readers to more substantive materials on the work.

Gabriela Uruñuela Y Ladron De Guevara, Christopher Pool (LAQ), and Ken Sassaman (AQ) have made great progress in reducing the time between submission, acceptance and publication of articles to LAQ and AQ. The Board supported the addition of two “mega-issues” of LAQ to eliminate the backlog and both journals are now able to use of the digital supplemental on-line materials to increase the number of articles published in each number.

This spring will also see the first issue of *Advances in Archaeological Practice* under the editorship of Christopher Dore. This online, peer-reviewed journal has been developed to provide an outlet for articles of specific relevance to the practice of archaeology, typically they will be shorter and released in a timely manner. They’ll cover the entire range of practice: fieldwork, analysis, methods, administrative or legal in nature. While these will be of great interest to everyone we hope that they will be of special value to archeologists “in the trenches” in consulting and government service.

The SAA Publications program under the editorship of Ken Ames has been expanding the number and range of monographs and edited publications. A new book on Hawaiian archaeology will be available in Honolulu and a number of other titles are nearing publication. In 2011 selected titles of the SAA Press became available in a Kindle format. Sales of these grow but remain modest. In addition to their availability a value to the Society is the visibility that they provide on the Amazon web site. Finally, as I hope everyone now knows, the most recent versions of *American Antiquity* and *Latin American Antiquity* are now online as are the last two years—after that they are accessible via JStor.

**Annual Meetings**
A number of steps have been taken to increase the value of the annual meetings. Perhaps the most obvious has been the creation of a new on-line annual meeting registration system. Not only has the system addressed complications that session organizers often faced, it has also meant that the paper abstract length can be expanded from 100 to 200 words. This will mean that the abstract can serve as a more valuable guide to the paper but, perhaps more importantly, in time it can serve as a source of information for projects and research that have not yet seen publication in other forms. A second new meeting development will be the availability of childcare at the next three meetings. This pilot has been set up to provide a real opportunity to assess the demand and value of such a service. Hopefully it will expand the participation of members with children. Another new part of the annual meeting is the designation of Saturday as “Stu-
dent Day.” A special one-day admission price and badging will be available for students along with special activities to introduce them to the SAA and archaeology.

A new meeting type was introduced in 2012 and will continue to be offered. The first Conference Intercontinental was held in Panama City, Panama. Held completely in Spanish it was an opportunity for more than 100 SAA members to participate in a focused meeting with 34 papers presented. The proceedings of the meeting are now undergoing editorial review as is planning for the 2014 meeting in Lima, Peru. The 2012 conference organized under the leadership of Dan Sandeweis and the 2014 meeting is being organized by Barbara Ayarro. The meeting participants were very positive, and it will serve as a model for other focused meetings in the future. We feel these can provide real value to our current members but can also provide value to archaeologists who are not yet members.

Over many years, the membership has repeatedly complained about both Sunday and Thursday evening sessions. Over the last year, a task force examined the options for elimination of these. Due to hotel booking factors elimination of the Sunday sessions is fiscally impossible. Moving the meeting to a week-day only format—or even weekdays and Saturday—would raise the hotel costs dramatically to our members as hotels are willing to discount their room prices if weekends days are included. A related complaint dealt with the undesirability of the Thursday evening sessions. After looking that the situation the Task Force recommended, and the Board approved, a plan that eliminates Thursday evening session and, in their place, dramatically expands the poster opportunities. This will require the assignment of additional space so it won’t begin until the new contracts for convention and hotel space are issued—that will be in 2018.

Other Initiatives

While meetings and publications attract the lion’s share of interest there are many other areas where the Society provides value. Two of these are our efforts to bring new students into the field. In addition to the new Student Days, key pillars of this effort are the continuing Native American Scholarship Program and the, new, Historically Underrepresented Groups Scholarship Program. A successful NSF proposal for the NASP was submitted in 2012, coordinated by Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh. Diane Gifford-Gonzales led the creation of the HUGS effort. As in past years the SAA provided a $1,000 scholarship—awarded to the Mule Creek Preservation Field School in collaboration with RPA. Our ongoing work with NASA on the joint SAA-NASA-National Geographic FAME Lab Project and our work with many media sources to improve the quality of the exposure and understanding of archeology by the public are also central. Mindy Zeder has led many of these efforts.

