Radiocarbon Dating Results While You’re Still in the Field

**Radiocarbon Age Calibration**

- Laboratory number: Beta 317090
- Conventional radiocarbon age: 2750±50 BP
- 2 Sigma calibrated results:
  - Cal BC 970 to 360 (Cal BP 2890 to 2910) and
  - Cal BC 940 to 830 (Cal BP 2890 to 2780)

- Results in as little as 2-3 days
- Online Access to Results
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Erratum: In the September 2014 issue of the SAA Archaeological Record, the article “Mentoring Tom Lewis” by Marlin F. Hawley and David H. Dye mistakenly identified Will Carleton McKern’s birthplace as Medicine Lake, Washington. The authors would like to thank George Cowgill for pointing out that the correct place of birth is Medical Lake, Washington. We point this out not only to correct the error, but also to set the record straight for future biographers and researchers.

On the cover: The 2012 graduating class receiving their Archaeological Technician Certification (photo by Matthew J. Rowe, 2012).
Articles in this November issue of The SAA Archaeological Record contribute to a range of critical discussions in our discipline. Human rights are at the center of two articles. Robert Muckle forcefully reminds us that no one, no matter who they are or what role they are in, has the right to engage in any form of sexually harassing or abusive behavior in any context. Muckle shines light on some frightening statistics and offers important advice and recommendations for all of us to consider as we work to create safe environments for our students, employees, and colleagues.

Blackmore and Rutecki introduce the SAA’s Queer Archaeology Interest Group (QAIG), recently formed to bring together members of the LGBTQI community, their allies, and interested scholars. I could not be more pleased to see the establishment of this group and all that it stands for. I hope everyone will read these articles.

Three articles illustrate archaeology’s complex and evolving relationship with indigenous communities. Acabado and colleagues introduce us to the complex world of archaeology in the Philippine Cordillera. They aptly illustrate the critical role of community engagement when archaeological data fail to support the historical status quo. How wonderful it is when archaeological findings spark community excitement regarding ancestry and identity! Collins and Tushingham update us on the 2014 Washington State University Museum of Anthropology Plateau Conference. The conference sought to bring together senior scholars and representatives from Plateau tribal groups to discuss the future of archaeology on the Columbia Plateau. Their article makes it very clear that indigenous archaeology and research on extant museum collections will be a critical theme in this region during the coming years. Rowe and colleagues provide us with an exciting model of archaeological research, heritage management, and education involving tribal students centered on the Bighorn Canyon National Recreation area, located on the Montana-Wyoming border. As witnessed in the smiling faces of the students gracing the cover of this issue, their program is bringing archaeological education to small communities with a variety of tangible results: job opportunities for graduates, expanded knowledge of the archaeological record, and annual assessments of archaeological landscapes. The best thing is that this program is transportable. Tipi rings can be replaced with shell middens, housepits, and pueblo ruins.

Finally, technology is advancing at a rate that can be hard for some of us to follow (at least in all its nuances). Cascalheira and colleagues come to the rescue with a succinct introduction to smartphones and archaeology. They highlight opportunities for the creation of custom Apps for site mapping and data collection. We can all benefit from these discussions!
Summer is traditionally the time for archaeological fieldwork. It certainly felt that way for me this summer, even though I packed neither a trowel nor a shovel nor a GPS unit in my bags. Fieldwork as the SAA President meant representing the Society at various archaeological meetings and conferences in Peru, Turkey, Canada, and the United States.

In August, I traveled to Lima, Peru, along with Tobi Brimsek (SAA Executive Director), Diane Gifford-Gonzalez (President-Elect), and Dan Sandweiss (Director), where the SAA sponsored two meetings. The first, entitled *Improving Standards and Practices in Cultural Heritage Compliance in Latin America*, focused on archaeological and cultural heritage compliance performed as part of projects sponsored by international development banks. Representatives of the World Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, and the International Finance Corporation met with counterparts in the cultural heritage field, including government officials from ministries of culture and regulatory agencies and academic and consulting archaeologists and anthropologists. The banks made presentations on their cultural heritage safeguards and asked for comments on draft guidance documents. Nine Latin American countries were represented, and, either through formal presentations or informal discussions, their representatives clearly presented the state of cultural heritage compliance in their countries, discussed gaps in heritage laws and infrastructure (both physical and human), and suggested ways that the bank could assist in improving cultural heritage compliance. Perhaps the most important outcome of the meeting was the recognition that all parties share the same goal of safeguarding critical cultural heritage while at the same time allowing economic development. We all agreed that the meeting should not be a “one-off.”

Following the bank meeting, SAA held the second Conferencia Intercontinental (CI), also in Lima. As with the first CI in Panama City, this one was a major success. More than 100 archaeologists from all over Latin and North America attended the conference, with papers ranging from theoretical discussions of the origins of complex society to the latest technological innovations. Gustavo Politis provided a provocative keynote address on the history of Argentinian archaeology. The success of the CI was largely due to the leadership of the program chair, Barbara Arroyo, and the local chair, Luis Jaime Castillo.

September found Tobi Brimsek and me in Istanbul, Turkey, attending the annual meeting of the European Association of Archaeologists (EAA). Perhaps not surprisingly, given the conference’s location, much of the discussion at the president’s luncheon turned to joint efforts to assist in the protection of archaeological sites threatened by the ongoing conflict in Syria and Iraq. While in Istanbul, Tobi and I met with Fritz Lüth (EAA President) and Willem Willems (Program Chair) to finalize the call for submissions for the joint thematic SAA-EAA conference, *Connecting Continents: Archaeological Perspectives on Slavery, Trade, and Colonialism*, to be held November 5–7, 2015, in Curacao. This conference promises to be a major event, with keynote speeches by Corinne Hofman, Kathleen Deagan, Tom Gilbert, and Roberto Valcárcel Rojas and excursions to many of the island’s historical and archaeological sites.

In October, the SAA Executive Committee met in Vancouver, British Columbia. Our meeting precedes the annual meeting scheduled for Vancouver in 2016. While there, archaeologists from the region hosted us at a reception at Simon Fraser University, where we discussed current SAA activities and listened to suggestions for improving and increasing the benefits of SAA membership for our Canadian members.

Later in October, I traveled to Washington, D.C., where I met with various federal agencies to discuss SAA’s cultural landscape initiatives. SAA has formed three task forces to study various aspects of how best to integrate cultural landscape approaches in land management planning and mitigation. The three task forces are: (1) Archaeological Survey Data Quality, Durability, and Use Task Force (Richard Wilshusen, Chair); (2) Task Force on Incorporating Archaeological Resources in Regional Land-Use Plans (Bill Doelle, Chair); and (3) Task Force on Valuing Archaeological Resources (Frank McManamon, Chair). In addition, SAA remains a consulting party on the Section 106 action as part of the Range Management Plan Amendment (RMPA) for the Mancos Shale/Gallup Formation in Northwest New Mexico (John Roney, Chair of the RMPA Task Force).
While in Washington, I followed up the bank meeting in Lima with a presentation on the importance of cultural heritage compliance to the Multi-Financial Institutes Working Group on Environmental and Social Standards (MFI-WG) in Washington, D.C., in October. The MFI-WG is a group of senior environmental and social managers from various international development Banks and bilateral donors who meet twice a year to discuss common and emerging issues that all development banks are trying to address. The presentation to the MFI-WG was a good opportunity to raise issues brought up in Lima across a range of institutions, including the World Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, International Finance Corporation, European Bank of Reconstruction and Development, Asian Development Bank, African development Bank, and so forth. It also demonstrated a commitment on the part of SAA to remain engaged as a partner in assisting these institutions to meet their cultural heritage safeguards.

While I was traveling, other members of SAA were hard at work. Two long-term survey initiatives are moving ahead. The first is the Discovering the Archaeologists of Americas (DAA) project. This long-term study of the demographics and characteristics of American archaeologists mirrors a similar study in Europe. The Discovering the Archaeologists of Europe project has undergone two iterations and now has profiles of archaeologists in 21 countries. At the EAA meetings in Istanbul, Kenny Aitchison, the principal manager of the profiling projects (DISC0 and DISCO2), estimated that there are 30,000 professional archaeologists working in Europe and that roughly $1.5 billion is spent annually on cultural heritage. These numbers are considerably higher than any estimates provided for the United States and any reasonable estimate made for the entire Americas (North and South). It is possible that our European colleagues are overestimating the number of archaeologists, but in examining the 21 country profiles (http://www.discovering-archaeologists.eu/), each country estimate appears sound and relies on a tested methodology. Having made estimates for the United States, I’m pretty sure the error is on our part. U.S. estimates are all based on a questionable set of assumptions and on meager and poor data.

But honestly, who cares how many archaeologists there are in the Americas and how much is spent annually on cultural heritage? You should. It makes a great deal of difference if in 2025 the number of professional archaeologists working in the Americas is 15,000, 20,000, or 30,000. Do we have enough graduate programs? Are there graduates trained for the jobs that will employ them? As someone who has spent a fair amount of time on Capitol Hill these last few years, I can say unequivocally that the inability to answer how many archaeologists work in Ohio, New York, California, etc., and how much is spent in these states and in the country as a whole on archaeology and cultural heritage is hampering our ability to be heard and to have influence on various pieces of legislation. Put another way, those on the other side (real estate developers, energy and pipeline companies, utilities, defense contractors, etc.) all have these numbers at the tip of their tongues. We don’t, and we need them.

The SAA’s Discovering the Archaeologists of the Americas Task Force (Terry Majewski, Chair) submitted to the board of directors a draft request for proposals (RFP) for a pilot study. The goal of the pilot study is to evaluate the feasibility of a hemisphere-wide DAA study by assessing the methodology and survey instruments in one U.S. state and one Latin American country. Using the experience to refine our approach, the survey questionnaires, and the analytic techniques, the SAA would then prepare proposals that could be submitted to funders to finance a full project or projects to collect demographic information on the profession across the entirety of the Americas. We intend to send the RFP out this fall, with the pilot study scheduled for 2015.

The second survey initiative involves repatriation. Long a contested topic in American archaeology, repatriation issues periodically come before the SAA board of directors. In my experience, these are some of the toughest issues facing any board. The excavation and analysis of human remains and mortuary items are central to many archaeological interpretations about past societies. At the same time, archaeologists try to be sensitive to descendant communities who have a decidedly different view about these items and their use in scientific inquiry. In deciding whether to weigh in on any particular issue, what position to take, and how strongly to take it, the board tries to reflect the values, ideals, and positions of the membership. Generally, it does so by requesting the opinion of various standing committees. But in the past few years, even these committees have tended to divide along the fault lines described above.

The board will continue to struggle with repatriation issues. In doing so, we want to make sure that we are accurately reflecting the views of the membership. The best way to do so is to ask our members for their views on repatriation in general, their views on the national law governing repatriation in the United States—the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA)—and their assessment of SAA’s activities and positions on repatriation, NAGPRA, and the SAA’s statement on the treatment of human remains. This is an important survey that has been years in the making. We have compiled questions from various committees, assembled them in a survey questionnaire, tested and refined the survey instrument, and are now ready to survey the membership. The SAA survey on repatriation will occur in early 2015. I hope you will take the time to share your views with us.
IN BRIEF

Tobi A. Brimsek

Tobi A. Brimsek is Executive Director of the Society for American Archaeology.

Have You Made Your Reservations Yet?
San Francisco, Here We Come!

Reservations are available for the 80th Annual Meeting in San Francisco, California, April 15–19, 2015. The SAA 80th Annual Meeting will be self-contained in the Hilton San Francisco Union Square, 333 O’Farrell St., San Francisco, California, 94102. The cutoff date for reservations at the Hilton San Francisco Union Square is March 18, 2015. Our rates are exclusively for SAA Annual Meeting attendees.

Three separate reservations websites have been established: one for regular attendees, one for government employees, and one for students. The regular attendee rate is $209 Single/Double, the government rate rooms are limited and on a first-come, first-served basis, and the student room rate is a $145 flat rate. Please note that students must present a student ID to qualify for the student rate.

Complete reservation information, including cut-off dates and rates, as well as links for reservations, is available on SAAweb and will, of course, be published in the Preliminary Program, available in December. Click on the “San Francisco Hotel Information” link on SAA’s homepage (www.saa.org) to see this information now. Updated information on hotel availability will always be posted on SAAweb, on the meeting hotel page.

Register at the Hilton San Francisco Union Square for the SAA meeting by January 21, 2015, and your name will be entered into an SAA drawing for an incomparable prize—a one-year membership in SAA! Make your room reservation today. There will be two separate drawings—one for the regular/government rate rooms, and one for the student rate rooms.

See You in San Francisco! And don’t forget that #SAA2015 is the official hashtag of the SAA 80th Annual Meeting. When you are talking about any and all things related to the Annual Meeting, use #SAA2015!

The First Ever SAA/EAA Joint Meeting—November 5–7, 2015, Curacao

For the first time ever, SAA and the European Association of Archaeologists (EAA) have organized a joint meeting that will bring together scholars on a tightly focused, high-caliber thematic meeting. This inaugural meeting, of great interest to archaeologists on both sides of the Atlantic, is entitled Connecting Continents: Archaeological Perspectives on Slavery, Trade, and Colonialism.

Given this theme and the background of the sponsoring organizations, the Caribbean was a logical region to hold the meeting. Curacao, a country rich in cultural heritage devoted to the conference theme, will be the meeting locale. The island offers an ideal conference setting, the Marriott Curacao Resort and Emerald Casino, and numerous opportunities to visit firsthand archaeological sites, museums, and restored historical buildings relevant to the conference themes.

The meeting format will be a mix of plenary sessions, for which topics and speakers will be selected, and open presentations on current and ongoing research. Limited poster-type presentations will be presented using a digital media format (i.e., LCD projector, TV, or similar medium).

