¡La inscripción solo está abierta hasta el 9 de diciembre!


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


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

¡Nos vemos en Panamá!
On the cover: Glenn A. Black and Ely Lilly (center image, l-r) organized and directed the WPA excavations at Angel Mounds near Evansville, Indiana from 1939 to 1942. The surrounding images are from the WPA work at Angel Mounds including from the top the 1941 Mound F excavation exposing the primary mound surface, opening a large area across a palisade ridge, exposing several bastions along the east village, and a close-up of the WPA crew atop Mound F in 1941. Thomas Boyd (front row, third from the right) is still living at 92 in Evansville and is the last surviving WPA crew member from Angel Mounds. Courtesy of the Glenn A. Black Laboratory of Archaeology and the Trustees of Indiana University.
This issue features the second part of a two-part forum on New Deal Archaeology sponsored by the History of Archaeology Interest Group and guest edited by Bernard K. Means. The first part of the forum (May 2011) featured articles that addressed the scope and broader impacts of New Deal programs on archaeology in the past, and how contemporary archaeologists can use the information gleaned from those programs in their work. This second part of the forum presents individual case studies of work done under the broad umbrella of New Deal programs and features individual archaeologists and specific sites as illustrations of the enduring legacy of this era in American Archaeology.

Having a two-part forum offers me the opportunity to remind readers that all issues of The SAA Archaeological Record are available online as well as its predecessor publication, The SAA Bulletin: (http://www.saa.org/AbouttheSociety/Publications/TheSAAArchaeologicalRecord/tabid/64/Default.aspx). It is policy that the online version and the print version you receive in the mail are identical in content and format, so you can use the print and electronic versions of an issue interchangeably. As many of you have let me know that you use content from The SAA Archaeological Record in public presentations and with your students, this is an excellent resource you can use to share information with various constituencies with an interest in archaeology. In this particular instance, you can go to the May 2011 issue to reacquaint yourself with Bernard Mean’s introduction to the forum before delving into these interesting case studies.

Forums are an important part of The SAA Archaeological Record’s content, and upcoming issues will feature forums on field schools, the rise of bioarchaeology, and cases studies in international collaboration. Most forums are brought to my attention by people interested in having a topic featured in the magazine, or through the organized sessions prepared for the annual meeting. If the topic has broad disciplinary appeal, I am happy to work with a guest editor(s) to bring the forum to the readership. I would be very interested in hearing your suggestions for future forums or article collections, and am particularly interested in developing a forum on private sector archaeology. If you have ideas for such a forum or are interested in participating, please contact me at jbaxter@depaul.edu. As always, I welcome inquiries about potential contributions, comments on previous content, and items for news and notes and the calendar features.
SAA Is Coming to Latin America!

As you are aware, January 13-15, 2012 mark the dates for SAA’s first-ever Conferencia Intercontinental, a unique conference designed to bring SAA and Latin Americans together. For the most part, all of the materials developed about the Conferencia have been in Spanish, as the sole language of the Conferencia is Spanish. All accepted papers and abstracts are now posted on SAA web, accessible through the Home Page (www.saa.org). Papers were selected through a comprehensive peer-review process by the Conferencia Program Committee. General registration is now open through December 9, 2011. Join us in Panama City, Panama for this premier event.

The meeting will be held at the convention center, ATLAPA, in Panama City, Panama. The meeting hotel is the Hilton Doubletree in Panama. SAA will be providing a free shuttle service from the DoubleTree to ATLAPA. You may make hotel reservations via the link on SAA web. SAA’s special rate includes breakfast and internet. ¡Nos vemos en Panamá!

SAA 2012 Ballot

The 2012 SAA ballot link will be sent to all members during 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 ballot material will be mailed. In addition to the 2012 slates, there will also be a proposed Bylaws amendment for your consideration.

To help ensure the efficiency of the web-based balloting system, please remember to update your email address in the Member’s section of SAA web (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!

Committee Service

As of last November, the Society began a new way to populate committees with volunteers. In order to open the process to the membership, each November the Society puts out a web-based call for volunteers for SAA committee service. This November the call will be put out for vacancies beginning at the close of the 2012 Annual Business Meeting in Memphis. Committee terms are generally two years. You may submit up to two separate interest forms each November. If you are seeking reappointment to a committee, you are also required to submit an interest form. You may only serve two consecutive terms on the same committee. The exception is awards committees, where no member is eligible for a second term.

The question on the interest form has been reformulated this year to: Please describe your experiences, skills, and/or interests that are relevant to the committee’s charge.

Please be aware that generally there are more volunteers than available slots. Your statement will be an important factor in the decision-making process. Decisions are made with the input from the chair by the Board liaison to that committee. With the open call, the Board instituted a selection process that involved the committee Board liaisons, rather than all committee appointments resting between the President and the chair. One goal of the selection process is to ensure the diversity of perspectives on each committee. We appreciate the willingness of everyone to serve. Please watch for the open call announcement in early November.

Home of the Blues, Birthplace of Rock ‘n’ Roll—MEMPHIS!

Have you registered and made your reservations yet? Memphis is driveable for over 50% of the population! The headquarters hotel for the 77th Annual Meeting in Memphis is the Marriott Memphis Downtown which is located directly across the street from the Memphis Cook Convention Center. The convention center, along with the headquarters hotel (Marriott Memphis

IN BRIEF

Tobi A. Brimsek

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

IN BRIEF, continued on page 4
To the Editor:

First of all, I wanted to say that I greatly enjoyed the most recent SAA Archaeological Record and the discussions of collaboration between archaeology and anthropology. I’m writing because I wanted to inform you of a session that was held during the 2010 AAA meetings in New Orleans that pertained to precisely this issue. This session was titled “Speaking The Same Language: Bridging The Ever-Growing Disciplinary Divide Between Cultural Anthropology And Archaeology,” organized by Ivy Hepp. In this session graduate students from Florida State University and the University of Colorado discussed many of the issues related to the ever-growing gap between archaeology and anthropology. Although the session was on the last day of the conference, many anthropologists attended it, and it was even featured in an article on the Chronicle for Higher Education’s website: http://chronicle.com/article/Anthropologists-Look-for/125464/. I think many anthropologists/archaeologists interested in this topic would find information presented in this session useful.

Jakob Sedig  
Ph. D. Candidate  
University of Colorado-Boulder

Earthquakes, Hurricanes, Floods....Frogs, Locusts?