The needs assessments indicated a strong interest in professional development and a task force lead by Sarah Herr and Suzie Fish developed a comprehensive plan for a professional development. The first steps will be a series of online seminars on a range of topics of current interest and expansion of the workshop format at the annual meetings.

A key ongoing effort by the Society of value not only to our members but to all archaeologists is the work done by the Government Affairs Committee (GAC)—over the year this group has effectively represented archeology in many state and federal settings—supporting initiatives, constructively criticizing when needed and providing expertise. TJ Ferguson led the group in 2012 and Lee Rains Clauss will serve as chair going forward. GAC has monitored activities by state and federal agencies and others and developed responses for the Society. It has become clear that archeological interests of SAA members go far beyond the geographic limits of the Americas—we have members in more than 50 countries—and many archaeologists living in the Americas work in other areas of the world. In order to better represent their interests in the last year we have created the International Government Affairs Committee (IGAC). Under the leadership of Dan Sandeweiss IGAC has already provide expertise and assistance to the efforts to protect the heritage of Egypt, Libya, Syria, Mali—and these are examples of just a few of the recent IGAC actions. The explosive growth of hydraulic fracking for oil and gas exploration has presented complex challenges to the protection of cultural resources. A task force has been investigating the potential impact and legal (state and federal) protections and developing a plan for the Society (and partners) going forward.

We recognize that different categories of members have different need and we have initiated an effort to identify those efforts that we can take that would be of particular value to our senior and retired members. This effort is being led by Bill Lipe.

Recently, NSF called to our attention that there was an unexplained gender difference in NSF senior award submissions. Males were submitting proposals almost twice as frequently as females. At the award level, however, rates were essentially identical. The SAA has initiated a task force lead by Barbara Mills and Lynne Goldstein to investigate the situation and provide recommendations going forward. Another task force, led by Alex Barker and members of the Committees on Museum, Collections and Curation and the Digital Data Interest Group, is developing recommendations for data management plans that would be part of NSF proposal submissions—plans that recognize the unique needs of archeological research both for physical and digital data management.

While this is an impressive list it is only a partial one. The Society is extraordinarily fortunate to have a superb and always
growing community of volunteers who serve on the committees, task forces and interest groups and who contribute their time willingly to advance our Society’s work. My thanks to all of you!

REMARKS FROM THE INCOMING PRESIDENT

Jeffrey H. Altschul

In my service to SAA, I have always been following Fred, he was a treasurer of the Society before me and now I succeed him as President. I can tell you: he’s a tough act to follow. Fred is famous for his “third way”; when sides on an issue seem intractable, he finds a way around the impasse so that everyone feels that they won. Fred without doubt has been our geeliest president and I can only hope that he has led us far enough into the future that your current techno Neanderthal president doesn’t drive us back into the Paleolithic. Most of all Fred has taught me that service can be fun. People ask what we do locked away for two days. Mostly we laugh. Fred did his job in a way that had us work hard without even knowing that we were working hard. I can only hope to do half as well. And, so please join me in acknowledging a job well done. Fred, from everyone at the SAA: Thank you!
2013 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 member who has an interest in a particular award to volunteer to serve on a future committee.

**Presidential Recognition Award**

**Diane Gifford-Gonzalez**

The President of the Society for American archaeology has presented this presidential award to Diane Gifford Gonzalez in recognition of her outstanding contributions to the Historically Underrepresented Groups Scholarship (HUGS) program and for her leadership in the development of a high quality proposal from the SAA to NSAF to obtain funding for the program.

**Presidential Recognition Award**

**Susan Kane, Cori Wegener, Tim Melancon, and Serena Bellew**

During the multinational Operation Unified Protector, Libya, there was almost no damage to the country’s extraordinary archeological sites. The preservation of these irreplaceable resources was the direct result of the efforts of a group of individuals. Working closely together, they located and organized information on the sites and provided these to the operations planners. Individuals who played key roles were:

Susan Kane, as an archaeologist with detailed knowledge of Libya, recognized her information could be valuable for military planning in terms of site protection. Prof. Kane took the initiative to work with colleagues around the world to put together and provide a high quality, comprehensive data set.