Details including the selected keynote speakers, the Scientific Committee, instructions on how to submit an abstract (via email), and important deadlines (submissions are due by January 31, 2015) are all posted on SAA’s homepage (www.saa.org). Click on the Connecting Continents image on the homepage for this joint meeting. We hope to see you there!

Committee Service—Open Call

This marks the fourth November during which the Society has put out a web-based call for volunteers for committee service. The call put out this November is for vacancies beginning at the close of the 2015 Annual Business Meeting in San Francisco. Committee terms are now generally three years, rather than the...
previous two years. You may submit up to two separate interest forms each November. If you are seeking reappointment to a committee, you also need to submit an interest form. You may serve only two consecutive terms on the same committee. The exceptions are the awards committees, where no member is eligible for a second term.

The statements given in response to the questions asked are very important determinants in the selection process. Please be aware that there will likely be more volunteers than there are slots on some committees. Decisions on committee composition are made with input from the chair through the Board liaisons to that committee. We truly appreciate the willingness of everyone to serve. Please check for an email with the open call announcement in early November.

**SAA 2015 Ballot**

The 2015 SAA ballot link will be sent to all members in the first week in January via email. If the Society does not have your email address, or if the email bounces back, a postcard with instructions on how to access the ballot material will be mailed.

To help ensure the efficiency of the web-based balloting system, please remember to update your email address in the Members’ section of SAAweb (www.saa.org) or by emailing your updated/current email address to the SAA staff at membership@saa.org.

Most importantly, please make sure that the ballot email from elections@vote-now.com makes it through your spam filters!

**Don’t Miss It—Advances in Archaeological Practice!**

*Advances in Archaeological Practice: A Journal of the Society for American Archaeology*—our exclusively digital, peer-reviewed quarterly journal—just had its one-year anniversary. If you have not yet seen it, please go to www.saa.org to begin your exploration. Make sure you take a peek at the newly introduced How-to Series. The first article in this series, written by William (Fred) Limp and Adam Barnes, is open to all. SAA members may choose this journal as their primary, second, or third journal with their membership. As a subscriber, you can have full access to the online discussion forum, which allows readers and authors to connect and talk about the published articles. Check it out and share *Advances* with your colleagues.
For the first time since 1973, the SAA meetings will be held in San Francisco. If the early registrations and abstract submissions are any indication, this is going to be a very big, busy, and popular meeting. This year’s meeting sets a record, with over 3,800 abstracts on the program. That’s over 700 more than last year’s record-setting meeting in Austin, Texas! These presentations include more than 250 organized paper and poster sessions and over 1,100 individually contributed papers and posters.

The program will begin on Wednesday evening with the Presidential Forum, “Orderly Anarchy in Prehistoric California”—a perfect way to welcome us to the Golden State. The program that follows over the next four days will be filled with all of the diversity that has come to typify an SAA annual meeting program. Submissions for the meeting span the globe and range from Neanderthal sites to contemporary archaeology of twenty-first century places. The breadth of topics in a meeting of this size is truly extraordinary: method, theory, technologies, pedagogy, community engagement, public archaeology, publishing, social media, and issues of archaeological practice are all found on the program alongside papers, posters, and sessions featuring the latest archaeological research. There will be 32 concurrent paper sessions taking place at any given time during the meetings, and poster space has been expanded to accommodate 70 posters at a time, as opposed to the usual 50. With so many excellent sessions, papers, and posters, the entire meeting schedule from Thursday morning to Sunday at noon will be filled with engaging and relevant content.

This year’s meeting offers many opportunities for interaction with colleagues. Over 25 organized forums will feature topical discussions and offer opportunities for panelists and audience members to connect on topics of interest. The addition of optional Q&A blocks in organized sessions will increase the opportunity for discussion and conversation within the traditional session format.

As I write this, I’ve just received back all the abstract reviews from the largest Program Committee in the history of the SAA. I owe an incredible debt of gratitude to the 39 people who joined me in reviewing, editing, and organizing this large number of abstracts. This year, for the first time, the SAA required that the Program Committee review abstracts for compliance with the SAA Principles of Archaeological Ethics, and it has been a very useful addition to the committee’s work (Baxter and Childs 2014). I want to thank everyone who volunteered to serve on the Program Committee, along with Cheng Zhang, SAA’s Manager of Information Services, and Shaza Wester Davis, the administrative assistant for the committee. All of these people have come together to put together a program that is dynamic, diverse, and exciting from beginning to end. See you in San Francisco!

Reference Cited
It’s time to start planning your visit to the City for the SAA 80th Annual Meeting, April 15–19, 2015. As I write this, a sizzling fall has rolled into the Bay Area and California is truly the Golden State, with the surrounding hills covered with drought yellowed grasses. As promised, following are a few suggestions for culture within an easy and short walk of the conference hotel or a taxi ride away.

The Asian Art Museum (asianart.org) is on the Civic Center a few blocks away from the hotel. It has a stunning collection of Asian art as well as an excellent cafe and gift shop. A farmer’s market is in operation on various days of the week. The San Francisco City Hall overlooks the plaza. It is worth a visit to this Beaux-Arts monument to the City Beautiful movement. The California Academy of Sciences in Golden Gate Park (www.calacademy.org) includes an aquarium, planetarium, natural history museum, and rain forest. It is certainly worth a visit for those with or without young ones. Opposite is the de Young Museum (https://deyoung.famsf.org) one of the fine arts museums of San Francisco with an attached Japanese tea garden dating from 1894. A sister museum, the Legion of Honor (http://legionofhonor.famsf.org) is located in the northwestern part of the city near the Presidio and has stunning views of the Pacific and the Bay. Please check websites for museum exhibition information prior to your visit. Other cultural attractions too numerous to mention are throughout the city, including Mission Dolores the oldest intact building in San Francisco dating from 1776 (http://missiondolores.org/old-mission/visitor.html).

In regard to other venues, the San Francisco Giants (SFGiants.com) have home games scheduled April 13–19. AT&T Park is on the waterfront, roughly 1.5 miles from the hotel, and is well worth a visit as the area has a number of micro breweries and restaurants around and near the park.

Last but not least, several conference tours are scheduled. On Thursday, a visit to the former federal prison on Alcatraz Island focusing on the island’s archaeology is planned with a guided interpretive tour by the National Park Service Education Program Manager. The 20-minute ferry trip will certainly give you a feel for San Francisco Bay. Free time after the interpretive tour should allow for additional exploration. On Friday, the Presidio Trust will host a tour of the new Archaeology Lab (http://www.presidio.gov/about/archaeology/Pages/Archaeology.aspx) in addition to other items of archaeological interest. The tour will be guided by one of the Presidio’s archaeologists.

Whatever you choose to do, the 80th Annual Meeting of the SAA promises to be a memorable one. I look forward to seeing everyone in April for your brief visit to the City!
When asked to write for this always-informative column for the SAA Archaeological Record, I actually found it strange to write about “being a volunteer.” I have never thought of the things that I have done or that others do as being “volunteering,” with the implication of doing something in one’s spare time (what’s that?) or something that is not part of one’s so-called mainstream life. In many ways, doing things within and for one’s professional society is integral to what it means to be, in this case, an archaeologist. I recall how impressed I was to learn that some of our members joined the SAA when they were in high school because they already knew that joining a professional society was what one did. But joining as a graduate student is surely what one “should” do, and, now, it can be even more rewarding because there are so many ways in which students can be on committees and learn the not-so-deep, dark secrets of the SAA!

Of course, there are dozens of websites that will regale you with what one can “get” from volunteering: networking, contacts, new skill sets, new ideas about what one can do in the discipline, being valued, socializing, and, of course, a satisfaction from having helped to accomplish something, from having advanced the mission of the organization. Are there certain aspects of the SAA that you think could be changed, modified, re-organized, or taken further? Here’s your chance to have an impact.

In looking back at my own participation in the workings of the SAA, several key events and moments stand out. I recall just chatting with Christine Hastorf and Peggy Nelson at some moment in the early 1990s (I think) and coming up with the idea for Round Table lunches, especially to address some of the gendered issues of being an archaeologist at that time. Although these may no longer be a regular feature of SAA meetings, our idea was then well-received and implemented, for many years providing a new and effective way to bring students together with a table leader to discuss many important issues. Christine, Peggy, and I were not even part of any formal committee or group at the time. Other moments have been more coincidental or serendipitous: being on the SAA Executive Board at the time of the passage of NAGPRA—a historic moment, to be sure. Or casually agreeing to run for the presidency of the SAA, thinking “I will never get elected”—well, sometimes one does get selected/elected!

Not surprisingly, that time was so amazingly rewarding, as one really does find out that there are ever so many others working in creative and substantive ways to move the SAA into all sorts of new programs and projects. It was rewarding to have a couple of days with the then-Board members to brainstorm about new programs (such as opening up the committees to student members). But it was even more rewarding when, a few years later, all of those ideas that took flight from a conference room in San Diego were put into place: a new journal, the Conferencia Internacional, the idea to develop funding for historically under-represented groups, and so on.

It is really rewarding to volunteer for the SAA precisely because the caliber of colleagues and of the SAA staff means that whatever you do is more than likely to turn out successfully, to reach its stated goals and beyond. The human element, the chance to work with others, is a core reason to volunteer for the SAA. In fact, I have the SAA to thank for many of my best friends and my most admired colleagues. Do try it!
Call for Applications

Advances in Archaeological Practice

The Society for American Archaeology invites applications for the Editorship of Advances in Archaeological Practice (AAP). AAP is a peer-reviewed digital journal that shares solutions in the broad practice of applied archaeology. It is currently edited by Christopher Dore. Launched in August 2013, the full-color digital journal is published four times per year. SAA’s goal is for each issue to contain 10 articles, with supplemental materials published online. The journal also maintains an online discussion forum and a journal Facebook page.

The journal publishes original articles that present creative solutions to the daily challenges archaeologists face in approaching the archaeological record, with a major emphasis on issues facing applied archaeologists, particularly in cultural resource management. The journal embraces a broad definition of “practice” that includes, but is not limited to, innovations in approach, technique, method, technology, business models, collaboration, compliance, process, ethics, theory, public engagement, and training.

While its articles and discussions are relevant to all professionals engaged in archaeology, the journal is intended to serve archaeologists regularly engaged in field investigations, laboratory analyses, management of archaeological and heritage resources, and the business and governmental activities needed to keep such enterprises going. The Society particularly encourages proposals from practitioners in applied archaeology, whether in agencies, firms, or other entities.

The new Editor will take over in April 2016, after a one-year transition with the current editor. The editorship will cover 2016–2019 and a total of 12 issues. The Society has a robust management system for article submissions and a professional journal production staff. The editor is responsible for proactively soliciting articles, managing the article review process, and making final decisions on article acceptance.

A task force has been designated by the SAA Board to assist in the search for the editor led by SAA Past-President Fred Limp. Please submit your application by January 5, 2015, electronically to flimp@uarl.edu or via mail to Fred Limp, SAA AAP Taskforce, 304 JB Hunt, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville AR 72701. Feel free to contact the current editor and/or Limp if you have any questions.

Your application should include a statement of your vision for Advances, including proposed steps for recruiting high-quality submissions. Information on your familiarity with and experience in both archaeological practice and publications editing/management is an essential part of the application. Your application should also include a proposed budget indicating financial or other support required for the post and, if possible, any subventions that your institution/company would be prepared to make.
KENNEWICK MAN
The Scientific Investigation of an Ancient American Skeleton
Edited by Douglas W. Owsley and Richard L. Jantz
This volume represents a collaboration among physical and forensic anthropologists, archaeologists, geologists, and geochemists, among others, and presents the results of the scientific study of this remarkable, ancient find. 8x11. 688 pp. 328 color, 35 b&w photos. 49 line art, 10 maps, 34 graphs. Index. $60.00 hardcover.

LA BELLE, THE SHIP THAT CHANGED HISTORY
Edited by James E. Brusegh
Timed to coincide with an ongoing, major exhibit of the La Belle ship and artifacts at the Bob Bullock Texas State History Museum in Austin, this full-color catalog presents the history of the shipwreck and descriptions of the artifacts it contained. 8½x11. 104 pp. 135 color photos. $19.95 paper

THE SHIP THAT HELD UP WALL STREET
Warren C. Riess with Shell O. Smith
Riess tells the whole story of the discovery, excavation, and study of an eighteenth-century ship uncovered during a pre-construction excavation at 175 Water Street in Lower Manhattan in the 1980s. 8x11. 120 pp. 57 b&w photos. 17 line art. Glossary. Index. $59.00 hardcover.

CLOVIS
On the Edge of a New Understanding
Edited by Ashley M. Smallwood and Thomas A. Jennings
Smallwood and Jennings bring together the work of many researchers actively studying the Clovis complex who provide their current perspectives of the Clovis archaeological record, addressing the question: What is and what is not Clovis? 8x11. 280 pp. 30 b&w photos. 27 maps. 28 line art. 24 figs. Index. $55.00 hardcover.

PALEOAMERICAN ODISSEY
Edited by Kelly E. Grad, Caroline V. Ketron, and Michael R. Waters
Providing an up-to-date view of the current state of knowledge in paleoamerican studies, the research gathered in this volume focuses especially on late Pleistocene Northeast Asia, Beringia, and North and South America, as well as dispersal routes, molecular genetics, and Clovis and pre-Clovis archaeology. 8½x11. 594 pp. 126 b&w photos. 42 line art. 56 maps. 58 graphs. Index. $45.00 paper

EMERGENCE AND DIVERSITY OF MODERN HUMAN BEHAVIOR IN PALEOLITHIC ASIA
Edited by Yousuke Kaifu, Masami Inzho, Ted Goebel, Hiroyuki Sato, and Akira Ono
Gathering the work of archaeologists from the Pacific Rim of Asia, Australia, and North America, this work addresses the relative lack of attention given to the emergence of modern human behavior as manifested in Asia during the worldwide dispersal from Africa. 8½x11. 594 pp. 230 b&w photos. Index. $65.00 hardcover.