Washington, D.C., SAA’s headquarters location, experienced a plethora of natural phenomena in recent months (ok, not frogs and locusts) starting with the hurricane, continuing with a 5.8 earthquake (which did not do damage to our new headquarters building but did shake lots of pictures on the walls) followed by floods. While we hope we can stop there, we are waiting with bated breath. Importantly all is well, everyone is safe, and the new offices are superb. As executive director, I would like to reiterate my open invitation to members to drop by and visit whenever they are in DC!

FORTHCOMING FROM THE SAA PRESS

Contemporary Perspectives In Southeastern Archaeology: From Colonization To Complexity

DAVID G. ANDERSON AND KENNETH E. SASSAMAN

A NEW TITLE IN THE SAA CONTEMPORARY PERSPECTIVES SERIES
Being the Program Chair for the SAA Annual Meeting is something like preparing for doctoral candidacy exams, though happily without the exams. Over the last two weeks I’ve been immersed in the breadth of our profession, and have learned about iguana consumption in Mexico, the material culture of low-rider social clubs, the several varieties of earliest stone tool assemblages in Brazil, and a set of intriguing approaches to dealing with the problems of societal classification that have been with us since Lewis Henry Morgan. A session likely to draw a large audience focuses on the direction(s) processual archaeology should take in the post-Binford era. And as has been common in recent years, there are multiple symposia honoring the careers of distinguished senior colleagues. Some of the more thoughtful and provocative papers each year are in festschrift symposia, where authors challenge old assumptions and revisit past debates with new data and new ideas. These sessions are also usually entertaining, and you’ll learn what really happened during that (in)famous field season at Santa Marta or Bogalusa or Hell-for-Certain Gulch.

The number of presentations in Memphis is going to be moderately large compared with recent years. There will be more papers (>2,200) and posters (>460), along with workshops, forums, and the Ethics Bowl, than you can possibly attend. I mean that literally; there is simply no way to arrange the schedule in a way that avoids putting sessions on similar subjects at the same time. For example, there are 28 symposia on Mesoamerican topics but effectively only eight time slots, so watch out for dashing Mayanists on their way from one room to another. The Southwest is also “overbooked,” and as one might expect with the meeting being in Memphis, Southeastern symposia are also going to be doubled up. I suspect every one of us will find we want to be in two or more places at once. We have 24 rooms for presentations. Fortunately, the smallest holds 68 people so I hope we won’t have any of those regrettable scenes where 50 people are trying to attend a session in a room built for 30.

Of course, the biggest session, and the only one which will have nothing scheduled opposite it, is the annual Business Meeting, starting at 5 on Friday afternoon. The Business Meeting is your chance to find out what the Board of Directors and Officers are doing with your organization (and your money). There is also a cash bar in the room, in case you feel the news requires lubrication. One very good reason to go to the Business Meeting is to attend the handing out of SAA awards. If you’ve never been there when the Lifetime Achievement Award is conferred, you’ve missed an opportunity to be present with the great figures in our profession.

Despite the delightful diversity of presentations on the program at Memphis, I do note a couple of surprising absences. Zooarchaeologists missed a great opportunity to address the archaeology of barbecue (hey, it’s Memphis!), and, alas, nobody sent in a submission on the archaeology of Elvis. But rather than ending this column with such dubiously tasteful comments, I’ll tell you my favorite paper title, “How Chocolate Came to Be.” This is going to get a large room, I promise.

Bridge at Sunset. Photo Credit: Jack Kenner.
April in Memphis is warm and the flowers are blooming, which provides the perfect opportunity to enjoy a walk along the Mississippi, a run on Mud Island, or a visit to one of its many outdoor and indoor attractions. We have organized several tours that highlight Memphis’ prehistory, urban history, and music history, and are also including recommendations for Memphis destinations that you might visit on your own.

A tour of the Chucalissa Archaeological Site and C.H. Nash Museum, just south of downtown Memphis, will highlight the Mississippian occupation that was widespread along the bluffs, as well as the research, educational, and participatory programs spearheaded by the University of Memphis. In addition to extensive collections from excavations of the Mississippian mound complex, the museum features exhibits, hands-on activities, and an arboretum and nature trail. This tour, led by museum director, Robert Connolly, will take place Friday morning. For those who can’t get enough archaeology, Pinson Mounds, Parkin Archeological State Park, the Hampson Archeological Museum, and Shiloh Mounds and National Military Park are within a two-hour drive of Memphis.

For your inner paleoethnobotanist, the dogwoods and azaleas will be in bloom, which you can enjoy both throughout the city or “in captivity” at the Memphis Botanic Garden in East Memphis or Overton Park in Midtown Memphis (though please refrain from charring the specimens for your type collections). Overton Park’s old-growth forest is an arboretum on the Register of Historic Places and shares the park with the Brooks Museum of Art. The Brooks features impressive permanent collections, rotating exhibitions, and one of the best brunches in Memphis. While you probably won’t see pandas, cheetahs, or monkeys throughout the city (barring a Zanesvillian catastrophe), you can enjoy them at the world-class Memphis Zoo (also in Overton Park), which features an eclectic assortment of archaeological iconography.

The Egyptian-themed Zoo entrance, along with the enormous glass Pyramid on the Mississippi River, are befitting tributes to Memphis’ claim to a privileged position on the “American Nile.” You can explore its history at the Mississippi River Museum by taking the monorail or footbridge from Front Street to the Mud Island River Park, which also features a half-mile scale model of the entire Mississippi River and boat rentals. In the historic Memphis Cotton Exchange, the Cotton Museum presents how these innocuous looking fluffballs have defined Memphis history, shaping both booming successes and glaring injustices in the Mississippi Delta region. The legacies of slavery and history of race relations can be best explored at the must-see National Civil Rights Museum, built around the historic Lorraine Motel (a short ride south on the vintage Main Street trolley line). If your first view of the preserved façade doesn’t make an indelible impression (approach it from the south if you can), the moving portraits of abolition and the civil rights movements certainly will.

In order to explore the multiple layers of Memphis history inscribed in the modern urban landscape, SAA will offer two historic walking tours by Memphis encyclopedia, Jimmy Ogle. A bottomless fount of local knowledge, Jimmy brings both visible and invisible Memphis alive through the traces of its history in the built environment. For the material-culture-minded, just ask him about any manhole cover.