Cori Wegener was the first serving Monuments Officer since World War II. Her tireless efforts in forming the US Committee of the Blue Shield and in encouraging ratification of the 1954 Hague Convention by the US Senate made possible the network of professionals used to insure that the information provided by the archaeologists made it to the organizations at Defense and State who could use the information wisely.

Tim Melancon made sure that the cultural property data made it to the critical offices both at US DoD and NATO for operational planning and implementation.

Serena Bellew’s work on behalf of cultural property protection in her role as the Deputy Preservation Officer at the US Department of Defense has contributed to a climate where the issue is recognized as a critical component for responsible operations in host nation settings. Thank you all for your extraordinary efforts in preserving such a key part of our world’s heritage.

**Presidential Recognition Award**

**Melnilda A. Zeder**

The President of the Society for American archaeology has presented this presidential award to Mindy Zeder in recognition of her outstanding contributions in organizing and leading the Society’s and other archaeological organizations’ positive response to the National Geographic television show “Diggers” and for her efforts in organizing the 2012 national meetings presidential forum on archaeology and the press.
This year’s SAA Student Paper Award has been presented to Bryn Letham of the University of British Columbia and David Bilton of the University of Toronto for their co-authored paper “Settlement and Subsistence among the shíshálh of the Northern Salish Sea.” Letham and Bilton’s thoughtful examination of traditions of practice among the shíshálh First Nation on the southwest coast of British Columbia suggest that there is notable continuity with regard to settlement and subsistence in the shíshálh landscape. The authors convincingly argue that a combination of tradition, practice, human political action, and aspects of the landscape and its resources contributed to long-term stability observed in the archaeological record of the shíshálh territory.

Gene Stuart Award

JULIAN SMITH

Julian Smith, an award-winning author and writer for American Archaeology, has earned the 2013 Gene S. Stuart Award for his responsible and entertaining writing about the fascinating capabilities and inherent problems associated with virtual archaeology. “Virtually Recreating the Past” presents an ethically responsible and engaging view on the new methods being utilized in archaeology and the diverse ways by which both professionals and the public can use and benefit from the technology. His article describes many different virtual methods, including the use of 3D modeling on traditional sod houses in the Canadian arctic, an interactive educational game based on a Russian fur-trading outpost on the Northern California coast, and laser scanning of buildings at the Maya site of Copan. Julian Smith has delivered to the public a well-balanced article detailing the possibilities and benefits of virtual archaeology that all archaeologists can respect.

Student Poster Award

G. LOGAN MILLER

G. Logan Miller has earned the 2013 SAA Student Poster Award for his poster submission titled “Lithic Microwear Analysis of Hopewell Bladelets from Fort Ancient: Implications for Ritual Economy.” The poster presented a well-conceived research project that utilized microwear analysis on bladelets from various contexts, including domestic and ceremonial structure as well as other features. Wear patterns were compared to experimental tools in order to evaluate the potential materials that were worked at each locality. Within a ritual economy framework, he evaluated models of organization of production and exchange. From his microwear and contextual analysis, he concludes that ritual craft items were produced at earthworks. In addition, he suggests that different materials were worked at different group locations, which could reflect reciprocal exchange. This innovative research project provides a platform for future studies and contributes greatly to our understanding of craft production and exchange in Hopewell society.

Ethics Bowl

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA TEAM, BERKLEY

Dienje Kenyon Fellowship

SHOSHANA ROSENBERG
Fred Plog Memorial Fellowship
KATHERINE DUNGAN

Douglas Kellogg Fellowship
CRAIG FERTELMES

Arthur C. Parker Scholarship for Archaeological Training for Native Americans and Native Hawaiians
REBECCA HEIDENREICH (THE NAVAJO NATION)

NSF Scholarships for Archaeological Training for Native Americans and Native Hawaiians
ALYSSA CHRISTINE BADER (ALASKA NATIVE)
DYLAN RAY JENNINGS (BAD RIVER BAND OF LAKE SUPERIOR OJIBWE)
SUSAN MARYLOUISE PEONE (THE COLVILLE CONFEDERATED TRIBE OF INDIANS)