Texas A&M University Press
800.826.8911 Fax: 888.617.2421 www.tamupress.com

Photo courtesy of Dallas, Texas, Smithsonian National Museum of Natural History
RETHINKING HISTORY, CONSERVING HERITAGE
ARCHAEOLOGY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT IN IFUGAO, PHILIPPINES

Stephen Acabado, Marlon Martin, and Adam J. Lauer

Stephen Acabado is Assistant Professor in the Department of Anthropology at the University of California-Los Angeles. Marlon Martin is Chief Operating Officer of Save the Ifugao Terraces Movement, Inc. Adam J. Lauer is a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Anthropology at the University of Hawaii-Manoa.

The rugged landscapes of the Philippine Cordilleras have long been a focus of anthropologists due to the variability of ethnolinguistic groups in the region and the fierce resistance of highland populations to colonizing forces from the lowlands. Of the seven major ethnolinguistic groups, the Ifugao is the most studied, primarily because of their extensive rice terraces (Figure 1). Since 2012, the Ifugao Archaeological Project (IAP)1 has been working with Ifugao communities to address issues of archaeological interest, such as landscape and community formation, as well as issues related to colonial legacies of knowledge construction, the dissemination of archaeological and ethnographic knowledge, and ways to combat the continuing circulation of inaccurate historical information.

In 1995, UNESCO placed the Ifugao rice terraces (Figure 2) in the List of World Heritage sites. This listing recognizes the “absolute blending of the physical socio-cultural, economic, religious, and political environments,” describing the terraces as “a living cultural landscape of unparalleled beauty” (UNESCO 2014). Not only are the rice terraces a testimony to the ingenuity and intelligence of the Ifugao in transforming this mountainous landscape, they also represent an enduring balance between the environment and the Ifugao community, whose members cooperate together to develop and sustain the terraces. The UNESCO recognition has also emphasized the idea that these agricultural monuments are at least 2,000 years old, a belief instilled in generations of Filipinos but refuted by archaeological investigations.

Local wisdom and nationalist sentiments would have us uphold this longstanding belief in the age of the Ifugao Rice Terraces, espoused by pioneer anthropologists of the Philippines Roy F. Barton (1919) and Henry Otley Beyer (1955). Recent findings by the IAP (Acabado 2009, 2012), however, have provided new information driving us to rethink this proposed date, primarily because of the dearth of archaeological data to support the “long history” model. Evidence is now pointing to a relatively more recent history of Cordillera rice terracing traditions—a “short history” model grounded on ethnographic, ethnohistoric, archaeological, and paleoenvironmental datasets.

The “long history” model is partly a product of the now widely rejected “Waves of Migration” theory of the peopling of the Philippines (Beyer 1948). Yet both the “long history” model and the “Waves of Migration” theory are still being taught in Philippine elementary and public high schools. These models also assume that the builders of the terraces—in this case, the Ifugao—were unchanging for 2,000 years.

A shorter history of the terraces does not diminish their value as a UNESCO World Heritage Site; rather, it reinforces an awareness of the technological and cultural sophistication of the people who constructed the terraces. This sophistication allowed the Ifugao to rapidly modify their landscape to fill valley after valley with terraced rice fields within 200 years. We should lay to rest the antiquity debates. They only exoticize highland peoples. Moreover, the differences that we see today between highland inhabitants and lowland populations are products of history and colonialism. It is more important for us that we acknowledge that we are in danger of losing these historical and cultural monuments and that we have a responsibility to take part in preserving our heritage. Most importantly, we have to acknowledge the value of community involvement in our scholarly research and conservation and development programs in the region.

Our paper emphasizes the importance of community engagement, especially because historical knowledge in the Philippines is still largely a colonial legacy. We propose that community involvement is vital in the dissemination of new knowledge. In our work, this is highlighted by community skepticism of the younger dating of the rice terraces, especially when all tourism brochures and history textbooks celebrate the antiquity of the agricultural fields. We also explore the colonial legacies of knowledge construction and how this knowledge becomes ingrained in our ideas of the past. In the case of the Philippines, archaeological models proposed at the turn of the twentieth century by American archaeologists and anthropologists have been difficult to supplant. In this paper, we present the impact of our archaeological work in Ifugao, which has contributed to a serious reconsideration of the dominant conceptions of history and
history-making in the Philippines. This article presents a short version of Philippine history, of our archaeological work at the UNESCO World Heritage Sites of Ifugao, Philippines, and of how community engagement enhances our research agenda.

A Model for Community Archaeology
Although the younger dating of the terraces might be a shock to most Filipinos and Ifugao communities, the involvement of Ifugao stakeholders in the IAP makes the dissemination of sensitive findings easier. The IAP promotes and encourages community participation in all aspect of the research program.

Community archaeology entails a partnership between local people and trained archaeologists in the conduct of archaeological investigations. Community participation aims to both

Figure 1. Map of the Philippines with the Ifugao Province highlighted.
humanize and end the exclusive control that “colonial archaeology” has had over the interpretation of the material past. In the IAP, local stakeholders’ participation intends to serve as a catalyst for renewed community interest in their nearly forgotten past and to encourage them to play a more active role in conserving their heritage.

The IAP’s objectives were primarily borne out of the need to date the Ifugao Rice Terraces and to resolve divergent academic discourses on the antiquity of these cultural monuments. However, preliminary consultations with community members brought out associated issues that demanded inclusion in the research if the results were to be of any significance to the Ifugao. Even at the onset, the community was involved in the identification of the project objectives (Figure 3).

Since the project’s implementation plans were conceptualized in collaboration with local government units, national conservation agencies, and the Save the Ifugao Terraces Movement (SITMo), a grassroots conservation NGO, both legal and customary consent processes were obtained without any contentious opposition from the communities. Several consultations with descendant communities and current project site inhabitants were conducted to obtain legal consent, as mandated by the Free and Prior Informed Consent (FPIC) guidelines of the National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP) for research being done in indigenous peoples’ ancestral domains.

Participation in the site excavations was encouraged in order to involve local peoples in the archaeological excavations. Site visits by local students and interested members of the community provided onsite lessons on local history and provoked a deeper understanding of their heritage (Figure 4). Public education on the processes of archaeology and participatory analysis of resulting discoveries serve to involve the local community as active partners and not merely as objects of the research. Free access to the project site also considerably helps in dispelling the notion that archaeologists are secretly treasure hunters searching for “Yamashita’s Gold,” among other troves.

In matters of policy, community involvement in archaeological processes can generate proactive measures from local government units in Ifugao that contend with ambiguous and ill-informed guidelines on cultural resources management. These are complicated by provincial national agendas for heritage conservation, the demands of mass tourism, and the World Heritage Status of the Ifugao Rice Terraces. Participatory archaeology in the Ifugao Rice Terraces should give foremost consideration to local decision makers in developing innovative and sustainable responses to this culturally evolving landscape and its dynamically changing social context.

The field seasons of the IAP culminate in a public presentation of preliminary findings, during which different sectors of the community are invited to listen and critique initial discoveries.
Things usually get interesting when archaeologists present material evidence apparently lost in the cultural memory of the community. This triggers a surge of recollections that usually work both ways to validate the archaeologists’ empirical assumptions and the community’s fading reminiscence of a forgotten aspect of their heritage. For the modern Ifugao who stands on the threshold of cultural loss, community archaeology serves as an aid to self-discovery and revitalized ethnic identity. Recent archaeological work has also encouraged the modern Ifugao to reconsider their place in Philippine history making.

Rethinking Philippine History

Philippine narratives, especially those that tell of the origins of Filipinos, are still based on the Waves of Migration theory, popularized by H.O. Beyer, considered the founder of Philippine Anthropology. The model was initially introduced by Spanish friars early in the Spanish colonial period. Ferdinand Blumettritt, an Austrian scholar during the Spanish-era Philippines, refined the model in 1882 (Scott 1994). Beyer’s theory was the first model developed to explain the origins of peoples who settled the islands that now comprise the Philippines. The model claims that a succession of different groups arrived in waves, with varying biological and cultural sophistication; there was a very specific racial typology, with each wave getting lighter and lighter as the level of culture got “higher and higher.” On this model, the dark-skinned pygmies that Beyer classified as the Negritos were the first group to inhabit the islands. They currently inhabit interior mountain ranges across the Philippine archipelago because, as Beyer postulated, of their “inferior culture.” They were pushed to the mountains when a second group arrived, identified by Beyer as the Indonesian A and B. The last group, the Malays, arrived in three successive waves, the last group appearing just before contact with Europeans. The last wave was eventually Islamized and Christianized. They settled the lowlands, thereby pushing the Indonesians and the first two waves of Malays to the mountains. The first two waves of Malays were not converted to either Islam or Christianity.

The dating of the construction of the Cordillera terraces was based on this model, according to which the Ifugao were considered as the second wave of Malays who were pushed up to the
mountains when the final, third wave of Malays settled the lowlands. Some historians interpret this model as a colonial strategy to indoctrinate Filipinos as peace-loving people who would avoid confrontation when a new group arrives. Not only does this model propagate the idea that Filipinos peacefully moved out of the way of newcomers, but it also says that nothing new ever developed or invented in the Philippines. Filipinos were just passive observers, waiting for someone from the outside to bring in new material and cultural innovations.

Archaeologists have proposed several alternatives to the Waves of Migration theory, based on archaeological data and sound modeling. Foremost of these alternatives are Solheim’s Nusan-tao (1988, 2006) and Bellwood’s Austronesian Hypothesis (1984). Still, a number of Philippine elementary and high school textbooks (e.g., Anda 2010; Rama et al 2006) use the outdated model proposed by Beyer.

**Original Filipinos**

Historical narratives of the Cordillera assume that highland peoples were isolated and “untainted” by European, or even by lowland, hegemonic culture. The highland peoples then become the emblematic stereotype of “original Filipinos,” a label that is ethnocentric because it also denotes unchanging culture through centuries of existence. What the IAP now tells us is that the Ifugao of the Old Kiyanggan Village had active and intense contacts with lowland and other highland groups, especially during the Spanish colonial period. In fact, rapid social differentiation coincided with the arrival of the Spanish in northern Luzon. What we are seeing in Ifugao are parallel patterns to what we see in Spanish colonies in the Americas. We also observe that once the lowlands of the Philippines were firmly hispanicized, Filipino lowland traders became de facto colonizers of the highlands, a pattern that is still present.

The dichotomy between highland and lowland Philippines is also largely constructed in this historical footnote, suggesting that the northern highland Philippines resisted Spanish domination. Even though Spanish cultural footprints in the province are scant, owing to the failure of the colonial power to establish a permanent presence in the region, there are major economic and political shifts in the highlands that coincided with the arrival of the Spanish in the northern Philippines. The recent findings of the IAP indicate that landscape modification (terraced wet-rice cultivation) intensified between ca. A.D. 1600 and A.D. 1800, suggesting an increased demand for food, which indicates population growth. This period also shows increased
social differentiation and apparent elite formation as a means of maintaining their position in the society. Although the Spanish colonial government never controlled the interior of the Philippine Cordillera, the economic and political transformations in the region were dramatic, likely due to the Spanish presence in the lowlands. Excavations from the Old Kiyangan Village (Kiangan, Ifugao) also indicate that the settlement had continuous contact and interaction with lowland groups and other highland groups between ca. A.D. 1600 and late A.D. 1800, refuting the idea of isolation. For example, imported glass beads and trade ware ceramics recovered from the site show that the region was globally connected.

The Ifugao Archaeological Project

Since the IAP was launched in 2012, community engagement has been at the forefront of the research program’s goals. We hope that the engagement of different Ifugao communities in the past field seasons and those to come will promote social cohesion among the relatively divided Ifugao groups who have diverse views of their cultural origins. The archaeological discoveries served as a catalyst for community debates and a stimulus to wider public participation in heritage conservation. The project inspired the establishment of a community heritage library in one public school to serve as repository for all published literature on the Ifugao and perhaps for some artifacts from the archaeological sites. The plan for the library is to involve Ifugaos and Ifugao at heart, here and abroad, to contribute to the collection of published works on Ifugao culture, history, and society. This will facilitate research for students, scholars, and enthusiasts. The involvement of local students also serves the purpose of spurring interest in the disciplines of history and sociocultural studies, courses not normally of consequence to young Ifugaos.

In the larger picture, we hope that the findings of the IAP spur changes in Philippine history curricula. The dominant archaeological model of the peopling of the islands is very ethnocentric and reinforces the misconception of biological differences among Filipino groups. In fact, the Indigenous Peoples Rights Act of 1997 (Philippines) (R.A. 8371) relied on this model for classifying Philippine ethnolinguistic groups.

Our experience collaborating with the communities has been gratifying. We now feel that the results of our work are not just buried in academic journals and that communities appreciate our work, especially when all stakeholders are involved in all aspects of the research project. Haggiyo!
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We are pleased to announce that the SAA Board approved the formation of the Queer Archaeology Interest Group (QAIG) during the 79th Annual Meeting in Austin, Texas. Before you renew your 2015 SAA membership, we would like to formally introduce ourselves, our mission, and why we think QAIG is an important addition to the SAA. For more than a decade, several attempts have been made to create such a group, each resulting in failure (Jim Aimers, personal communication 2014). This has not been for a lack of interest but rather due to the difficulties often associated with being LGBTQI and stigmatization within our discipline and society at large. At its core, QAIG brings together individuals interested in sexuality studies and other forms of queer research, highlights the problems experienced by members of our community, and addresses pedagogical issues important to LGBTQI students. The goal of QAIG is to connect people interested in these various forms of research while also creating a safe and inclusive environment for professional networking and student development. Whereas, the world is changing, there continues to be a great deal of confusion around the concept of queer and why this matters to archaeological practice. It is impossible to address here all of the complexity and nuance involved in LGBTQI issues in archaeology, but we hope that this article provides a starting point for a long and fruitful conversation.