And of course, no trip to Memphis would be complete without a visit to the veritable time capsule of extreme aesthetics that is Elvis’ bedazzled mothership. The SAA will offer a trip to Graceland on Saturday morning that includes roundtrip transportation and the “Platinum Tour,” which grants access not only to sequined jumpsuits and shag-carpeted ceilings, but the mansion, planes, and cars. While Graceland is a bit off the beaten track, there are almost endless opportunities to explore Memphis’ rich music history, from the neon splendor of Beale Street, to Sun Studios, to the Center for Southern Folklore.

And finally for sports fans, mid-April brings not only the last week of Memphis Grizzlies NBA basketball, but also the first week of minor league baseball at the beautiful Autozone Park (i.e. the nicest baseball park where you might still, upon occasion, see a ground ball go through the shortstop’s legs) — and of Memphis Roller Derby (i.e. the only place where you can see the PrissKilla Prezleys take on the Women of Mass Destruction). Oh yeah, and Memphis has more golf courses than Starbucks.
I started my career as an archaeologist at an exceptionally young age—literally in the backyard of my family home in Pittsburgh! Our house, built in 1899, had a mystique about it, and the southeast corner of our backyard, in particular, was a special area—it had a “Digging Hole.” No other yard contained such mysterious ground. The Digging Hole was a ready-made recreation spot for the eight of us children and for the neighborhood children as well. Only in this spot were we allowed the freedom to play in the dirt without remorse and without punishment from Mom for digging up her flower beds. The Digging Hole provided us hours of entertainment. While I knew little of the world of professional archaeology, I thoroughly enjoyed the feel of dirt on my hands and the excitement of discovery. My young imagination was further fueled when, to my delight, Jeff (one of five older brothers), hid pennies and miniature plastic green army men for me to uncover. “Staging” artifacts was common, but it was more than finding objects that kept all of us digging. My eldest brother Rich summed it up best when he remarked that “All the curiosity was based on the principle that there was information down in that hole and we could find out who had been here before us if we just dug deep enough.”

During summer vacations throughout my childhood, my parents took our family to sites and museums in Pennsylvania and surrounding states, like Fort Pitt, Carnegie Museum of Natural History, Indian Caverns, Horseshoe Curve, Fort Necessity, and Independence Hall. Exposure to real archaeological digs at Monticello and Williamsburg showed me that one could make a career out of digging.

When I was in sixth grade, I mentioned my interest in archaeology to my father. He produced a series of concise books on wide-ranging topics from the Science Service of Washington, D.C.: Classical Archaeology and Archaeology: Middle America. The glamour of far-off places captured my fancy, and I was sure Spanish lessons would serve me well in Spain, Peru, and Mexico! I remember reading Ivor Noel Hume’s Historical Archaeology, marveling at how much information could be obtained through careful recording and analysis. Picked up by my father on our trip to Williamsburg, this book is now in my stacks, and I very fondly remember him every time I see it. When Mr. Harvey asked us ninth graders to write a paper, “You and Your Future,” I had no hesitation about what I wanted to do. At the mature age of 14, I wrote that I was already highly qualified to become an archaeologist. I had an interest in excavation, had taken geometry, thought I spoke Spanish, and had experienced living conditions that mimicked the field experience (ten people all in one old house with only one full bath!).

Since my initial Digging Hole experience, I have had significant mentors during my career. Professor Paul Heberling, the only
The anthropologist at Juniata College in Huntingdon, PA, had enough enthusiasm for an entire department! He taught core courses in every field, offered special topics, and supervised tutorials. He ensured that I had a well-rounded exposure to anthropology, but also to related disciplines (sociology, psychology, history, geology, and biology) that would allow me the flexibility to specialize later on. Prof. Heberling also provided the opportunity to work at the historic site of Greenwood Furnace in central Pennsylvania.

Penn State archaeologists William T. Sanders and David Webster were in the midst of conducting Proyecto Arqueológico Copán–Phase II in the early 1980s when I started graduate school. Jumping at the chance to gain field experience in Honduras, I assisted fellow graduate student AnnCorinne Freter-Abrams and later, David Webster. I became captivated by the study of Classic Maya commoners. Ann was exceptionally patient and kind, explaining regional prehistory and methods. She also got me through my first episode of culture shock. None of the locals understood my Spanish, and I couldn’t understand theirs, despite several years of classes. Ann showed me the proper way to order a Coke. To mark my birthday, she surprised me with a cake that closely resembled Structure 10L-4 in Copán’s Main Group!

I served as David Webster’s graduate student teaching assistant, and I successfully completed my advanced degrees under his guidance. His engaging manner of lecturing provided me valuable lessons in teaching style. I learned that solid knowledge of a subject was the foundation upon which I could tell a great story, and I came to appreciate that getting students interested in my subject was half the battle to learning.

I was a Summer Fellow at Dumbarton Oaks (DO), and Elizabeth Boone, then DO Director, and fellow Fellows, Stephen Houston, Patricia McAnany, Karl Taube, and David Webster, provided lively exchanges that dramatically increased my appreciation of ancient Mesoamerica. The luxury of having the DO collection at my fingertips was priceless. The intellectual stimulation there was exhilarating.

These diverse experiences, plus my willingness and ability to teach a wide range of courses and to be flexible in scheduling, all added up to marketability. I did not know I would go on to teach courses in my specialization as well as across all four fields in anthropology. My first academic appointment came at Kennesaw State University in Georgia. My husband Vishy, a rocket scientist by training, and I moved to Atlanta for his new job with Lockheed. My long-time friend and cultural anthropologist, Alice James of Shippensburg University, assisted me with my new part-time teaching duties and showed me how much fun one can have at the same time!

A few years later, Vishy and I left the Southeast for the Northwest because he took a job with Boeing. I returned to Georgia briefly as a visiting scholar at the University of Georgia. Upon moving permanently to the Northwest, Mr. Osmundson, Anthropology Department chair at Bellevue Community College, hired me to teach nighttime classes. Over the years, I moved from part-time evening teaching to a tenure-track position and department chair. I now enjoy a successful career at Bellevue Community College, which recently changed its name to Bellevue College.