SAA Native American Undergraduate Archaeology Scholarship
CHI R. WOODRICH (BAD RIVER BAND OF LAKE SUPERIOR OJIBWE)

SAA Native American Graduate Archaeology Scholarship
DAVINA TWO BEARS (THE NAVAJO NATION)

Archaeology Month Poster Award
FIRST PRIZE: WYOMING
SECOND PRIZE: OHIO
THIRD PRIZE: CALIFORNIA

Dissertation Award
AMANDA LOGAN

Dr. Amanda Logan is the 2013 recipient of the Dissertation Award. Her clearly written dissertation incorporates archaeological, ethnobotanical, ethnographic, and historical evidence to address change in foodways over the past 1,000 years in Banda, west-central Ghana. Countering the frequent claim that African societies are in a permanent condition of food deficit, Logan illustrates how the culinary process is indicative of agentive investment at each stage of activity, from farming to cooking to consumption. The “Colombian exchange” brought many new foods to West Africa in particular, some of which appear to have been quite quickly adopted (e.g., tobacco) and others that only became widely used staples under conditions of post-slavery economic stress and British colonial practices of labor management and taxation (e.g., maize). Emphasizing the many stages of decision making in food use, Logan writes eloquently about food and foodways while incorporating theory from a variety of disciplines to discuss the role of memory, gender dynamics, and migrations in creating new culture complexes.

Book Award: Scholarly Category
ELIZABETH ARKUSH

Elizabeth Arkush’s Hillforts of the Ancient Andes: Colla Warfare, Society, and Landscape is the ideal combination of new data and relevant theory with connections and implications for larger anthropological issues of statecraft and warfare. She reviews ethnohistoric evidence on the Colla people of the southern Andes and anthropological literature on warfare before presenting results of her work in data-rich chapters. The use of cutting-edge technologies in aerial survey and GPS mapping complement traditional archaeological techniques and analyses to investigate the placement, building, and motivations for building hillforts. Her comparative chapter on fractured landscapes
and fortification presents a model to explain divergent regional histories and trajectories of ancient complex societies based on warfare. In short, Dr. Arkush generates significant insights into the role of violence in shaping political organization and regional landscapes for regional specialists and those working beyond the Andes.

**Book Award: Public Audience Category**

**PATRICK KIRCH**

Patrick Kirch’s *A Shark Going Inland Is My Chief: The Island Civilization of Ancient Hawai‘i* is a superbly written book for the layperson and scholar alike. Dr. Kirch explores a fundamental archaeological question—the emergence of divine kings and states—using accessible language and great storytelling. He draws upon half a century’s worth of archaeological experience in Hawai‘i and the Pacific to seamlessly weave together archaeological research, traditional knowledge and stories, and personal anecdotes to tell the tales of ancient Hawai‘i and the Hawaiians, from the initial colonization of the island archipelago by Lapita people from Polynesia through contact with the European world. Perhaps more important, Dr. Kirch keeps archaeology as the backbone of the narrative while skilfully combining other sources of knowledge about ancient Hawai‘i in this entertaining and insightful book.

**Award for Excellence in Archaeological Analysis**

**GAYLE FRITZ**

Gayle Fritz has earned the SAA Award for Excellence in Archaeological Analysis for her lifetime commitment to furthering the theoretical frameworks and standards of analysis of paleoethnobotany in an ongoing effort to understand the origins of crop domestication in the Americas. Her work is foundational in demonstrating the theoretical interrelationships between paleoethnobotanical analyses and anthropological questions of gender, feasting, migration, and status. She was central to demonstrating that eastern North America harbored an independent center of domestication. Always with an eye on and deep respect for data, Gayle Fritz brings high and innovative standards of method and technique to her work, whether in the field or the laboratory, and has influenced multiple generations of paleoethnobotanists as both teacher and mentor. She continues to expand her own horizons through research on crop domestication in Central Asia. Gayle Fritz’s career embodies the primacy of data, centered in high level analyses, to archaeology.