LGBTQI: Some Clarifications

Let us start by unpacking the acronym LGBTQI (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender/ Transexual, Queer, and Intersex). Currently, society defines gender as a binary between masculine and feminine—cultural roles that are equated to biological sex and heterosexual relations. However, those who define themselves somewhere within the LGBTQI spectrum do not fit these narrow identifications. For example, sexual orientation applies to sexuality and self-definition of sexual identity (e.g., gay, lesbian, bisexual), whereas gender identity corresponds to a person’s chosen gender (e.g., man, transgender, genderqueer). These may or may not correspond with a person’s biological sex (e.g., female, intersex), just as gender presentation may or may not align with any of the above categories. How a person chooses to present along the feminine–to–masculine spectrum does not define their sexuality even if it conflicts with social norms. Finally, allies are members who may not personally identify as LGBTQI, but who choose to actively participate in the widely-defined and diverse aims of our community. Allies are essential to advancing societal recognition for equal rights of LGBTQI individuals (for more information on the above terms, please see UC San Diego LGBT Resource Center 2014).

We are a group of diverse peoples, backgrounds, and interests. The acronym recognizes this diversity while also creating a space of political and social inclusion. QAIG chooses to use LGBTQI to recognize the similarity of our struggles, while understanding that each part of our community faces unique difficulties. Race, ethnicity, class (or any intersecting aspect of identity), all play a substantial role in shaping how people negotiate their identities and participate in society. These identities and resulting experiences bring the strength of multiple perspectives to our group and are critical to addressing broader social justice issues. The word queer was chosen to reflect this diversity, as it broadly references a spectrum of sex, sexual and gender identities, and gender presentations. Moreover, queer has been used by allies as an intentional rejection of political and social structures that normalize and stigmatize many within the LGBTQI community.

Queer Archaeological Research

Drawn from numerous intellectual and political strands—poststructural/postmodern feminisms, lesbian and gay history, sexology, AIDS activism, and queer liberation movements, queer broadly references “whatever is at odds with the normal,
the legitimate, the dominant” (Halperin 1995:62). It acts as a verb, the very act of deconstructing or at least questioning the categories and methodologies naturalized within scholarly discourse (Blackmore 2011). As a theoretical tool, queer theory formalized among debates concerning definitions of gender, sex, and sexuality prevalent at the time (see Butler 1990; de Lauretis 1991; Foucault 1978). Gayle Rubin (1984:307) argued specifically that sexuality was reduced to a sex act and one that privileged male–female relations. Such critiques problematized these definitions of gender and sexuality as exclusively heterosexual and reductionist in terms of how they could be expressed and performed. Queer theory, as a response, sought to destabilize assumptions that framed sexual and gendered identities as constant, stable, or irreducible truths.

Queer theory’s application to archaeology first emerged in 2000 with the publication of “Queer Archaeologies,” a thematic issue in the journal World Archaeology (Dowson 2000) and Schmidt and Voss’s Archaeologies of Sexuality. In the World Archaeology issue, authors examined what it meant to be a queer archaeologist, specifically focusing on issues of homophobia in the academy, the silencing and marginalization of LGBT archaeologists, and how these issues impact archaeological practice. As one of the first comprehensive examinations of sexuality in the archaeological past, Archaeologies of Sexuality took seriously the role of sex and sexuality as part of archaeological inquiry. Voss and Schmidt (2000:23) argued that archaeology had the potential to be both a leader among disciplines that contributed to studies of human sexuality and as an important vehicle for understanding the past. Sexuality studies have the potential to challenge long-held assumptions around social organization and culture change—two key concepts in archaeological inquiry. Whereas, queer archaeology seeks to understand varied sexualities in the past, it also applies a lens of nonnormative critique that illustrates how intersectional and fluid identities can be identified through material remains (Voss 2008). Queer archaeological research has grown enormously over the last 15 years and reflects a wide range of interest and foci that cover the archaeological spectrum.

Community Support: Professionalism and Pedagogy

Despite increasing acceptance, LGBTQI individuals continue to experience hardships, such as employment and task discrimination, promotion refusal, and unequal access to health and other social services. Examples of common problems faced by LGBTQI archaeologists include being “out” in the field; issues around gender performance and identity in the academy (student or professional), in nonacademic sectors, in the field and among local communities; medical access and care for trans archaeologists; and discrimination in field schools and classrooms. QAIG will sponsor symposia, forums, and workshops at our annual meetings to raise awareness of these issues and to provide a space for engaging the SAA membership more broadly in this conversation.

QAIG will also serve as a network of support, training, and development for LGBTQI archaeologists and their allies through connecting senior, junior, and student archaeologists. Of particular concern are the issues faced by students as they learn how to navigate a career in archaeology while unaware of the potential professional ramifications of their perceived identities. For example, LGBTQI students are discriminated against in graduate program admission decisions and funding sources, prevented from conducting research requisite to their degree completion, and are subject to co-worker, collegial, faculty, and administrative harassment. They experience corresponding emotional and physiological difficulties surrounding these and other acts of discrimination that may go unrecognized or misunderstood. We hope to create support networks for those students who do not have any support in addition to educating mentors and other allies on LGBTQI issues and the resources available to them and their students. Currently, we are working on developing resource lists, sheets, and tips as well as establishing routine commentary and contributions on the experiences of LGBTQI and ally archaeologists for broader dissemination at meetings and online. QAIG hopes to positively impact archaeology as a discipline and as a professional and social body—discriminatory practices, in all forms, serve no other purpose other than to limit quality research and hinder our understanding of the past.

To celebrate our new section, QAIG will be sponsoring several events at the SAA Annual Meeting in San Francisco, including a panel discussion on what it means to be LGBTQI in archaeology, a research symposium on current trends in queer archaeological research, the annual meeting of the research group, and at least one informal social gathering (details will be announced closer to the meeting). As a new interest group, it is important to maintain and expand our membership so that we can best serve the broader goals and mission of SAA. Creating long-term change takes time, effort, and support. We hope that you will join us!
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Smartphones and the Use of Customized Apps in Archaeological Projects

João Cascalheira, Célia Gonçalves, and Nuno Bicho

Over the past few years, smartphones and tablets have become essential implements in the day-to-day lives of millions of people. Literally, these devices have replaced notebooks, agendas, cameras, GPS units, and, to some extent, personal laptops, combining the role of all these items in a single, pocket-sized gadget.

In archaeology, smartphones and mobile application software can be valuable tools for registering coordinates during field survey, taking notes during excavation, or simply photographing findings. For example, Apple apps have been used in the Proyecto de Investigación Arqueológico Regional Ancash (PIARA) in Peru (DeTore and Bria 2012), in Pompey (Ellis and Wallrodt 2011), and in a geochemical rock-sourcing project in the Upper Columbia River (Goodale et al. 2013).

Although some mobile apps have already been purposely developed with educational and scientific goals in mind (e.g., the pioneer case of the Archwilio app; http://cofaidurachymru.org.uk/arch/), the development of specific apps for archaeological research has been limited. The most likely reason for this scarcity is that, traditionally, the creation of mobile apps requires specialized development environments and deep knowledge of software programming, which most archaeologists simply do not have.

Recently, however, Google created the App Inventor for Android operating systems, which has proven to be a much simpler way of building Android-based mobile applications in a visual/code-free environment. Here, we introduce the second edition of this online application (the MIT App Inventor) as an emergent and very promising tool for use in archaeological projects, providing an example of how the advanced computing capabilities and connectivity of smartphones, together with customized apps, can greatly support archaeological field survey.

Smartphone Choice and Technical Specifications

The term “smartphone” first appeared in the late 1990s to describe equipment that typically combined the features of a cell phone with those of other popular consumer devices, such as personal digital assistants (PDA), media players, digital cameras, web browsing, or GPS navigation units. Widespread use of smartphones began roughly after Apple released their first iPhone in 2007, and, since then, a myriad of brands and models have emerged and are available to consumers. This explosion in Smartphone use has, in turn, triggered the emergence of an entire constellation of technologies, including the entire market for mobile applications, also known as apps (or application software), defined as specific software designed to run on smartphones, tablet computers, and other mobile devices, typically offered for general productivity and personal information retrieval, but also for leisure and professional performance.

At present, popular smartphones are, mainly, powered by Google’s Android, Apple’s iOS, Research in Motion Blackberry OS, and Microsoft’s Windows Mobile OS. Each of these systems has its own distinctive features, but all are based on direct manipulation of contents using, in most cases, touch-screen inputs like swiping, tapping, and pinching to control on-screen objects.

When choosing a smartphone, the specs to look at are basically the same as when choosing a laptop. Processor performance and RAM capacity are two important features that play a significant role in how well a smartphone performs. Screen size, brightness, and sharpness are also very relevant, as are battery capacity and the diversity of sensors available.

For use in archaeological projects, there are some features that may be more relevant than others, depending on whether the phone will be used in the field or in a lab environment. Battery capacity is one good example, particularly when using smartphones for fieldwork. On average, a typical smartphone battery will last for approximately five hours of talk time and more than one hundred hours in standby mode. During fieldwork, the most desirable scenario is to have a device that operates for a full day of work. In most situations, this will be the case, given that the use of high-consuming battery features (e.g., the GPS
Table 1. Results of a GPS Test Conducted with Various Brands and Models of Smartphones.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Longitude</th>
<th>Trimble® GeoXT™ Results (m)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samsung</td>
<td>Galaxy Fresh Duos</td>
<td>39.10283</td>
<td>-8.67522</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTC</td>
<td>One S</td>
<td>39.10285</td>
<td>-8.67525</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samsung</td>
<td>Galaxy SII</td>
<td>39.10286</td>
<td>-8.67521</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samsung</td>
<td>Gio</td>
<td>39.10286</td>
<td>-8.67522</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samsung</td>
<td>Galaxy Ace</td>
<td>39.10289</td>
<td>-8.67515</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huawei</td>
<td>Ascend P6</td>
<td>39.10288</td>
<td>-8.67525</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All coordinates were sequentially obtained in the same exact location under the same atmospheric conditions.

*Results measured in Google Earth.

sensor) is only sporadic. Users can also preserve battery power by not having many apps running in the background and by shutting down sensors immediately after their use. The result is that the next time those features are needed, they will take longer to start, but it will save a good amount of the battery life. Nonetheless, it is always a good idea to have spare batteries for each device, as well as to buy some extra charging equipment, such as car adapters or USB chargers, which are essential for smartphones that do not have removable batteries.

Another important feature when using smartphones in the field is the resistance to shock, drop, dust, temperature, and water. Several rugged models are already available, specifically built to be used during outdoor activities, fulfilling standard military requisites and the toughest environmental protection protocols. These devices, however, are priced as top-range phones, frequently starting at $300 per unit. If the budget is limited or one simply needs protection for previously bought phones, a good range of covers and protective skins are available for virtually every smartphone model on the market. Naturally, these will not offer the same protection level as rugged devices.

Perhaps the most important features to consider are the diversity and quality of the hardware sensors. In this category are included features such as GPS receivers, Accelerometers, Magnetometers, Photo cameras, Gyroscopes, Proximity sensors, Bluetooth transmitters, etc.

Nowadays, smartphones are considered to be capable GPS devices, usually comparing favorably to and functioning just as accurately as regular, dedicated GPS units (Klimaszewski-Patterson, 2010). Of course their accuracy in positioning can never be compared to machines that cost thousands of dollars, but, in most situations, depending on the device and App used (for more information see Bauer 2013), location errors are acceptable. We tested a good variety of smartphone GPS chips with our own App (see below), and the errors are consistent, always staying under 6 m when compared with a Trimble® GeoXT™ (Table 1).

The MIT App Inventor

The creation of mobile apps to run on smartphones follows essentially the same principles as programing for the traditional operating systems of personal computers. For a non-programmer this can be a very challenging task because it involves working with programming languages such as Java, C +, C#, etc. Currently, Apple users are able to create mobile Apps skipping this step. This is done by using files created on File Maker Pro software that are then exported as apps to run over the File Maker Go on iPhones and iPads (e.g., Motz and Carrier 2013). Although the app is free, File Maker Pro itself costs money. Unfortunately, this system is not compatible with Android or any other mobile system. For Android OS, there is also a reasonable number of platforms for app development, but only one, the App Inventor, stands out by virtue of being free and extremely easy to use, with no coding necessary for setting either the layout or behavior of the apps.

App Inventor for Android was created by Google in 2010 and closed down very shortly after, to be rescued by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), which currently offers it in a Beta, but fully operational, version at http://ai2.appinventor.mit.edu/. Briefly, MIT App Inventor is a freeware application that runs in a web browser and lets users create mobile applications for the Android system without having to write the traditional software programming codes. This is done by using blocks of pre-established controls, tools, and components that can be combined to perform actions using the internal capabilities and hardware of the Smartphone, but also other available Apps. It is based on the simple drag and drop of items into two key-screens: the Designer View and the Blocks Editor.

The Designer View (Figure 1) is where the interface and design of the App are generated, combining elements like buttons,
labels, list pickers, text boxes, sensors (e.g., GPS units, barcode scanners), and media components (e.g., camera and sound recorders, speech recognizers). In the Designer View, it is also possible to configure the components’ contents and their basic appearance, including layout tools for organizing the visual aspect of the interface. Blocks Editor, on the other hand, is where behavior is created for all the components inserted in the Designer View. This is the step that traditionally was represented by intricate lines of programming code, but that in MIT App Inventor works simply as a drag and clip of puzzle-piece shaped blocks. Some blocks represent general Android-app actions, like defining what a button does when pressed or how the app will proceed after a textbox is filled. Others are basic logical procedures (e.g., “if-then;” “for each item in list do;” “join text”) that allow the construction of behavioral sequences for each action within the app. Figure 2 presents an example of the configuration of a simple action such that, when a button is clicked, a text box is filled with the text “Experience.” To this single click, other puzzle pieces may be added, allowing the construction of more complex chains of action.