Academic preparation in anthropology does not include explicit instruction in administrative duties, marketing skills, or for that
matter, the most current teaching technologies. In 2009, due to last-minute schedule changes, I found myself having to teach an on-line course for the first time, with only one day’s instruction on how to manage the on-line environment! Since then, I have progressed from a state of total fear (!) and apprehension to appreciating this mode of teaching, and embracing on-line course design and development. Although on-line courses do not reproduce the on-campus experience, they have their rewards and work well for certain types of students. The on-line instructor can still “e” in the classroom to deliver lectures, hold discussions, show films, and “chat” with students. From my instructor’s perspective, teaching on-line allowed me to teach AND safely recover from a fall I experienced during fieldwork!

My primary job as a community college instructor is to provide high-quality accessible education to a diverse group of students, most of whom are not sure what anthropology is and some may require special accommodation. Given the open enrollment policy of the community college, where anyone can become a student, people with a wide range of abilities and interests attend classes. It takes a skilled individual to accommodate all learning styles and simultaneously ensure that solid content is imparted with high standards of evaluation. Most often, the only anthropology to which a student will be exposed is the one class they take to fulfill a graduation requirement. I derive great satisfaction in passing down the basic tenets of our discipline to another generation who can usefully apply them to their own life situations.

It’s time consuming to teach, but even more time consuming to ensure that students learn. Thus, long hours inside and outside the classroom are the norm for a community college instructor. I spend a large portion of every day preparing for class to ensure that materials are relevant and updated, and reach the intended audience. The standard load per quarter for full-time faculty is three 5-credit classes of 42 students each. Within the past 11 months of writing this essay, I have taught 14 courses, including several sections of the four-field survey course; two in archaeology, one in biological anthropology, a new one in nutritional anthropology; and a course in linguistics that I had never taught. Without a solid foundation in all fields of anthropology, my job would be extremely difficult. Other daily activities include lecturing, composing exams and activities, and grading. Office hours are spent assisting students with course content and dispensing career advice or meeting with the other anthropologists in my department. And for comparative perspectives, there are faculty in psychology, sociology, criminal justice, and geography in my immediate office area upon whom I can readily call. The call of college governance is ever present.

Maintaining currency in my specialization is essential, so I dedicate time to reading journals, recent books, and websites, researching areas of interest, and doing fieldwork when feasible. I continue to make contributions through select publication projects, conference presentations, reviewing others’ manuscripts for publication, and providing feedback on NSF proposals. The intellectual stimulation and the satisfaction from scientific inquiry are rewards in themselves. In between all of these activities, my husband and I walk a few miles nearly every day and hit the gym as well. It clears our heads, provides time together, and benefits our overall well-being.

I’m really proud of the college for what it can offer in anthropology education. I spent four years as department chair and helped to reshape the department in numerous ways. Anthropology classes had suffered from low enrollment for a few years. As chair, it was my responsibility to increase the numbers and remove our classes from the proverbial administrative hit list. Along with willing and enthusiastic department members, we re-vamped existing courses and updated the curriculum. We marketed our classes by rewriting catalogue descriptions and creating lively course titles. A course called Food, Drink, & Culture (rather than Nutritional Anthropology) draws a roomful of students with a waiting list!

Fieldwork is the hallmark of our discipline and one of its most exciting and challenging aspects. So we also provided students experiential learning activities to actually DO anthropology instead of talking about doing it. Our high-quality, practical, and fun fieldwork exercises aptly demonstrate to students how anthropologists conduct their science. In one fieldwork exercise, for example, students measured offices across campus and computed roofed-over space and square feet/individual. They learned to make quantitative and qualitative assessments and...
Volunteer Profile

Lee Rains Clauss

This column is a new feature of The SAA Archaeological Record. In each issue, we’ll be featuring a member of one of the SAA’s many committees and interest groups. If there is someone you’d like to see profiled in this column, please contact Jane Baxter.

When I received the invitation from the The SAA Archaeological Record to write a piece regarding my volunteerism within the SAA, I was pleased to be given an opportunity to highlight the important work of the Government Affairs Committee. My comfort with the request, due to the relative anonymity I thought it would afford, disappeared when Jane Baxter clarified that the focus of the volunteer profile was not to be the committee, but me. It was at that moment I envisioned a message being sent to SAA Headquarters with the clipped, ominous phrases: Associations unclear... intentions unconventional... ranks infiltrated.

Why the dramatic internal response? In short, it is because I am not an archaeologist—at least not wholly, and most definitely not in the traditional sense. When I joined the SAA in 2000, I was an applied archaeology graduate student with an undergraduate degree in historic preservation. At the time, my work experience ran the gamut from archives, architectural history, and academia to regulatory archaeology, NAGPRA compliance, and curation. Fast forward to today... I am just as adept at recording a pithouse as a Prairie-Style home; just as comfortable crafting archival scope and content descriptions as NEPA need and purpose statements; and just as passionate about regulatory compliance and policy analysis as community-based participatory research and restorative justice. My education and experiences have led others to describe me as an applied anthropologist, historic preservation specialist, educator, and activist. However, I am fairly certain that who I am professionally defies clear definition—a situation that I recently discovered to be true for a growing number of SAA members.

At the 76th Annual Meeting in Sacramento, several forums focused on applied archaeology and its various domains of application. I was delighted to see my chosen approach within archaeology receiving some overdue attention, but disturbed that the general tenor of the discussions was one of distress and disillusionment. I knew the problems all too well: Internship papers were not held in as high esteem as theses; RPA membership seemed improbable; tenure was problematic. In short, people who had dedicated themselves to a career in applied/action/activist archaeology felt devalued and ostracized by peers, the academy, and some professional organizations. At the time, I did not have the opportunity to express empathy or provide hope for those expressing frustration and fear, but this vignette offers me such an opening. So, to the tempest-tossed, tired archaeologists that view their associations with the discipline as tenuous, I encourage you to find guidance in the paraphrased words of Tennyson: Lose yourself in action, lest you wither in despair.