**Award for Excellence in Cultural Resource Management**

**HENRY D. WALLACE**

Henry D. Wallace has earned the SAA Award for Excellence in Cultural Resource Management Award for his exceptional and pivotal research on the Hohokam of southern Arizona. His 32 years of research from directing numerous survey and excavation projects has resulted in a regional perspective and refinement of temporal and dynamic changes in Hohokam settlement patterns over time. Some highlights of his research include building a chronology of rock art styles; ceramic research that has allowed the refinement of chronological intervals to a generational scale in the Hohokam region; and understanding how village formation and community structure change through time and across large regional scales. His research in CRM has enabled a broad and insightful view and understanding of the Hohokam world, their social organization, settlement structure, patterns of political leadership, and ritual influence, deriving from research that goes far beyond a simple view of the archaeological record.

**Crabtree Award**

**EDWARD AND DIANE STASACK**

Edward and Diane Stasack are role models for avocational archaeologists dedicated to serving archaeology and the public. Like Don Crabtree, they have been drawn to a particular material aspect of the past, in this case rock art, and through their enthusiasm for this class of material, they have expanded the realm of what we know. The Stasacks have been recording rock art in Hawai‘i and Arizona for several decades, producing more than 50 reports, publications, and presentations on more than 80 sites. This massive effort continues today. They introduced many new methodologies for recording rock art in Hawai‘i, and their inventories include not just images but the microenvironments in which the petroglyphs were placed, rises and depressions, cracks, and viewscapes for each petroglyph. The Stasacks have
trained students, volunteers, and staff at various institutions in their methods. The enormous database that they have assembled informs their own research and will inform that of others in the future.

The Fryxell Award for Interdisciplinary Research

ANTHONY F. AVENI

Anthony F. Aveni has earned the Society for American Archaeology’s Fryxell Award for Interdisciplinary Research (Earth Sciences) based on his prominent role in developing the interdisciplinary fields of archaeoastronomy and cultural astronomy, as well as his service to the profession through scholarship, student training, and public dissemination. Dr. Aveni’s extraordinary contributions to archaeology have included the integration of the scientific and humanistic studies of astronomical principles in ancient calendars, record keeping, urban planning, architectural design, and cosmologies. He has undertaken fieldwork in Mesoamerica, the Andes, the American Southwest, Italy, Israel, and other parts of the globe, often incorporating student training through study groups run through his long-standing home institution, Colgate University. The methodologies that Anthony Aveni has developed and taught to generations of students, for rigorously testing astronomical assertions within the cultural framework of anthropological archaeology, represent a most laudable contribution to the field.

Award for Excellence in Latin American and Caribbean Archaeology

LUI S G UILLER MO LUMBRERAS SALCEDO

Luis Guillermo Lumbreras Salcedo has earned the Award for Excellence in Latin American and Caribbean Archaeology 2013 for his contributions to the practice and institutional development of Latin American archaeology and to the construction and dissemination of archaeological knowledge. His outstanding research in Peru has provided an important model for theoretical and methodological approaches elsewhere and has inspired many generations of colleagues and students in the Americas. It is clear that he has been a highly influential and visionary leader of Andean archaeology. The breadth and depth of the impacts stemming out of his theoretical and substantive works are historic and without comparison among his Andean and Andeanist contemporaries. He is one of the few archaeologists who have developed theoretical views that challenge and offer viable alternatives to the traditional paradigms. His ideas have transcended political boundaries. His book, Archaeology as a Social Science, has been one of the most influential writings in Latin America and beyond. He has served to bridge the Andean and Andeanist intellectual traditions.

Lifetime Achievement Award

HENRY WRIGHT

Henry Wright is the 2013 recipient of the SAA Lifetime Achievement Award. In his career, he has made transformative contributions to archaeological theory and method, and has conducted important research in North America, Mesopotamia, Africa, and China. He exemplifies the highest qualities of enduring scholarship, teaching, service, and outreach, both nationally and internationally. His fieldwork has focused on the emergence of the world’s earliest states, although he has also investigated a wide range of other topics. Dr. Wright’s contributions to scholarship have been acknowledged by a MacArthur Fellowship in 1993, election to the National Academy of Sciences in 1994, and a Gold Medal for Distinguished Archaeological Achievement from the Archaeological Institute of America in 2009. At the University of Michigan, he was awarded a Colleague Professorship in 2001 and the Albert C. Spaulding Distinguished University Professorship in 2006. Congratulations to Dr. Wright.