Another element that is also important during the construction of the app is the Android Emulator (Figure 3), since it lets users test the validity and feasibility of the programmed actions. With this tool, it is possible to preview the performance of the app directly on the computer, without the need to build a file and transfer it to the smartphone or tablet. Another option is to use the AI Companion feature, which is basically an app that allows the user to pair the App Inventor webpage with a smartphone to test the apps as they are being built.

When finished, the final version of the app can be exported to the smartphone simply by clicking the “create .APK” button, sending it to the phone’s app directory and ordering it to install or simply create a QR (Quick Response) code to be read by the phone or tablet and download the app to the Android-powered device.
ArcheoSurvey: An Example of a Custom App for Field Survey

Two archaeological survey projects are currently being developed by the team of the Interdisciplinary Center for Archaeology and the Evolution of Human Behavior (ICArEHB) at the University of Algarve (southern Portugal). The project “Middle Stone Age Archaeology and the Origins of Modern Humans in Southern Mozambique” intends to survey several areas of Mozambique. The project “Between Tejo and Sado: GIS Predictive Modeling for the Discovery of New Mesolithic Sites in Central Portugal” (www.mesosig.pt) is based on predictive modeling using the location patterns of previously known sites, aiming to survey central Portugal for new Mesolithic settlements.

Most work carried out in these projects is field survey, including the collection of information on the location and specific characteristics of each identified site. Traditionally, recording these variables involves the use of GPS units, paper maps, compasses, and customized/standardized survey forms. All these are features can be combined in one single smartphone app, reducing the load carried to the field.

Taking advantage of the App Inventor’s simplicity, we developed a survey app that we called ArcheoSurvey (Figure 4), of which a simple version is now available to download from the “Between Tejo and Sado” project website (see above) and from the ICArEHB webpage under the Mozambique project section (http://www.icarehb.com/index.php/field-methods-and-techniques-mz). Both the app and the configuration files are available to download so that more archaeologists can use it and customize the current configuration to fit their own projects. We have been using more complex versions of this app for several field seasons now, and it has worked just fine within our specific goals.

There are two main components to the app: (1) a database component and (2) a geographic information component. In the latter, the two main features to highlight are the GPS recording capability, used to record the location coordinates of sites, and the Map Viewer, used to check location of the surveyor on Google Maps and to see the limits of survey areas and paths.

The integration of personalized maps with, for example, shape files imported from a GIS software is most certainly possible with MIT App Inventor (although this feature is not currently available in ArcheoSurvey), using third-party proprietary applications and connecting it with the customized app.

The GPS utility, as previously mentioned, can encompass errors that, depending on the smartphone, can go up to 5 m, but Map Viewer can also be used to manually insert a new point in Google Maps. Although this will not automatically be connected to the database, it can be used for later correction of the exact position of the site. One of the major drawbacks of using Google Maps is that the more recent versions of this software require Internet access to update satellite maps in real time. This is a problem we are currently trying to solve based on the use of a different offline maps app as an alternative.

The database component seeks to replace the traditional paper forms, given that it includes a series of descriptive fields, such as type of site, visibility, approximate chronology, etc. Most of these are multiple-choice variables, whose options were previously inserted. Others are simple numeric (e.g., approximate area in m²) or text boxes (e.g., observations) to be filled out by the surveyor during site description. A utility that is also available is a button to capture a picture with the device’s camera. The photo is saved in the internal memory of the device and is associated with the survey database by keeping its path as one of the database entries, but not (yet) directly accessible from the app. The App Inventor system can use URLs to access various places where media is stored on the device. Images in the photo gallery can be accessed with file names and by using the ImagePicker component.

Another function that we have included in the latest versions of ArcheoSurvey is a barcode reader functionality for easy labeling and tracking of artifacts collected during survey. When using this tool, the idea is that the denomination for each site is the ID present in the next label of a series of pre-printed barcode self-adhesive tags that are glued to the bag where the collected materials are kept. In the future, we plan to include a database search functionality with the barcode reader.
Every time the information from a new site is inserted and the form is completely filled out, there is a “Save” button at the end of the page that stores all data in a Tiny DB component and, simultaneously, in a CSV file in the smartphone internal memory. Tiny DB is what is known as persistent data storage, that is, the data stored there will be available each time and only when the App is running. Data items are strings stored under tags that are, in this specific case, the unique ID codes used to identify each site. The Tiny DB, however, keeps the values inside the smartphone root files that are accessed only by adminster-level permissions. The CSV file can, of course, be directly imported to MS Excel, Access, or other similar software.

App Inventor also offers another option that, in cases where Internet is available, is perhaps the most appropriate. It is the Fusion Tables Control, which is also a non-visible storage component that communicates with Google Fusion Tables where data can be stored, shared, queried, and visualized in the form of simple Excel-like tables. In the particular case of an app like ours, this option would be particularly good because Fusion Tables automatically creates a map based on the coordinates and characteristics of the sites introduced in the database.

**Final Words**

MIT App Inventor joins the already important use of Android-powered devices in archaeology, allowing the construction of customizable apps, both in design and in structure, that may meet the specific needs of specific projects, either in the field or in the lab.

Among the main advantages of its implementation in archaeological projects are that: (1) it is relatively easy to use, including by non-programmers, and is fully customizable; (2) it is free and, in most circumstances, does not require the purchase of new (sometimes very expensive) equipment, since most people can use their everyday smartphones (or tablets); and (3) it allows the combination of a myriad of utilities in a simple mobile app that can meet the specific needs of our work.

Still, some downsides can be mentioned. For example, it does not allow the creation of apps for operating systems other than Android, and it does not export programming code, so no direct code creation or modification/improvement is possible. Hopefully, these shortcomings will be solved when MIT releases the next version of App Inventor.

**References Cited**

Bauer, Christine


DeTore, Kathryn, and Rebecca Bria

2012 Digital Archaeology at PIARA. Electronic document
Figure 4. Two main screens of the ArcheoSurvey App.

Ellis, Steven, and John Wallrodt
2011 iPads at Pompeii. Electronic document,
Goodale, Nathan, David Bailey, Theodore Fondak, and Alissa Nauman
Klimaszewski-Patterson, Anna
Motz, Christopher, and Sam Carrier
The Intermontane Plateau region of North America has an incredibly rich and unique environmental and cultural history with amazing research potential. It is also home to a number of thriving American Indian Tribes who are taking an active role in identifying and protecting cultural resources. The potential to do interesting, important, and meaningful work in an atmosphere of respectful collaboration is too good to miss. Despite these opportunities, archaeological interest in the region has not been as great as we think is warranted. There has not been any significant exploration of contemporary theoretical topics or even cultural historical synthesis or interpretation for a number of decades. The outside world’s awareness of the region has in large part been centered on the archaeo-politics of the East Wenatchee Clovis find and the Ancient One known as Kennewick Man.

This situation was the main topic addressed at the Washington State University (WSU) Museum of Anthropology Plateau Conference, a special daylong seminar held at WSU on March 14, 2014. The conference included presentations by a panel of senior scholars and tribal representatives who were asked to present their views on what questions might be addressed by future archaeological studies on the Plateau, followed by lively discussions by participants with a wide range of perspectives. Here we report on the major themes discussed in this day-long “brain-storming event,” the intent of which was to inspire a new generation of scholars and to help secure the future of archaeological research on the Plateau.

Origin and Intent of the Plateau Conference

During the last half of the twentieth century, WSU was arguably the leader in archaeological scholarship on the Southern Plateau. Faculty and graduate students conducted large-scale studies along the Clearwater, Snake, and Columbia rivers in conjunction with the construction of dams, as well as smaller-scale studies in the uplands. WSU graduates went on to lead programs at other schools, federal and state agencies, tribal programs, and private firms. Many of the collections associated with these projects are curated at the Museum of Anthropology at WSU (MOA).

Since the beginning of the new century, and with notable exceptions, local synthetic scholarship has stagnated. At the same time, the role of tribal participation in archaeology has grown and prospered. This growth brought valuable new perspectives and new approaches to the discipline. Much of this situation was characterized by Ken Ames in his 2009 keynote address to the Northwest Anthropology Conference, in which he noted that the Northwest has the potential to contribute significantly to current topics of global interest in archaeology, including concepts that will potentially reshape our views of North American prehistory, but also drew attention to significant problems, such as aging scholars, gaps in University curricula, and a general “erosion of regional expertise” affecting all of the regions of North America (Ames 2009).

At WSU, research into Plateau archaeology declined after the departure (because of retirement or death) of several key figures, including Richard “Doc” Daugherty, Roald Fryxell, Carl Gustafson, Peter Mehringer, Frank Leonhardy, and David Rice, among others (Figure 1). Archaeological scholarship prospered during the era of the Department's CRM arm—first under the leadership of Randall Schalk, then Alston Thoms, William (Bill) Andrefsky, and later Ken Reid—but became less active after the closure of the unit and Bill Andrefsky’s migration to the Dean’s office. The focus of the MOA has been to get the museum in order, especially in terms of NAGPRA compliance. Organizing the large, old collections has increased our appreciation of their potential to address contemporary interests.

Recently, the MOA and the WSU Department of Anthropology have demonstrated an intent to revitalize Plateau scholar-
ship by redefining their mission to include scholarly work by MOA faculty, mentorship and recruitment of graduate students, and ongoing support for research by others. In addition, the Department of Anthropology has adopted a scholarly protocol that requires active engagement with Plateau Tribes and regular reporting of research activities directly to tribal entities.

The intent of the Plateau Conference was to advance these efforts and to foster opportunities for junior faculty, graduate students, tribal organizations, and others to formulate new scholarly work in a context that addresses the needs and concerns of the multiple entities engaged in contemporary archaeology.

Shortly after Shannon Tushingham was hired at WSU, Ken Ames contacted her with a welcome and an offer to help in the future. This came up in conversation with Mary Collins, who said, essentially, that it would be great to get a bunch of folks together to help forge a new path. So we began sending invitations but actually weren’t sure until pretty late in the game whether we could garner enough interest and financial support to make the event happen. We were hoping for perhaps 20 people. As it turned out, the response was overwhelming, with over 60 participants attending! Even so, many could not attend because they were invited so late in the game, due to the event’s rather haphazard beginnings. Regrettably, for example, we had no Canadian Plateau researchers represented, a situation we would like to remedy in future meetings.

The Plateau Conference

Like all good gatherings of archaeologists, the event was kicked off with a keg party—actually a reception and dinner the evening before the conference—during which participants...
could relax and catch up with each other. We convened the next morning (March 14th) for the conference. The format began with 15-minute presentations by a panel of senior scholars (defined as individuals who earned their BA degrees before 1980) and tribal representatives who presented their views on what questions might be addressed by future archaeological studies on the Plateau (see sidebar, Figures 2 and 3). This was followed by an afternoon of informal conversation. Our overall intent was to make this an interesting and lively “brainstorming event” in a casual roundtable atmosphere (Figure 4).

**Major Themes**

What is the future of archaeological research on the Intermontane Plateau? What challenges do we face, what directions should we be going in, and how do we incorporate different voices and exciting new analytical techniques into our discipline? These were some of the major questions addressed at the conference.

Of course, in this short space it is impossible to comprehensively summarize the wide range of ideas and topics discussed over the course of the entire day. (For posterity’s sake, the event was video recorded). However, there were a number of key themes that we will attempt to summarize below.

**Remembering Our Past**

A major thread was recognizing the contributions of two Plateau scholars who had sadly passed away shortly before the conference: Richard “Doc” Daugherty and Ernest (Skip) Lohse. Mary Collins and Ken Reid honored them in their introductory remarks. Doc Daugherty, of course, was a WSU Professor whose pioneering efforts and contribution to Northwest archaeology are unparalleled. Most people in the room were connected to or inspired by Daugherty in some way—including many of his students (or students of students) and colleagues. We were also saddened to hear, just a week before the conference, that Skip Lohse—who was to be one of our panelists—had suddenly passed away at only 60 years of age. Skip was an Idaho State University professor who had contributed greatly to the archaeology of the Southern Plateau.

**History and Contemporary Framework for Academic Archaeology on/in the Plateau**

In the era of Richard Daugherty, who, in 1954, was the first archaeologist to be hired at WSU and one of the first in the region, archaeologists did not believe there was great time depth, population size, or significant temporal changes to the prehistory of the region. There was little consideration or protection of cultural resources. Looting, especially of graves along the Columbia and Snake Rivers, was a well-respected family pastime.
Much of the first work done by archaeologists in the region revolved around changing people’s attitudes about these resources, which resulted in increased legal protection and salvage of sites impacted by major dam and highway construction projects. Recognition of a long culture history was one of the first significant advances of the era. Until the end of the twentieth century, archaeology remained a largely academic focus with ever-expanding and changing methods and theoretical perspectives.

Today, the programmatic framework within which Plateau archaeologists operate includes not only significantly advanced analytical techniques but a community of interests that includes a strong tribal presence and an enormous effort at compliance with section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and an associated, often elusive, body of resulting information.

Academic interests have largely been maintained by non-Ph.D.-granting programs. Some of these programs have produced remarkable results and notable publications. The lack of a Plateau regional focus at any of the Ph.D.-granting institutions in the region has, however, undercut the capacity to advance regional knowledge. This situation was the basis for a call for a long-term institutional commitment to regional archaeology by Ph.D.-granting universities, with programmatic efforts emphasizing increased information sharing and synthesis, as well as training and guidance for CRM professionals and undertakings. Such a commitment, it was noted, must recognize the importance of collaborating with tribal interests and needs and using less invasive methods of study, including directing efforts at existing collections.