This month you have an opportunity to engage in the work of the SAA by nominating yourself for committee service. You may find yourself currently struggling with the bastions of American archaeology, and thus think this counterintuitive, but I assure you the SAA has room for both its most strident champions as well as those who see themselves as change-agents. After all, the SAA has always embraced my person, even when our politics were incongruent. On more than one occasion in the last eleven years, I have voted with my feet (and my pocketbook) and left the fold for a time, but the SAA has always welcomed me back. And, upon my return, I was not treated as a nameless drone or a member of a fringe element, but as a peer with ideas worthy of inclusion in the annual program, and most recently, as a colleague honored with the invitation to serve on the Government Affairs Committee. I am only in my first year of service and already I find it to be immensely enlightening, compelling, and rewarding. I do not think this experience unique to me, so I unreservedly encourage all fellow SAA members with a passion for purpose and a desire to shape the direction of the discipline to act upon the invitation.
PowerPoint slideshows have become an increasingly commonplace feature of professional conferences since the SAA established the Student Paper Award in 2000. As PowerPoints are now ubiquitous, it is important to emphasize the necessity of producing excellent presentations. In recognition of this fact, submissions for the Student Paper Award are evaluated on many different criteria including the visual component of the submission. The committee assesses papers on the basis of the: (1) quality of the arguments presented; (2) quality of supporting data; (3) contribution to broader methodological or theoretical issues in archaeology; (4) contribution to understanding a specific region or topic; (5) quality of writing, organization, and length; and (6) quality, appropriateness, and number of visuals for a 15-minute oral presentation. As the visual component of the submission is evaluated and pdf files of all PowerPoint slides to be used in the oral presentation are a required part of the award submission process, the SAA Student Paper Award Committee seeks to offer a few helpful suggestions for creating excellent visuals. While the content of this article was prepared for student presenters, we hope this guide will be useful to nonstudents who are interested in becoming better acquainted with what is now the standard for visual presentations at the SAA and many other conferences. PowerPoint is an incredibly effective tool for communicating complex ideas to an audience while infusing presentations with greater visual interest. Despite this, distracting PowerPoints can be counterproductive and weaken conference presentations. To help presenters put the “power” back in PowerPoint and produce high-quality competitive submissions for the Student Paper Award, we provide suggestions for text slides, photographic images, and graphics in the form of charts, tables, and figures.

Avoiding Text Slide Pitfalls

Keep the text to a minimum. This is the first rule to adhere to judiciously when making text slides. The use of complete sentences is rarely advisable and in the world of text slides, less is more. Using small amounts of text in the form of bullet points or short phrases is more appropriate, and most PowerPoint aficionados advise against the use of more than six words per line and six lines per slide. Your text slides will not be evaluated as excellent if they are so densely packed that they are rendered unreadable to the audience. Text slides are a poor medium for communicating high levels of detail and text-heavy slides only serve to obscure key points (Figures 1a and 1b).

Font size is another extremely important consideration in the creation of text slides. The body of text slides should feature fonts no smaller than 24-point. Slide titles should use even larger font sizes, while smaller font sizes are acceptable for references or captions. Selecting an appropriate font style is equally

Main Project Goals and Questions

- In this site is documentation of institutionalized social inequality as originally suggested by previous researchers? What factors did they take into account? And how are they relevant to this particular context?
- What are the underlying factors and processes for the emergence of institutionalized social hierarchies and how can we see them archaeologically?
- Why did social inequality emerge at this point in time and not earlier or later? How did we identify the most relevant contexts to sample for radiocarbon dating and make them comparable to others in the region?
- What is the nature of the archaeological record? How have contemporary issues, such as economic development, land use practices, and local communities, contributed to past and present research at the site?

Figure 1a: Example of a text slide containing too much information. Remember the six words per line, six lines per slide rule.

Project Goals

- Institutionalized social inequality?
- Underlying factors and processes
- Chronology and context

Figure 1b: Example of an effective text slide containing an appropriate amount of information. This slide follows the six words per line, six lines per slide rule.
significant. Clear and commonplace fonts are typically preferable to quirky or fanciful ones as unusual fonts can deflect attention away from your central message. Once you have selected the appropriate font size and style it is important to utilize the same format throughout your talk.

Effective slides should also feature good contrast between text and background. Certain color combinations will make your slides difficult to read and bright fluorescent hues should be avoided. While some backgrounds may be well suited to non-academic presentations, many templates are often too busy for most audience members at scholarly conferences. Evaluate your options carefully (Figures 2a and 2b).

Another important tip for the preparation of excellent presentations is not to go overboard with the number of slides presented. Most talks should closely adhere to the one slide per minute rule. Thus, a 15-minute presentation should not include significantly more than 15 slides. Moreover, transitions from slide to slide should utilize animations sparingly. While some animation might be occasionally warranted, it is typically prudent to avoid over-animating your PowerPoint presentation as sensory overload will overwhelm and distract your colleagues. And finally, remember to include citations and references on slides where such features are warranted.

The Production of Impressive Images

Incorporating images such as photos into slideshows can enhance presentations and have the potential to effectively communicate difficult concepts. While the adage “a picture is worth a thousand words” can sometimes be true, only high quality, carefully selected, and appropriately sized images will result in the desired outcome. If you find yourself wanting to apologize...
for any aspect of your photo, jettison it from your presentation with no second thoughts.

Utilizing digital photos or maps that are heavily pixilated is counterproductive. The incorporation of blurry images not only gives the appearance of being unprofessional, their poor-quality diminishes effective communication. The inclusion of fuzzy images is never justified. It is also important to crop the edges of any photo that includes extraneous detail that might shift focus away from the central image and message. Photoshop should be used to correct any image that is too light, too dark, or off-centered. Once high-quality images are identified, they should be labeled and thoughtfully placed on the slide (Figures 3a and 3b).

The Art of Graphics

Archaeological presentations routinely include graphs and charts to display various forms of data. While graphics can be excellent additions to any PowerPoint presentation, they also can easily confound your audience if you present too much information. When presenting a table, for example, font size should follow the rules above, and you will still want to maintain the six words to a line and six lines to a table whenever possible. Exceeding this guideline will likely force you to reduce font size, resulting in an indecipherable graphic. Large tables should thus be avoided. Labels are essential and it is typically best to keep your labels horizontal. Similarly, pie charts that consist of too many slices will dilute your main point. Pie charts that consist of approximately a half-dozen slices will communicate your findings most effectively (Figures 4a and 4b).

Submission Process

While the Student Paper Award committee evaluates submissions from numerous standpoints, we hope that this short article will help students and others prepare outstanding visuals, while making more transparent how the visual components of all award submissions are evaluated. Students are invited to consult the SAA website (www.saa.org/AbouttheSociety/Awards/StudentPaperAward/tabid/185/Default.aspx) to learn more about eligibility criteria, required submission materials, and deadline information. The submission deadline for this year is January 12, 2012, and students are encouraged to contact Mary Ann Levine (maryann.levine@fandm.edu), Committee Chair, should they have any questions.
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CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION IN ARCHAEOLOGY

A NEW PROGRAM

Ian Burrow

Ian Burrow is President of the Register of Professional Archaeologists for 2010-2012.