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

President Fred Limp
Secretary Janet Levy

and the retiring BOARD MEMBERS

Melinda Zeder
Alston Thoms

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 Gordon Rakita assisted by Shaza Wester Davis

And to the Committee Members of the Program Committee

Keith Ashley
Jane Eva Baxter
Caryn M. Berg
Virginia L. Butler
Ethan E. Cochrane
Liam Frink
Brett Hill
Terry L. Hunt
Joseph W. Lehner
Ernest S. Lohse
Desiree R. Martinez
Jerry D. Moore
Juliet E. Morrow
Marit K. Munson
David L. Peterson
Sean Rafferty
Kathryn Reese-Taylor
John D. Rissetto
Kari L. Schleher
Rebecca H. Schwendler
Miriam T. Starks
Christina Torres-Rouff
Mary Beth D. Trubitt
Christian Wells
David R. Yesner

AND

To the Annual Meeting Local Advisory Committee, chaired by

James M. Bayman
Kathleen L. Kawelu

David Brugge
Linda Cordell
Verna L. Cowin
T. Patrick Culbert
Marcia Donaldson
Elizabeth Ann Morris Gell
Rachel Horlings
Mark Mack
Betty Meggers
Lawrence W. Meier
James Mellaart
Christopher Peebles
Gregory Possehl
William Rathje
Robert Sharer
Leslie Shaw
Daniel E. Shea
Janet Specter
Roderick Sprague
Bernard Wailes
John Weymouth

NEWS AND NOTES

The Society for Historical Archaeology and the Advisory Council on Underwater Archaeology will hold their 47th Conference on Historical and Underwater Archaeology in Québec City, Canada, from January 8–12, 2014, under the theme Questions that count, a critical evaluation of historical archaeology in the 21st century. Call for papers opened May 1, 2013 (http://www. SHA2014.com/callforpapers.html).

The SHA first asked eminent archaeologists to identify questions that count at the plenary session of the 20th Conference on Historical and Underwater Archaeology in Savannah, Georgia in 1987. We now pose this question to the broader archaeological community. The diverse sectors of the SHA and ACUA communities are invited to assess their progress, orientations, and priorities. The responses may be very different from one sector to another, surprising some or confounding others. More importantly, it is crucial to allow each segment of our community to express its own views on the current and future situation of the discipline.

Historical archaeology has evolved both globally and locally. There has been a diverse integration of new technologies, forms of media, analytical methods, and participants. Community-based programs, public and descendant archaeology, and the experience of archaeological practice have all evolved over the last quarter century. To use antiquated parlance, dirt archaeologists are faced with a dizzying array of possibilities while still challenged with maintaining quality practice in an age of an explosion of sources and media. Other archaeologists are focused almost exclusively on analytical methods. How can we encourage best practices for all amidst a new array of questions which all seem to count?

Québec City is a place to rejoice in the old and explore the new. One of the oldest cities in North America and a UNESCO World Heritage Site, it is also a hub for exploring new media and technology. Cutting-edge analytical methods available in local laboratories have permitted experimentation in local archaeology, and new technologies have been incorporated into the public presentation of some of our most significant sites. The city is also at the boundary of land and sea, wedged between Cap-aux-Diamants and the majestic St. Lawrence River, where an immigrant European population met with First Nations peoples during the 16th century. We propose themes that explore these boundaries, while posing questions that count or that continue to count, and invite archaeologists from all communities to present new research in their archaeological practices.

We hope to see you there!
John Walter Weymouth died at his home in Lincoln, Nebraska, on December 20, 2012. He is widely recognized for his work in the development of geophysical methods in archaeology, for which he received numerous awards, including the A.T. Hill Award from the Nebraska State Historical Society in 1995, the Fryxell Award from the Society for American Archaeology in 1997, an Honorary Membership from the International Society for Archaeological Prospection in 2004, and the Rip Rapp Award for archaeological geology from the Geological Society of America in 2012.