**2014 Plateau Conference Panelists:**
- Lillian Ackerman, WSU
- Kenneth Ames, Portland State University
- William Andrefsky, WSU
- Pat Baird, Nez Perce Tribe
- Sarah Campbell, Western Washington State University
- Steve Hackenberger, Central Washington State University
- Mike Iyall, Cowlitz Tribe
- Kevin Lyons, Kalispel Tribe
- Guy Moura, Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation
- Max Pavesic, Independent Researcher
- Kenneth Reid, Idaho SHPO
- Lee Sappington, University of Idaho
- Jill Wagner, Coeur d’Alene Tribe
- R. Lee Lyman,* University of Missouri

*Unable to attend; prepared comments read.
Tribal Collaboration and Programmatic Needs

There has been a healthy growth of tribal programs and collaboration over the years. A recurring theme, particularly with tribal representatives, was the need to incorporate tribal values, Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK), and ethnography in archaeological studies. Furthermore, recording Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs) should be part and parcel of what we do. And, in terms of compliance work, there was a call to consider the potential for archaeology outside strict project boundaries, which in CRM is commonly termed the Area of Potential Effect (APE)—in other words, to look “outside the APE box” by considering the range of possible effects that might be caused by project implementation. This should not be restricted only to archaeological site disturbance, but also might include traditional cultural properties, gathering places, and consideration of the use and feeling of place, soundscapes, viewsheds, and the like.

In terms of programmatic needs, there was a general consensus that we need to get better at publishing and disseminating our results to a widespread and diverse audience. The public, tribal, and non-professional communities appear more responsive to multimedia productions than to the more traditional academic report. We also need to ensure that data are comparable from study to study. All of these efforts, of course, will help us to synthesize on the regional scale. Another theme that emerged in conversations after the conference is that tribal, academic, agency, and CRM archaeologists are often segregated, working on their own problems and with their own colleagues. That is something that needs to be addressed. We need to share information and work on building cohorts of scholars—and hopefully this will cut across some of our institutional boundaries.

Articulating the BIG Questions

Many conference attendees agreed that, despite the rich and varied nature of Plateau archaeology, there is a general and lamentable lack of interest in the region on the national level. Simply put, the Plateau does not seem to be on the radar of many archaeologists outside of the area. So, how can the relevance of Plateau archaeology be demonstrated to the outside world? How can we recruit a new generation of graduate students to work in the region? This can partly perhaps be achieved by outlining research questions that bridge Plateau borders (and attract research funding!). As pointed out by Prentiss et al. (2005:48), Plateau studies historically have largely operated on the local scale, with regional syntheses being few and far between. Yet such syntheses are a necessary step in articulating questions of interest to a wider audience.

A constant theme in discussions about questions archaeologists should be asking was the need to expand our understanding of the temporal and spatial variation of the region. One of the most striking aspects of the Southern Plateau is that there are vastly different natural areas within a relatively small geographic area. Alpine peaks and meadows, forested lowlands, grassland prairies, deeply eroded river canyons, scorched desert landscapes, and diverse plant and animal communities speak to a cultural landscape that is far more diverse than is currently understood, with complicated systems of resource sharing. How these systems worked raises important questions of social organization, leadership, amalgamation, and conflict, as well as resource intensification and domestication, topics that currently enjoy global interest.
This relates to the general need to engage in regional (or distributational) archaeology. Because of the long history of river basin work, our sample is skewed to river basin sites, which tend to be winter settlements. Thus, our knowledge is limited to only one part of the annual settlement round. Future archaeological studies in understudied ecological zones and geographic areas (such as the uplands of the channeled scablands) could be quite productive and help us to anchor extant collections and knowledge. There was a call to look outside of regional areas and watersheds, and across state and national borders, to better understand regional patterns.

Major research questions relating to subsistence intensification, the evolution of storage, and hunter-gatherer management of plants (e.g., roots, tobacco) and fish (especially salmon) have been and can continue to be addressed in Plateau studies. While questions related to these topics have been explored for decades, new analytical techniques and theoretical perspectives promise new insight. This is especially true when synthetic efforts compare the results of extensive recent work on the Northern (Fraser-Thompson) Plateau to the cultures of the Columbia Plateau (e.g., Chatters and Pokotylo 1998; Prentiss and Kuijt 2012; Prentiss et al. 2005).

Other topical themes that were introduced and which may be more unique to the Plateau included human response to catastrophic natural events. One such event was the eruption of Mount Mazama about 7,000 years ago, which is believed to have been some one hundred times greater than that of the 1883 eruption of Krakatoa, which impacted global climate for several years. The archaeological record for the Mazama era is vastly understudied.

So, too, is the period of Euro-American contact with the traditional people of the Plateau. The interior Northwest is arguably the last period of Euro-American contact in the continental United States. While diseases may have been introduced as many as 500 years ago, horses were acquired less than 300 years ago and extensive settlement occurred only within the last 150 years. Native American survival and persistence is certainly a hot topic in other parts of the country and could also be one in the Plateau.

Conclusion

There is both a long history of scholarship in the region and abundant avenues for future research. Our intent at WSU is to revitalize Plateau scholarship, while at the same time recognizing that today we are working in an entirely different landscape than in Daugherty’s era. The Plateau Conference certainly gave us a lot to think about, and it will help us to map out a program characterized by collaboration with tribes, good science, an interdisciplinary approach, and a field program anchored to, and informed by, work with extant collections. It is our hope that conference participants enjoyed the collegial atmosphere of the event and that they found the discussions to be as thought provoking as we did.
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Note

An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Northwest Anthropological Conference Annual Meeting in Bellingham, Washington, March 27, 2014.
A recent article focusing on sexual harassment and abuse in field-based sciences is important. It is not an easy read. It is disturbing. But all archaeologists should be aware of the data presented, which are based on the results of a 2013 survey of those in academic disciplines where working in field locations is routine. Archaeologists should acknowledge the severity of sexual harassment and abuse in the field, and address it.

The article is “Survey of Academic Field Experiences (SAFE): Trainees Report Harassment and Assault,” published in the July 16, 2014, issue of *PLoS ONE*. The authors are anthropologists Kathryn Clancy, Robin Nelson, Julienne Rutherford, and Katie Hinde. Overall, 666 people participated in the survey, representing 32 disciplines. Approximately 75 percent were from the United States. Close to one quarter of the respondents identified specifically as archaeologists.

The numbers cannot, and should not, be ignored. Sixty-four percent of respondents claim to have personally experienced sexual harassment and more than 20 percent claim to have experienced sexual assault in field locations. Not surprisingly, females are targeted much more frequently than males. The survey indicates that sexual harassment and assault are overwhelmingly aimed at trainees (students and postdocs), and the primary perpetrators are males senior to them professionally. Besides being the target, experiencing sexual harassment and assault may also include witnessing it. More than 70 percent of respondents reported having either directly experienced or been told about sexual harassment at their field sites. The survey further indicates that there is limited awareness of policies dealing with harassment and mechanisms for reporting, and that of those that did report, only 18 percent were satisfied with the outcome.

The implications of this survey for archaeology should be obvious. I can’t imagine anyone believing that archaeology would be better with fewer women. Yet harassment and abuse of women in field locations, whether targeted at students or at those on a career track, surely drives many away.

Although the survey is not specific to archaeology, the fact that almost one quarter of the respondents identified as archaeologists is significant. It moves the discussion of sexual harassment and abuse in archaeological field locations out of the realm of anecdotes, campfire chatter, oral traditions, rumors, and innuendo and beyond the “culture of fieldwork” and “what happens in the field, stays in the field” mentalities. It provides important data to move forward.

There are multiple ways of addressing sexual harassment and abuse in field locations in archaeology. As suggested by Clancy, Nelson, Rutherford, and Hinde (2014), because supervisors are key to determining workplace culture, principal investigators have the power and responsibility to make positive changes, including raising awareness, creating guidelines for respectful behavior, and adopting reporting mechanisms.

Archaeology field schools can be a good way of setting standards. When preliminary results of the survey first surfaced in April 2013, I was preparing for an annual archaeology field school that I direct each summer. I immediately established a zero-tolerance policy of sexual harassment for the field school (incidents of sexual abuse are to be reported to the police) and discussed it with the class on the first day. The policy was based on university policies, but it was tailored specifically to the archaeology field school. Students were given handouts with the policy that included not only a definition of harassment (eg., unwanted advances, comments, and jokes) but also multiple clear lines of reporting, none of which included females reporting to a male on the project. The lines of reporting included telephone numbers. Feedback from students on this policy has been positive.

Archaeology field schools have very much become a rite of passage in entering the profession in many regions, so they are a good place to establish a culture of fieldwork that does not include sexual harassment and abuse. I let my students know that every field experience is different and that when they go on to other field projects they are likely to discover different field
customs, but that experiencing sexual harassment is never acceptable.

Field school selection committees may also be used to give at least some signal to potential applicants that the field school is a safe environment. The selection committee for the field school I direct, for example, always includes two or three women (anthropologists and sometimes a physical geographer), as well as myself.

In addition to field schools, it may also be worthwhile to consider explicitly covering sexual harassment and abuse in other courses. Over the past year (since the preliminary survey results were released in 2013), I have mentioned the survey results in other classes I teach, including introductory courses. I don’t particularly like showing a dark side of archaeology, but I think it derelict not to let students know the perils they may face.

Other ways of addressing sexual harassment in the field include making all those involved in fieldwork aware of departmental, institutional, and company policies regarding harassment, as well as potential legal ramifications. The survey indicated that many were not aware that such policies existed. Where policies do not exist, they should be created. Associations of professional archaeologists would be well-served by explicitly addressing harassment in the codes of conduct and ethics as well.

My own experience suggests that many do not clearly understand what constitutes harassment, not recognizing, for example, that a joke or being witness to comments may be harassment. It may be helpful, therefore, to make it clear to everyone on a field project what constitutes harassment and the potential penalties.

It is important not to forget that the primary targets are usually the most vulnerable—students—and they may not understand what is acceptable. I was reminded of this in the midst of writing this short piece. One of my students emailed me to let me know that she thought she was currently being sexually harassed, but wasn’t sure. She wasn’t sure whether it was harassment, and she wasn’t sure what to do. She showed me the correspondence. It was disgusting. A predator, a creep in a position of authority, was suggesting that he could help with her career in archaeology. But he wanted to touch her first. It fit the pattern. The target was an archaeology “trainee.” The perpetrator was a male senior to her in the profession. I am glad that this student emailed me. She contacted me because she knew my attitudes towards sexual harassment, and she didn’t know what to do. I offered some suggestions and advised her that I could act on her behalf if she preferred.

The study by Clancy, Nelson, Rutherford, and Hinde (2014) is important for field-based sciences, which I imagine will lead to others, including some specific to archaeology. The authors recognize some of the biases, including the potential for both over-reporting and under-reporting by those who have experienced sexual harassment and abuse. In the case of those identifying as archaeologists, I imagine that the survey is strongly biased towards those in academia. Overall, the overwhelming majority of respondents identified as students and faculty. Only three percent identified as “employees” and less than seven percent identified as “non-academic.” It would be interesting and important to see whether there would be similar results from a survey in commercial archaeology.

It is unfortunate that sexual harassment and abuse persist, in archaeology and elsewhere. But it does exist, and it should be addressed. Staying silent and doing nothing, especially for those in positions of power, is no longer acceptable.
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In the May 2014 issue of the SAA Archaeological Record, Newman and West discuss the social relevance of archaeology in the twenty-first century, observing that students struggle to articulate the value of preserving archaeological resources beyond an ephemeral affirmation of importance. Questions about the value of preservation are increasingly significant as intensive developmental pressures such as energy production, natural resource extraction, and population expansion continue to threaten cultural resources at an alarming rate. Additionally, the demand for economic development continues to gain clout within the cost-benefit analysis of archaeological preservation, yet the value of preserving archaeological resources remains difficult to clearly define and even more difficult to quantify. Congressional language in the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 is vague, citing the “spirit and direction of the Nation” or “providing a sense of orientation to the American people” as the impetus for preservation and the inherent source of value in archaeological and cultural resources (NHPA 1966). This language, along with the complex nature of historic preservation efforts, contributes to the difficulties in articulating the relevance of continued protection. Fortunately, we have not yet reached the point where development automatically takes precedence over preservation, although it is not difficult to envision a time when cultural resource management programs must justify their costs, in clearly quantifiable terms of value, in an increasingly hostile political environment. This essential tension raises the question, how do we continue to justify the preservation of archaeological resources in the face of growing demands for domestic energy development and natural resources? To help preempt these discussions, we present three tangible examples of how the preservation and documentation of the Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area’s archaeological resources continue to provide returns from the resources invested.

Beginning in 2005, archaeological field schools, along with other compliance-related archaeological projects, have documented a significant portion of the Bighorn Canyon cultural landscape (see Figure 1). Bighorn Canyon is part of a National Park Service administered recreational area created with the damming of the Bighorn River in the mid-1960s. The park is located in a stark, high-elevation, desert landscape on the Wyoming-Montana border between the Pryor and Bighorn Mountains. For over 10,000 years, ancestral hunting and gathering groups traveled this area connecting the Central Rocky Mountains and the Northern Plains, leaving behind a rich archaeological record of their lives. Students from 11 institutions, including Northwest College (Powell, Wyoming), Indiana University, St. Cloud State University, and the University of Memphis, along with Apsáalooke (Crow) and Northern Cheyenne tribal members have received field training there while documenting numerous archaeological sites (Scheiber et al. 2011). The archaeological field schools have surveyed hundreds of tipi rings, stone features, lithic scatters, and cairns scattered throughout the landscape. Most sites are along the Bad Pass Trail, one of western North America’s most well-documented trail systems (Loendorf 1980). Students mapped many of these sites and recorded artifacts and features with sub-centimeter precision using survey-grade GPS equipment. Attribute data, such as long and short axis dimension, orientation, and material type, were collected from all feature rocks over 10 cm in minimum diameter (Scheiber and Finley 2010). Because of this thorough work, Bighorn Canyon is a well-documented archaeological landscape that provides multiple opportunities to extract tangible, quantifiable returns from our preservation efforts.