The Eighth of the SAA’s Principles of Archaeological Ethics reads as follows: “Given the destructive nature of most archaeological investigations, archaeologists must ensure that they have adequate training, experience, facilities, and other support necessary to conduct any program of research they initiate, in a manner consistent with the foregoing principles and contemporary standards of professional practice.”

Once we are out of graduate school and (we hope) busily engaged in our jobs in CRM, government, teaching, or elsewhere, finding opportunities for training and for keeping up to date with discoveries and theoretical and technological advances can become a little more challenging. There has been much talk in recent years about the need for creating a framework for continuing education in archaeology. Who can provide it? How can it be accredited? How can it be documented on your curriculum vitae?

For the last few years the Register of Professional Archaeologists has been actively working on this issue. After much hard work and dedication by our CPE Committee, the Register is now pleased to announce the official launch of the RPA Continuing Professional Education (CPE) Program. Designed particularly for Registrants, it is nevertheless open to all.

Like the SAA Principles, the RPA’s Code of Conduct directly addresses the issue of qualifications and competence. Item 2.1 of the Code states that it is an archaeologist’s responsibility to “stay informed and knowledgeable about developments in her/his field or fields of specialization,” and 1.2 stipulates that an archaeologist shall not “undertake any research that affects the archaeological resource base for which she/he is not qualified.” As those members of the Society who are on the Register will know, breaches of the Code render a Registrant open to the RPA’s Grievance Procedure. This program is entirely voluntary for RPAs.

The new RPA program therefore supports and strengthens RPA’s mission to “establish and maintain the highest standards of professional archaeological practice,” and will, we hope, also be welcomed by the wider archaeological community. The 7,000-member SAA, as one of the four sponsoring organizations of RPA (along with the Archaeological Institute of America, the American Anthropological Association, and the Society for Historical Archaeology), is a key part of that community. Our intention is that the RPA imprimatur will help people to identify CPE offerings that are focused, relevant, and taught by qualified individuals.

How the RPA CPE Program Works:
The core idea is that educational programs designed for the continuing professional development of archaeologists can now be certified by the Register, provided that they meet RPA’s clearly defined written standards and criteria.

Applications for Certification will be reviewed by the RPA Continuing Education Committee. The Committee will determine whether or not the proposed program meets RPA’s criteria. The program must have or demonstrate:

1. Educational Focus: All CPE programs must focus on learning. CPE programs may include workshops, trainings, classes and other suitable formats. The length, depth, venue, and manner of instruction must be appropriate for the subject matter and stated learning objectives.

2. Expert Instructors: All instructors must be subject matter experts. An expert is defined by the Register as a professional who has mastery of the method and theory of the subject matter as demonstrated in practice, teaching, research, or publication. Instructors also must demonstrate proficiency in the specific principles of the activity being taught. In team-taught programs, instructors must be subject-matter experts in the field(s) for which they are responsible. Archaeologists in teaching roles in the programs must be on the Register of Professional Archaeologists.

3. Lack of Commercialism: CPE instructional materials must be
for educational purposes. Program materials promoting goods or services are unacceptable.

4. **Non Discrimination:** CPE programs must be open to all RPAs eligible to participate. Certain CPE programs may require prospective participants to demonstrate knowledge or proficiencies prior to enrollment.

5. **CPE Credit:** CPE programs may range from short courses completed in hours, to intensive field, class, or laboratory training that take days or weeks to finish. The Register recognizes the value of documenting both successful CPE completion and the program scope and intensity. One hour of CPE credit will be given for each hour of program training, up to a maximum of eight hours per day and 40 hours per week. Successful completion of the program will be recognized with a certificate of completion.

6. **Evaluation:** All CPE programs must submit to the Register copies of original attendance logs and participant evaluations of CPE content and delivery. The submission to the Register must specify the RPA or RPAs who successfully completed the program and must be received by the Register within 20 days of CPE program completion. The Register may, upon review of the submission and other materials, ask for modifications to the program or withdraw Register certification for the CPE program.

If the program meets the above criteria, the CPE provider will be able to advertise the offering as an RPA-Certified CPE program, and is permitted use of the RPA logo.

Certified CPE programs will be listed on the Register’s website (www.rpanet.org). Prerequisites and the number of CPE credit hours offered will also be identified. Instructors will be free to advertise elsewhere and to invite non-RPAs to participate.

RPA’s who take these programs will receive a certificate of successful CPE completion. One hour of CPE credit will be given for each hour of program training, up to 40 hours per week.

**Next Steps**

I encourage anyone who is offering a workshop, seminar, or other educational program that appears to meet these criteria to consider applying for certification. As an incentive, RPA is waiving application fees for the first year. We have launched this program in the belief that it addresses a need in the archaeological community, and I will be interested to see how it develops in the coming months.

The development and launch of this program would not have been possible without the vision and dedication of our CPE Committee, and particularly the work of Jeff Altschul, Jo Reese, and current chair John Welch.

You will find full details at the “Continuing Education Certification Program” tab on the RPA website (www.rpanet.org).

If you have additional questions contact the RPA Continuing Professional Education Committee Chair, John Welch, at welch@fsu.ca.

---
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A few months ago I gave a talk at an environmental educators’ conference with a presentation with the same title at this note. My presentation followed that of two geography colleagues; the first works with high-tech virtual models and the second studies the social landscape of the soccer World Cup. My first colleague started his talk with the question, “Who here is a gamer?” to which about 1/5 of the audience raised their hands. My second colleague, fully expecting to one-up his friend asked, “Who is a soccer fan?” (remember, this is Canada) and about 1/3 of the audience raised their hands. Then it was my turn. “Who here loves archaeology,” I asked. I was pleased but really not surprised that almost every hand in the audience went up—and they went up quickly.

Now, to be fair, when I relayed this story to my friend Michele Washington, she said that I’d have gotten a different response rate if I had posed the same set of questions to her Tl’amin First Nation community. She said this to me wearing her bright yellow Brazil soccer jersey. Still, I maintain that what I say is true: Everyone, well mostly everyone, loves archaeology. How many of you have heard, “I always wanted to be an archaeologist....” I believe that is our responsibility as archaeologists to use this love and fascination with our profession to educate broadly about a range of heritage-related issues.