John was born January 14, 1922, in Palo Alto, California, on the campus of Stanford University, where his father and grandfather were professors. He studied physics at Stanford and the University of California-Berkeley (Ph.D. 1951). John taught and conducted research in physics at the University of California, Clarkson University, and Vassar College before joining the University of Nebraska-Lincoln (UNL) in 1956. While conducting research on X-ray diffraction, he became acquainted with archaeology and explored the application of this technique to the study of ceramic composition.

As John’s interest in archaeology grew, he began investigating the use of magnetometers and other geophysical instruments as survey tools for the subsurface mapping of archaeological features. In the 1970s he evaluated the use of magnetometers at earth-lodge village sites along the Missouri River, and his success in this early work precipitated projects throughout North America and Europe. Much of his work was conducted in assistance to the National Park Service at nearly 20 parks, ranging from Fort Clatsop and Chaco Canyon to Abraham Lincoln’s Home and Hopewell Culture National Historical Park. His research interests also led him to St. Catherine’s Island in South Carolina, Cahokia and Fort des Chartes in Illinois, Spiro, Deer Creek, and Edwards in Oklahoma, and the Cowen site in Iowa. John worked on historic forts, pioneer farmsteads, and a pony express station and conducted NATO-sponsored work in Greece.

Although John officially retired from UNL in 1989, that by no means put an end to his professional contributions. His most recent work has been the mapping of a major Hopewell earthwork site in Ohio using a cesium gradiometer. John was actively involved in fieldwork at the Hopeton Earthworks until 1995. After that time he continued research and writing, with his latest publication in 2009. His work at Hopeton demonstrated the importance of geophysical methods for mapping and relocating prehistoric earthwork sites that have been severely degraded by two centuries of agriculture.

John’s work paved the way for geophysical applications in archaeology, transforming the use of these methods in North America from a type of special analysis to an invaluable and standard component of contemporary archaeology. He served as an important bridge between the geophysical community and archaeologists, establishing and encouraging connections with archaeological practitioners on a national and international level. John presented his findings at archaeological, geological, and geophysical conferences, and through publications and technical reports produced an unparalleled body of work spanning four decades. His meticulous and prolific research has inspired several generations of scholars to follow in his footsteps. His collaboration with the National Park Service helped establish their critical role in research, development, and training in the use of geophysical methods in archaeology.

John was both a scholar and a teacher. One the students in his first Physics in Archaeology class (1971) recalls that to assist the more science-challenged students, John provided mimeographed notes at all of his lectures and encouraged them to listen rather than write notes themselves. He was a frequent participant in National Park Service sponsored training workshops on archaeological prospection, and he mentored and assisted numerous students and colleagues who sought to include geophysics in their research.

His family, friends, and colleagues knew John as a humble, thoughtful, and caring man with a great love of music. John was thoroughly devoted to the dogs in his life, who occasionally accompanied him on field trips. He was a strong-minded and disciplined scholar and a great colleague and mentor who loved the intellectual exchange associated with interdisciplinary science. John helped lead archaeology into the future, and those of us who had the privilege to know him and work with him understand how much he will be missed.

—Mark Lynott and Rinita Dalan
DAVID M. BRUGGE
1927–2013

David M. Brugge, 85, died March 15, 2013, of COPD complications at the Rehabilitation Center of Albuquerque. He was born and raised in Jamestown, NY; his father wanted him to be an engineer, and his mother hoped he would be an artist. However, Dave preferred anthropology, and his service in the U.S. Army at the end of World War II enabled him to attend the University of New Mexico on the GI Bill, where he earned a BA in anthropology (1950). Following graduation, he was involved in seasonal ranger work, archaeological surveys, and excavations, as well as establishing with a friend the Ayani Trading Company in Old Town. However, this endeavor was short-lived, and Dave moved to Gallup, where he drove trucks for the Gallup Field Office delivering food for the Navajo Commodity Program. In 1953, he secured work at the newly established Unitarian Service Committee’s Gallup Indian Community Center. He led the English Language Recreation Program, which provided Dave with increased Navajo contacts while he traveled with railroad workers. During this period, he met Ruth Sherlog, a social worker, who also worked at the Center; they married in Mexico in 1959 and were inseparable until her death in 1990.