First, we use previously documented archaeological landscapes as a training ground for future archaeologists (see Figure 2). Typical-
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ly, archaeological field schools either survey new areas where the archaeological resources are unknown or continue excavations on well-known sites. In both situations, new students work under the supervision of graduate or senior students and instructors. While this training method has worked through the past and has generated enormous datasets, conducting field schools on previously documented landscapes provides some significant advantages. Students can survey a previously documented archaeological landscape many times over without diminishing the thrill of discovery for those who are new to the landscape. In many ways, this is the field equivalent of conducting laboratory research and training with extant collections instead of excavating new materials. Conducting training in this way helps to preserve the archaeological record for future generations and to maximize the return from our archaeological resources. Additionally, regular surveys accurately document and monitor archaeological resources helping to identify negative impacts on the sites and allowing for early mitigation, if necessary.

From a teaching perspective, working on a known archaeological landscape allows for accurate assessment of student progress and learning outcomes because instructors know exactly what students should find. If students do not identify the known archaeological materials, then instructors can determine whether the student does not understand the objective or whether the method of instruction is unclear. Either way, field training on previously documented landscapes has a high degree of accountability because there are accurate measures of progress and learning. Second, we use the Bighorn Canyon archaeological landscape to reconnect indigenous communities to their heritage, while providing vocational training within a community that has limited economic opportunity. Since the initial approval of 12 Tribal Historic Preservation Offices (THPOs) in 1996, the demand for qualified, tribal monitors has increased, and the need to build and expand capacity within THPOs has grown. This is particularly true in the energy-rich basins of Montana, Wyoming, and North Dakota. In many cases, tribal monitors have little, if any, archaeological training, and opportunities for training are often limited to in-house seminars and workshops conducted by individual THPOs. Anthropology and post-secondary degrees in general are rare among tribal monitors, reflecting the relatively low (although growing) enrollment of Native Americans in colleges and universities (DeVoe and Darling-Churchill 2008).

Partnering with Northwest College, we conduct a 30-day, six-credit-hour archaeological technician certification course at an accredited academic institution that provides comprehensive training in field methodology. Since 2011, nearly 30 Apsáalooke and Northern Cheyenne tribal members have passed through the training program (see Figure 3). Many are working for their tribal cultural programs, and at least one is pursuing a graduate degree in anthropology at the University of Montana. These are clear marks of the program’s success.

Although we primarily focus on providing rigorous anthropological and archaeological field training, the tribal partnerships we have built open unique opportunities for cultural education. Tribal elders and other native cultural experts from the tribes that visit and join our field camp throughout the 30 days share their culture with field school participants and help the younger generation of participants rebuild connections to their past traditions (see Figure 4).

In addition to vocational training, field experiences like our 30-day certification program appear to have other significant benefits. Immersive field camps expose all native and non-native students to role models from both within and outside of the tribe and can build the interest, motivation, and confidence that tribal youth need to pursue post-secondary degrees. Living in our six-week field camp builds strong and lasting connections between native communities and anthropologists, helping to create important professional and personal networks that enrich learning and promote successful entry into post-secondary programs or employment.

Third, we use the Bighorn Canyon archaeological landscape to introduce middle and high school students to archaeological field skills. During the summer of 2009 and 2010, Little Bighorn College in Crow Agency Montana ran Crow Camp, a summer science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) program for graduated high-school students from the Crow Indian Reservation (Scheiber et al. 2011). Additionally, for four sum-

Figure 1. Students from the 2012 archaeological field school conducting a close-interval survey in the Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area (photo by Matthew J. Rowe, 2012).
mers, fourth through sixth grade students from Rocky Mountain Middle School in Cowley, Wyoming, have participated in two-week archaeology summer day camps where archaeology is the educational focus for students who scored poorly on standardized exams or are otherwise perceived as “at risk” for passing to the next grade. The Rocky Mountain Middle School program comports well with current national education goals of expanding and building skills in the STEM disciplines. The field experience exposes students to the real-world application of mapping and survey technology, geosciences, natural and environmental sciences, and mathematics. Specifically, while mapping tipi rings and archaeological sites, students apply the geometric concepts of angles, bearings, circles, and ratios in the form of map scales. Lectures on taphonomy and site formation processes introduce students to the geologic timescale, geomorphology and landform change, and other geologic processes. Plotting the locations of archaeological sites on topographic maps exposes students to the applications of global positioning technology and geographic concepts such as grid systems and symbolic representation of topographic features. Discussions about dating and sourcing archaeological materials introduce applications of concepts from physics and chemistry, such as half-lives of isotopes and elemental fingerprints. Other concepts from environmental science, ecology, and biology are also integral to discussions of past human cultures. In addition, the summer archaeology field school gives students practical experience using the metric system. Archaeology is a strong topical hook for student learning, and outdoor field experiences engage students in a dynamic, out-of-class learning environment. Field-based learning experiences are inherently interdisciplinary, help build teamwork and social skills, and reinforce in-class lessons (DfES 2006). We hope to develop this program further to better mesh with the educational objectives and curriculum of the local schools and to create quantifiable assessment tools to evaluate the educational value of the summer program for teaching STEM topics.

Conclusion

If we hope to maintain robust cultural preservation programs in the future, it is imperative that archaeologists communicate tangible and quantifiable reasons for preserving archaeological resources, in addition to the more esoteric values associated with National heritage, identity, and connections to the past. To do this, archaeologists must look beyond preservation and begin to think about how we use preserved archaeological resources to further benefit society. Our partnership with the National Park Service, various educational institutions, and tribal groups produced three examples of social benefits provided by preserving archeological landscapes. The most obvious benefit is that preserved archaeological landscapes provide highly effective training grounds for future archaeologists, while preserving the archaeological record for future generations and maintaining research integrity. Using previously documented archaeological landscapes to train students protects undocumented sites from unintentional damage or poor quality recording associated with limited education and experience. This means that training for future archaeologists has minimal impact on undocumented archaeological resources and that training methods are more effective because they have a high degree of accountability. Second, the preserved archaeological landscape provides vocational training opportunities, as well as cultural heritage education, for regional tribal groups. Integral roles for tribal elders and other community members build connections between generations of tribal members while immersing all students (native and non-native) in portions of Apsáalooke and Northern Cheyenne culture. Our program introduces post-secondary education and awards college-level credits, which may encourage participating tribal members to pursue college degrees. The inclusion of many different institutions exposes non-native students to a

Figure 2. An Apsáalooke (Crow) student from the 2014 field school learning how to map tipi rings (photo by Daniel Baney, NWC 2014).

Figure 3. The 2012 graduating class receiving their Archaeological Technician Certification (photo by Matthew J. Rowe, 2012).
broad spectrum of native culture. Camp life and in-camp activities introduce all students to prehistoric technologies such as flint knapping and atlatls, meaning that learning continues beyond the formal course work (see Figure 5).

Centering vocational training programs on preserved archaeological landscapes can expand economic opportunities for tribal members while increasing THPO capacity and strengthening cultural heritage preservation programs. Third, the preserved archaeological landscape offers many STEM training opportunities for middle and high school students in an assessable environment to monitor the progress and effectiveness of summer programs. These archaeological summer camps provide real-world connections to the application of STEM topics that are often difficult to communicate in the classroom. Creating these real-world connections can help provide motivation to students who often wonder why they need to learn these topics.

We suggest that these three examples drawn from our experiences provide a robust model for how educational programs and partnerships can use preserved archaeological landscapes to add tangible social value to cultural preservation efforts. These programs are not mutually exclusive; rather, they have synergistic power when integrated with an educational program that has native and non-native students from all ages and educational levels working and learning together. The programs we outline in this article are scalable and transferable to other archaeological landscapes, and they comport well with current educational theories and goals. Strong ties with the National Park Service, and with Apsáalooke and Northern Cheyenne tribal members, have been critical to the success of our programs, but these exact connections are not requisite to forming similar educational programs in other locations. Most cultural heritage sites with visible resources can facilitate the development of similar educational programs through creative partnerships among regional government agencies, native tribes, local stakeholders, and educational institutions. The concepts embedded in the programs we present are easily transferrable to other preserved archaeological resources, such as mound sites in the Midwest and Southeast, coastal shell middens, or Ancestral Puebloan ruins in the American Southwest. Additionally, the cultural resource focal point of these programs does not necessarily have to be prehistoric because historic sites also provide similar opportunities and have comparable management and monitoring requirements. Using archaeological resources in the manner described above supports the ethical principles outlined by the SAA while extracting tangible social benefits. Instituting these programs on a broader scale transforms preserved archaeological landscapes from dusty museum pieces into dynamic outdoor classrooms that support STEM training, develop leadership and teamwork skills, and provide examples of real-world applications of in-class course work. To protect archaeological resources from future development, we must think well beyond preservation and instead figure out how to put our Nation’s archaeological resources to work.

Acknowledgments. Our collaboration extends beyond the tribal and community members mentioned in this piece. Ronda Peer, Dean of the Extended Campus at Northwest College, has supported archaeological education through her institution since 2000. Chris Finley (retired) and Cassity Bromley of the National Park Service have ceaselessly labored for financial support of the

![Figure 4. Apsáalooke and Northern Cheyenne students in 2012 demonstrate how to set up a tipi (photo by Daniel Baney, NWC 2012).](image)

![Figure 5. Students learn about stone tool technologies through in-class lectures and flint knapping sessions during the 30-day field school (photo by Daniel Baney, NWC 2012).](image)
field schools. Burdick and Billy Two Leggings are Apsáalooke tribal liaisons who show ceaseless efforts in tribal cultural preservation and the education of tribal youth. Our work could not continue without all of their combined efforts.
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Arthur C. Aufderheide, Emeritus Professor at the University of Minnesota, died August 9, 2013, in Duluth, Minnesota.

Arthur was head of pathology at the Minneapolis V.A. Hospital, St. Mary’s Hospital, Duluth, and St. Luke’s Hospital, Duluth. He also held teaching positions at University of Minnesota Duluth Medical School from 1978 to 2009, and was head of the Medical School Pathology Department and acting dean from 1973-1974.

He was a prominent bio-anthropologist who helped found the new scientific discipline of paleopathology, with his research interests focused on paleoepidemiology. Together with his wife Mary, he pioneered the study of disease patterns in ancient populations. His vocational interests led him to the Arctic for seven expeditions, living with an Inuit family for three winters. A member of the Ralph Plaisted Snowmobile Polar Expedition in 1968, he joined renowned photographer Jim Brandenberg in documenting 15,000 feet of film about Arctic ethnic groups. He later joined the staff of Universidad Tarapaca in the Atacama Desert in northern Chile, where he developed outstanding research on mummy studies as well as bio-anthropological investigations that contributed greatly to understanding the lifeways and diseases of pre-Hispanic Andean peoples, particularly in the north of Chile and the south of Peru.

Through his research, Arthur broadened the scope of paleopathology analyses using molecular biology, isotopes studies, analytical chemistry, immunology, and imagery, which revolutionized the methodological and technical procedures used to better understand the origins and characteristics that caused diseases and their relationship to ecology and lifeways in the past. His pathological studies of ancient populations such as the Chinchorro and Alto Ramirez people from northern Chile are crucial for interpreting the archaeology of the South Central Andean area.

Arthur's other contributions included studies on archaeo-parasitology and the identification of Trypanosoma cruzi, tracing the evolutionary history of Chagas disease in northern Chile as far back as 9,000 years B.P. Using molecular biology, he also investigated infectious diseases among the ancient people of the Atacama region. The presence of Mycobacterium tuberculosis and Treponema, responsible for tuberculosis and treponematosi, were also found among prehistoric populations of northern Chile.

Arthur wrote over 100 scientific articles and four important books, including Paleopathology: Current Synthesis and Future Options, co-edited with Donald Ortner (1991); The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Human Paleopathology, co-authored with Conrado Rodriguez-Martin (1998); and The Scientific Study of Mummies (2003). Among his other attributes, Arthur was also a tremendous supporter of and responsible for organizing the Mummy Studies Congresses.

I met Arthur in Arica back in 1983, and together we did field work in several sites along the Pacific coast. His persistence and his attitude of always learning by exploring and expanding horizons inspired all of us who worked with him at some point in our careers. In one of his last interviews, Arthur said he was sure the development of the study of ancient diseases would ultimately help epidemiologists understand the modern spread of disease.

Arthur is survived by his wife Mary, daughter Patricia, and sons Walter and Tom.

Mario A. Rivera
Universidad de Magallanes
Born on September 19, 1937, Peter D’Arcy Harrison was one of the last “gentlemen-scholars” in Maya archaeology, and his passing at age 76 on December 15, 2013, effectively signals the end of an era. Peter was not only an academic researcher but also a widely skilled renaissance man and philanthropist. Besides carrying out archaeological research for almost three decades, Peter also mounted exhibits of his photographs at numerous venues, consulted on a number of films and formal exhibits, and was a prolific writer of short fiction that included a published book of short stories. Yet perhaps the most impactful time of his life was the 48 months that he spent at Tikal, Guatemala, as part of the University of Pennsylvania Tikal Project.

Peter grew up in Toronto, Canada, and received both his BA (1959) and MA (1961) in anthropology from the University of Toronto. He continued his graduate career first at the University of Arizona in Tucson (1961) and then at the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia, where he earned a PhD in anthropology in 1970.