My experiences in British Columbia tell me that archaeologists can use the widespread intrigue associated with their discipline to not only educate about heritage, but also to help build bridges between communities. Field schools, for instance, provide an excellent context for people to come together around a shared enthusiasm for seeing history and playing detective. Many times, people who are normally adversarial in their relations can discover common ground this way. Often, landowners who are initially guarded and mistrustful about what the presence of sites on their land might mean, become keen partners in heritage conservation via engaging in the process of actually doing archaeology. End-of-year school fieldtrips provide a ready forum for connecting kids to the past. And, events involving food and artifacts are always sure to draw in both people from diverse communities, including the media.

I am fully aware that the fascination with archaeology is often embedded in a more complex love-hate relationship. Here in British Columbia, as elsewhere, the love of archaeology is coupled with a range of less-positive emotions: fear that personal land will be confiscated in a land-claims process, racist ideas about First Nations, belief that artifacts should be sold for personal profit, and fear that the discovery of an archaeological site will reduce property values, slow down development, or add significant costs to any project. I’ve heard it all many times, but in my experience, with careful maneuvering, ultimately the love of archaeology helps lure people in to an open discussion about heritage values.

Building Bridges

A potentially powerful bridge formed through archaeology is that between First Nations and non-Native communities. Here in British Columbia, the link between these two communities is obvious since most of the archaeological sites can be tied to First Nations ancestry, but are now on private, non-First Nations land. I have witnessed time and time again people of both communities sharing ideas and excitement about artifacts and an excavation unit. Discussions of land claims are put aside to hold a projectile point and marvel at the fact that someone held this same point several millennia before. The artifact in these instances becomes more than just a stone tool; it is the medium by which intercommunity communication begins (Figure 1).

Similarly, archaeology can be used to make bridges between the general public and the scientific community. It’s fair to say that, at least in North America, most of the general public does not connect with the minutiae of scientific research. However, many people are easily engaged in scientific questions when they revolve around the discovery of the past. Again, the ability to touch past lives is a potentially powerful medium for public engagement.

Archaeology can also create bridges between the scientific community and that of resource managers more broadly. Here, the greatest inroads are between the links made between zooar-
archaeologists and paleoethnobotanists on the one hand and modern natural resource managers on the other. Increasingly, archaeologists are considering what relevance their data have in modern management contexts (e.g., Frazier 2007; Lyman and Cannon 2004). Many are beginning to work with managers to design archaeological research that is both temporally and spatially relevant to answering questions about managing resources and ecosystems today (Figure 2).

A personal favorite is the potential for archaeology to bridge communication between elders and youth and in fact, youth and anyone. I have seen it happen over and over again. The generation of “plugged in” youth need to see, touch, and feel something to connect to it. Holding artifacts, digging in the dirt with a trowel and seeing the stratigraphy unfold, or discovering artifacts in the screen, all provide a tangible connection between the past and present. A landscape that was previously thought of as a homogenized, western European creation, transforms to a landscape with history—where other children long ago also played in the dirt, fought with their siblings, and ignored their parents. In this context, the past has importance and therefore so do some of us older folks who are connected to it (Figure 3).

And finally, archaeology has the potential to make linkages across political spectra. I have worked with people who are situated at the right and left extremes of this continuum and have witnessed, again, the power of archaeology to make links between people who otherwise would have little in common. Of course, people on the right often tend to start with a stance that archaeology prevents much-needed development, and people on the left often argue for heritage protection (at least when the site isn’t in their own yard). However, gentle and subtle introductions to an archeological record that reveals hidden secrets has the potential to break down these entrenched views and open up discussions about the value of heritage to societies broadly.

The Under-Tapped Potential of Archaeology

While I appreciate the theoretical discussions in our discipline about engaging diverse communities and the lead of the SAA’s in making concrete efforts to reach out (e.g., Malloy and Jefferson 2009), I am most excited by the many small steps taken to make links between communities. Archaeology is a powerful way to start discussions that ultimately lead to broader shifts in perspective about the importance of cultural and biological diversity, history, local ecological knowledge, and so many other things.

Without question, it is our responsibility to use our privilege as archaeologists to educate widely about heritage. The age-old fascination with discovery, past lives lived, and well-crafted, beautiful objects all play into our favor. Taking advantage of these facts requires that we spend significant amounts of time doing on-the-ground education. It also requires that we embrace the idea...
that a public that is well educated about archaeology will be our strongest allies not only in protecting archaeological sites, but also in promoting the notion that heritage preservation is fundamental to the well being of people and this planet.

To this end, I offer a list of 12 mini-projects that my colleagues and I in British Columbia have found to be powerful ways of engaging the public. These projects are designed not only to increase the public’s connection to archaeology and heritage preservation, but also to encourage communication between sometimes disparate communities.

1. Hold a community potluck associated with excavations and field schools. Sharing food is a fundamental component of making intercommunity links.

2. Hold artifact nights where the public can bring in artifacts for identification. Let people hold an artifact and imagine it in the hands of someone in the distant past. Then . . . you can talk to them about the importance of context/undisturbed sites and of controlled excavations.

3. Make an artifact kit and have it with you at all public venues, and again, let people touch the artifacts.

4. Create an educational and engaging pamphlet to pass out at public events. Kids will invariably bring these home to their parents.

5. Make “Everyone loves archaeology” buttons or stickers that people can take away. These are guaranteed to keep the conversation going after people leave you.

6. Have your students make compelling educational posters to display at diverse public venues.

7. Make dioramas or large, laminated drawings or 3-D maps that help people visualize how the very spot in which they are standing was once alive with other peoples’ lives. And, remember, not everyone loves stratigraphy as much as we do.

8. Talk to schoolchildren about heritage in as many venues as you can.

9. Write short, accessible articles about archaeology and heritage in local newspapers and newsletters. Do this often.

10. Create engaging web sites that give a taste of the excitement of archaeology (e.g., http://www.sliammonfirstnation.com/archaeology/) and how it is linked to broader heritage issues.

11. Cultivate relationships with journalists and other media and work with them to write articles that are both interesting and highlight the importance of respecting heritage values.