Dave’s earlier close associations with and interest in the Navajos led to an important decade of intensive work with the Navajo Land Claims and Tribal Research Section, including archaeology, ethnography, legal work on tribal rights, and more. His anthropology degree, inquiring mind, and former experiences essentially took flight; Brugge was well on his way to becoming an icon within Athapaskan studies! An early result was a co-edited Navajo Bibliography (1967) with J. Lee Correll and Editha Watson; this was updated and republished in 1969, as well as in 1973. Another landmark publication was Dave’s Navajos in the Catholic Church Records 1694–1875 (1968); it was reprinted in 1985, and again in 2010. His employment with the National Park service began in 1958 with five years as curator of Hubbell Trading Post National Historic Monument; it continued with the Chaco Project (1973), which involved returning to Albuquerque with his wife and children. Two more major works resulted: History of the Chaco Navajos (1980) and Tsegai (1986) after he became NPS Regional Curator, Division of Information and Visitor Services, Santa Fe, in 1977. He opted for a daily commute instead of another family move and retired in 1989.

In 1994, Dave published a major work: The Navajo-Hopi Land Dispute: An American Tragedy (University of New Mexico Press), reflecting his and others’ dissatisfaction with the Healing v. Jones decision and the disastrous relocation that ensued. Throughout his professional career, he focused on and ethnohistory, as revealed by numerous publications, and he co-founded the Navajo Studies Conference with Charlotte J. Frisbie in 1986. He was also deeply interested in a number of other issues—among them, championing environmental and human rights. He was a member of numerous anthropological and other organizations and an avid reader of their publications and other printed matter. His knowledge and editorial skills resulted in a number of presses and journals requesting his services as a manuscript reader/reviewer. Many of us considered him to be a “walking encyclopedia!” His willingness to share information and provide assistance to colleagues and students was noteworthy; even his interests in botany and entomology, which were frequently photographically captured and shared, sometimes became the subject matter for his watercolor Christmas cards. Dave transcended being the consummate scholar in many ways; he was honored by a festschrift by the Archaeological Society of New Mexico (1998), as well as an honorary doctorate from the University of New Mexico in 2005. His passing leaves a major void in the lives of his children, Doug, Steve, and Janet, their spouses, three grandchildren, and numerous colleagues and friends.

Note: Dave’s biography and complete bibliography containing around 300 publications will become available online in the future.

—Prepared by Theodore R. Frisbie, Professor of Anthropology Emeritus at Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville.
WE WANT YOU! VOLUNTEERS NEEDED FOR THE ANNUAL MEETING!

For the 79th Annual Meeting in Austin, Texas, SAA is seeking enthusiastic volunteers who are not only interested in archaeology but also looking to save money and have fun.

For volunteers to have more meeting flexibility, SAA will again only require 8 hours of volunteers’ time! The complimentary meeting registration is the exclusive benefit for your time.

Training for the April 23–27, 2014 meeting will be provided from detailed manuals sent to you electronically prior to the meeting, as well as through on-the-job training. As always, SAA staff will be on hand to assist you with any questions or problems that may arise.

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

Applications will be accepted on a first-come, first-served basis starting on July 3, 2013 until February 3, 2014.

See you in Austin!
Radiocarbon Dating Results Available Online Anywhere Anytime

Results in as little as 2-3 days

Australia Brazil China India Japan Korea UK USA
Hawaii’s Past in a World of Pacific Islands

By James M. Bayman and Thomas S. Dye

A NEW VOLUME IN THE SAA CONTEMPORARY PERSPECTIVES SERIES

... traces how archaeology and its concepts have developed in the unique cultural and social milieu of twentieth and early twenty-first century Hawaii.

Order at saa.org via the SAA Marketplace:
$25.95 (Regular price)  $19.95 (Member discount price)
CALL FOR SUBMISSIONS

The 2014 Call for Submissions is now available on SAAweb: www.saa.org/call

Visit this page to find a letter from SAA’s President, information on submission policies and guidelines, and information on how you can access the user-friendly web-based submission system. View, download, and/or print the Call for Submissions today. We hope you consider participating in SAA’s 79th Annual Meeting.

Questions?
Email us at meetings@saa.org
or call us at +1 (202) 789-8200 x109.