In 1966, Peter became an assistant professor of anthropology at Trent University in Peterborough, Ontario, Canada and was promoted to the rank of associate professor in 1972. More interested in the research aspects of Maya archaeology than the traditional academic job track, he left Trent in 1976 to become a research associate at Tulane University in New Orleans, a position he held until his death. From 1998 until his passing he also served as a research associate at the University Museum of the University of Pennsylvania. From September 1989 through June 1990, Peter was a fellow in residence in pre-Columbian studies at Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, DC. However, as a lover of mountains and wide open spaces, he maintained his formal domicile in Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Peter had a variety of research interests in archaeology that shifted over time. From 1957 through 1964, he carried out archaeological field work in Canada at 11 sites that ranged in date from the Paleo-Indian to the Historic period. It was during this time, however, that he became interested in Maya archaeology, first working at Tikal, Guatemala, in the 1959 University of Pennsylvania field season and then again during the 1962 field season. He next served as the sub-director in charge of the Tikal Project in Guatemala for a continuous span of 3 years from 1964 through 1966, working closely with William R. Coe. These three years provided a foundation for Peter’s lasting interest in Maya subsistence and architecture with building function for Tikal’s Central Acropolis emerging as the subject of his subsequent Ph.D. dissertation. Following the completion of his doctoral degree, he carried out the Uaymil Survey Project in Mexico for three field seasons from 1972 through 1974. From 1979 through 1981 he undertook his seminal Pulltrouser Swamp Project with Billie Lee Turner, examining early Maya agriculture and raised fields in northern Belize; he returned to Belize on his own in 1984 for a final laboratory season. His several books on Maya agricultural practices and subsistence represent a turning point for our conception of ancient Maya complexity.

It was during his laboratory work at Pulltrouser Swamp in 1984 that we came to know him personally, as he would spend his weekends at a hotel north of Corozal Town where we would rendezvous with him for dinner during the course of carrying out the third of our excavation seasons at Santa Rita Corozal. Our professional relationship with Peter continued for many years after 1984 through professional conferences as well as through social events both in central Florida (usually at a Disney hotel) and at his home in Albuquerque. He eventually donated his Pulltrouser Swamp field vehicle to the Caracol Archaeological Project and then made yearly donations to our Belize field work. His annual funding was instrumental in ensuring the continuance of our fieldwork in that country.

Peter’s concern with the need for more research in the Maya area led him to establish two foundations that were designed to promote research and publication on the ancient Maya. The first was the Ahau Foundation, which fostered our own research at Caracol and also contributed to a series of projects in Guatemala, especially Juan Pedro Laporte’s important work in the southeast Peten. More recently he established the Tikal West Foundation to complete the final publication of the University Museum research reports on Tikal, a project that still continues half a century later.

On a more personal level, both his wife of 47 years, Alexandra M. Harrison, and his son, Andreas R. Harrison, survive him.

Arlen F. Chase and Diane Z. Chase University of Central Florida
José Antonio Pérez, Pepe to his friends, died May 24, 2014 of cancer in Buenos Aires, Argentina.

Pepe was born in Córdoba, Argentina December 8, 1937. His high school years took place at Colegio Nacional de Monserrat, graduating in 1957. Thereafter, he entered Universidad Nacional de Córdoba where he took a degree in history with a thesis on “Settlement Patterns in Northwest Argentina,” and a doctoral degree with his thesis on ceramic analysis from archaeological research in Ciénaga Grande (Department of Tumbaya, Jujuy) with Rex González as his advisor.

Together with colleagues from Chile, Peru, and Ecuador, he was part of a young generation who were responsible for the development of archaeology as a discipline in South American universities. He served as professor of prehistory and American archaeology at Universidad de Córdoba from 1971. In 1979, when he moved to Mexico because of the dictatorship in Argentina, he became professor of Andean ethnohistory and American archaeology at Escuela Nacional de Antropología e Historia (ENAH).

In 1987, Pérez Gollán was again in Buenos Aires at Universidad de Buenos Aires as a member of the Facultad de Filosofía y Letras. From then on, he served in temporary appointments at several universities both in Argentina and abroad. But his most important contribution was probably from his position as director of Universidad de Buenos Aires’ Ethnographic Museum from 1987 to 2005. There, as the successor of prominent archaeologists such as Rex González and the precursors of Argentinean archaeology Juan Bautista Ambrosetti and Salvador Debenedetti, José Pérez Gollán developed outstanding work both updating the museum exhibitions to modern standards and also putting the museum on the international scene. In 2005 Pepe Pérez moved to the National Historic Museum as its director until 2013. He also served as a visiting professor in Chile, France, and the United States, where he held a Fulbright Visiting Scholar Fellowship.

A hard worker and publisher, he authored several books, most notably Primeras Culturas Argentinas with Alberto Rex González (1970), Víspers de la conquista with Alberto Rex González (1972), 2000 años de arte precolombino en la Argentina (1994), and Arte precolombino argentino (2000). In 2006 Pérez Gollán won the Konex Award, and in 2012, he was conferred the Gratia Artis Award by the Fine Arts Academy for his support and interest in communicating the arts. He was a tireless scholar with multiple interests, from history, ethnology, and archaeology to museum studies and heritage protection. But certainly his favorite subjects were within Andean culture history and his preferred site, Ambato in Córdoba.

With Pepe Pérez, another outstanding member of the 1960s archaeological generation is gone.

Mario A. Rivera
Universidad de Magallanes
Edward Barna Kurjack was born July 29, 1938, in Brooklyn, New York, and died August 2, 2014, at the age of 76 in Melbourne, Florida. He is survived by three brothers—Dennis, Barna, and Louis Kurjack—and two sisters, Ilona Mueller and Kathleen Horvath. He was a loving brother, cousin, uncle, and teacher. Ed earned a BS from Florida State University in 1962, an MA from the University of Alabama in 1964, and a Ph.D. from Ohio State University in 1972. He first experienced the field working on a salvage project directed by Dr. Charles Fairbanks in the Weiss Basin of Alabama in the summer of 1959. Ed directed the Stanfield-Worley Bluff Shelter excavations in 1961 and analyzed the artifacts for publication under the supervision of Prof. David L. DeJarnette. That winter, he joined Tulane’s Middle American Research Institute (MARI) project at Dzibilchaltún, Yucatán, México, directed by Dr. E. Wyllys Andrews IV, serving as a staff archaeologist at MARI through 1964. In 1967, he led investigations into the Urn Burial Caves of Salangsang Project in the mountains of western Mindanao, Philippines. Ed joined the faculty of Western Illinois University in 1971, where he was a popular and innovative teacher for 28 years. He retired in 1999 as a full professor. Ed’s research focused on ancient Maya social organization and the social, political, and economic importance of Maya causeways, among other topics. He pioneered the use of GPS, remote sensing, digital mapping, and computers in the archaeology of the northern Maya lowlands in Mexico. His nearly 50 publications describe his research on the ancient Maya and on the prehistory of Alabama, where he began his field career. The best known are Prehistoric Lowland Maya Community and Social Organization: A Case Study at Dzibilchaltún, Yucatan, Mexico (1974), the first detailed settlement pattern study of a Maya city in the northern Maya area. He subsequently co-authored the Map of the Ruins of Dzibilchaltún (1979) with George Stuart, John Scheffler, and John Cottier. Ed was an investigator for the Mexican National Institute of Anthropology and History, Merida, Yucatan, Mexico, co-directing the Archaeological Atlas of Yucatan Project from 1975 to 1980. The Atlas Arqueológico del Estado de Yucatán (1980), co-authored with Silvia Garza Tarazona de González, is a landmark publication in the history of Yucatecan archaeology. Ed also served as field director of an archaeological reconnaissance of the Copan Valley, Honduras from December 1977 to July 1978. Ed held the position of Research Associate at MARI and at the Precolombian Art Research Institute of San Francisco and was granted an honorary position in the Philippine National Museum. In retirement, he remained an active researcher and was engaged in further research with materials from the Stanfield-Worley Bluff Shelter and other projects at the time of his death. Ed Kurjack was a generous friend and colleague and a tireless and effective mentor to others interested in Yucatán, past and present, the enchanted land where he felt most at home. He wanted to be remembered as one who loved to live life.

Acknowledgments. I thank Ed’s dear friends and colleagues Dr. E. Wyllys Andrews V, Dr. Anthony P. Andrews, Arq. Rubén Maldonado Cardenas, Arqla. Beatriz Repetto Tio, Professor Emeritus Lawrence A. Conrad, and Dr. Virginia E. Miller for their helpful comments.

Patricia K. Anderson Associate Professor (and a fond mentee of Ed’s) Department of Sociology and Anthropology Western Illinois University
### ASSETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>December 31,</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT ASSETS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and Cash Equivalents</td>
<td>$ 2,340,336</td>
<td>$ 2,118,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Receivable, Net</td>
<td>32402</td>
<td>5862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pledges Receivable</td>
<td>8400</td>
<td>7325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued Interest Receivable</td>
<td>1001</td>
<td>1760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid Expenses, Current Portion</td>
<td>100605</td>
<td>73576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Current Assets</td>
<td>2482744</td>
<td>2206752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREPAID EXPENSES, Net of Current Portion</td>
<td>10500</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INVESTMENTS</td>
<td>4768881</td>
<td>2970787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPERTY AND EQUIPMENT, Net</td>
<td>104984</td>
<td>118249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPOSITS</td>
<td>11031</td>
<td>11031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 7378140</td>
<td>$ 5306819</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS

|                                |                |       |
|                                | 2013           | 2012  |
| CURRENT LIABILITIES            |                |       |
| Accounts Payable and Accrued Expenses | $ 55209 | $ 14742 |
| Deferred Revenue               |                |       |
| Membership Dues, Current Portion | 528695    | 469616 |
| Subscriptions                  | 125698        | 119006 |
| Meetings and Other             | 516429        | 402280 |
| Total Deferred Revenue         | 1170822       | 990902 |
| Total Current Liabilities      | 1228031       | 105644 |
| OTHER LIABILITIES              |                |       |
| Deferred Lease Liability       | 58135         | 49816 |
| Deferred Membership Dues, Net of Current Portion | 24837 | 27116 |
| Total Liabilities              | 1309003       | 1082576 |

### NET ASSETS

|                                |                |       |
|                                | 2013           | 2012  |
| Unrestricted                   | 2720718        | 2472419 |
| Board-Designated               | 598584         | 625016 |
| Temporarily Restricted         | 3319302        | 3097435 |
| Permanently Restricted         | 363320         | 317861 |
| Total Net Assets               | 2386515        | 808947 |
|                                | 6069137        | 4224243 |
|                                | $ 7378140      | $ 5306819 |
## SOCIETY FOR AMERICAN ARCHAEOLOGY

### STATEMENTS OF ACTIVITIES AND CHANGE IN NET ASSETS

#### Year Ended December 31,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>Temporarily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue and Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>Restricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Dues</td>
<td>$746,999</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Meeting</td>
<td>548,890</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>252,320</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Programs and Services</td>
<td>5,879</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization and Administration</td>
<td>257,501</td>
<td>87,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Programs and Services</td>
<td>2,466</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards</td>
<td>21,997</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Assets Released from Restriction – Public Programs and Services</td>
<td>41,859</td>
<td>(41,859)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue and Support</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,877,311</strong></td>
<td><strong>45,459</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Expenses

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>Temporarily</td>
<td>Permanently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Services</td>
<td>Program Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>70,835</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Meeting</td>
<td>336,957</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>319,779</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Programs and Services</td>
<td>240,881</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Programs and Services</td>
<td>81,962</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards</td>
<td>25,791</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,076,205</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and General</td>
<td>559,684</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Development</td>
<td>20,155</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,656,344</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Change in Net Assets

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change in Net Assets</td>
<td>221,367</td>
<td>45,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,844,894</td>
<td>316,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21,645</td>
<td>423,273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Net Assets, Beginning of Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Assets, Beginning of Year</td>
<td>3,097,435</td>
<td>317,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,224,243</td>
<td>2,781,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>787,302</td>
<td>3,800,970</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Net Assets, End of Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Assets, End of Year</td>
<td>$3,319,302</td>
<td>$363,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$6,069,137</td>
<td>$3,097,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$4,224,243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the first time ever, SAA and EAA have organized a joint meeting that will bring together scholars in a tightly focused high-caliber thematic meeting. For our inaugural meeting, we have chosen a theme of great interest to archaeologists on both sides of the Atlantic: slavery, trade, and colonialism.

Slavery and colonialism are topics of great interest to American and European archaeologists. Scholars generally tend to work within the theoretical and methodological confines in which they were trained. Consequently, these topics are treated quite differently in different countries. Our objective is to break down these barriers by inviting leading scholars to present, debate, and discuss various theoretical perspectives and methodological approaches to these topics using examples from throughout the world and not restricted to Europe, Africa or the Americas. We equally welcome examples from different periods in time, such as perspectives that can be offered from the classical world and others.

A tremendous amount of work is being conducted on the subjects as archaeologists investigate ancient civilizations, historical empires, and societies swept up in their wake. This is your chance to participate in this inaugural joint conference. In doing so, you will join four leaders of the field, who have agreed to give the following keynote addresses:

Corinne L. Hofman, Leiden, Netherlands
“The Nexus1492 Project: New World Encounters in a Globalizing World”

Kathleen Deagan
"Colonialism, Slavery, and Trade: A (North) Americanist Perspective"

Tom Gilbert, Centre for GeoGenetics, Copenhagen, Denmark
“The Eurotast Project: Exploring the History, Archaeology and New Genetics of the Transatlantic Slave Trade”

Roberto Valcárcel Rojas
“The Caribbean and the Indigenous Slavery in the New World”

There will be no concurrent sessions; all participants will be able to hear all papers. To submit an abstract for consideration by the Scientific Committee, please email the abstract, title, and author name(s) and affiliation(s) to saa-eaa2015@saa.org by February 2, 2015. Abstracts should not exceed 200 words.

You can view the full call on SAA’s homepage: http://www.saa.org/.
Professional Development the Easy Way!

Visit www.saa.org for detailed information, registration, and schedules for these upcoming courses:

- Archaeology & Social Media: A Primer for Those Who Aren't Sure They Need It or Want It
- Funding Opportunities from the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research
- Introduction to Archaeological Digital Data Management
- AMS Radiocarbon Dating: Expectations and Essentials for Sample Selection and Calibration
- Proposal Writing in Cultural Resource Management
- An Introduction to the Section 106 Process
- The Conservation and Management of Rock Art: An Integrated Approach
- Introduction to Archaeological Digital Data Management
- Publishing Your First Article in *American Antiquity*
- Fundamentals of Budgeting for CRM Projects

Check saa.org for course updates and additions!