12. Even when you’re working in remote field situations, try and have a portion of your project that is visible and accessible to locals. If appropriate, have signs, media, etc. that encourage “drop in” visitors. You won’t get as much research done, of course, so it may be best to do this in a focused and limited time frame. Students are fabulous tour leaders and giving them this role adds another dimension to knowledge-sharing. And, always let visitors touch the dirt—either in the screen or using a trowel. The physical connection to the past is powerful.
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Announcing a Summer Institute for College and University Faculty:
Mesoamerica and the Southwest: A New History for an Ancient Land
On-Site in Mexico, Arizona and New Mexico June 17 – July 23, 2012

Funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) and sponsored by The Community College Humanities Association (CCHA), this five-week Institute, held on-site in locations in Mexico and the U.S. Southwest, will enable twenty-four faculty participants to explore the rapidly accumulating new collaborative scholarship by investigators in both Mesoamerican studies and Southwestern studies. Institute seminars, discussions and on-site field study with renowned visiting specialist scholars in Mexico and in the Southwest together provide a compelling format for the selected Institute Summer Fellows directly to engage with the “new history for an ancient land.” Site visits enable Fellows to evaluate for themselves at first hand the similarities and differences between such Mesoamerican sites as Teotihuacan and the Aztec Templo Mayor of Tenochtitlan, and Southwestern sites such as Chaco Canyon, Mesa Verde and Aztec Ruins -- in terms of commonalities and differences in architecture, site design, iconography, and hypothesized worldviews and religious and ceremonial systems.

Stipend: Participants receive all lodging, internal travel and site-visit costs for all scheduled activities during the Institute as specified in the detailed Daily Schedule, along with a few pre-arranged meals. Participants are responsible for all other meal expenses; for personal expenses; and for their own individual travel arrangements to arrive in Mexico City by Sunday, June 17, 2012 and for return from Santa Fe anytime after July 23, 2012.

For Application and Information Packet download Institute Application Packet directly from our website at www.ccha-assoc.org/MesoSW12/index.html

Institute Faculty
John Pohl (Curator of the Arts of the Americas, the UCLA Fowler Museum); Karl Taube (Anthropology, University of California at Riverside); Eloise Quiñones Keber (Art, Baruch College and the Graduate Center of CUNY); Alan Sandstrom (Anthropology emeritus, Indiana-Purdue University); Kelley Hays-Gilpin (Archaeology, Northern Arizona University and Research Associate, Museum of Northern Arizona) with Ramson Lomatewama; Stephen Lekson (Curator of Anthropology, Museum of Natural History, University of Colorado); F. Kent Reilly (University of Southwest Texas); Ramón Gutiérrez (U.S. History, University of Chicago); Fran Levine (director of the New Mexico History Museum, Santa Fe); Donna Glowacki (Anthropology, University of Notre Dame)

For additional information you may also contact one of the Project Co-Directors:
Dr. George Schepfer (Humanities, Community College of Baltimore County and Faculty Associate, Advanced Academic Programs, The Johns Hopkins University) (shepbklyn@aol.com)
Dr. Laraine Fletcher (Chair, Anthropology, Adelphi University) (fletcher@adelphi.edu or larainefletcher@aol.com)

Or contact the Project Manager: Prof. David Berry, Executive Director of CCHA, the Community College Humanities Association) (tel. 973-877-3204; berry@essex.edu).

Application Deadline: March 1, 2012
NEW DEAL AND RIVER BASIN SURVEY
ARCHAEOLOGY AT FORT LARAMIE
NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

Danny N. Walker

Danny N. Walker is an archaeologist with the Wyoming State Archaeologists Office.

New Deal archaeology happened across Wyoming between 1938 and 1941 with a formal Works Progress Administration (WPA) program titled the “Wyoming Archaeological Survey” authorized in November 1938 (Sowers 1941). The Wyoming Archaeological Survey was an extensive WPA project covering all portions of the state with field offices at Laramie, Casper, Sundance, and Lander. Most work was completed at known archaeological or historical sites, but several areas were surveyed for new site locations. Investigations occurred at 38 sites, including such well-known ones as Dinwoody Cave, Spanish Diggings, Castle Gardens, Medicine Hat Cave, and Fort Caspar (Sowers 1941). Minimally, preliminary results were presented for most of these projects in the form of monthly reports, but for many sites without reports we have been unable to determine what work was done or exact site locations. As with many other WPA projects, the survey closed with the advent of World War II, but provided a basis for future archaeological research.

Other New Deal archaeology was conducted in Wyoming, including at Fort Laramie. Fort Laramie was first established in 1834 as a fur trader post (Barbour 2000), purchased by the United States Army in 1849 and decommissioned in 1890 with the property sold to several civilian ranchers (McChristian 2008). For the next 47 years, until July 5, 1937, the property remained in civilian hands (Matters 1980; McChristian 1998). In March 1937, final paperwork was signed for the State of Wyoming to buy the main portion of the fort property from the private owners. The fort was “given” to the United States government on May 3, 1938 and declared to be Fort Laramie National Monument by President Franklin D. Roosevelt on July 16, 1938. The property was expanded in 1960 to include additional lands east of the original area to the North Platte River. The property was designated Fort Laramie National Historic Site in 1961 following this expansion.

Architectural and archeological studies of the fort structures began while the fort was still state property (Matters 1980:128–129) with a Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) project “Topographic and Building Survey of Fort Laramie” between November 29 and December 23, 1937 (Figure 1). This project was to map the boundaries of the National Monument and all standing structures and features within its boundary. Part of the mapping project was also to “clean up” the monument area of all “trash” from the 48 years of homesteader occupation following the military abandonment in 1890. G. Hubert Smith, an National Park Service (NPS) archaeologist, was detailed to Fort Laramie to supervise this 1937 project “to . . . coordinate clean-up work to ensure against the accidental destruction of bona fide historic features (Matters 1980:134). Twenty CCC enrollees were transported daily from the Lake Guernsey Camp for the project.

Among results of the fortuitous CCC project were vastly improved appearance of the grounds, the first reliable site map to record accurately all identifiable historic features, and preliminary archeology which delineated hidden building sites and laid the groundwork for the area’s unique collection of military period artifacts . . . A by-product of the archeological survey was confirmation of the fact that the Monument area excluded over one-half of the 1890 Fort grounds, primarily the Quartermaster and stabling area [Matters 1980:134].

This latter discovery was critical justification for the 1960 expansion of the monument grounds. Even today, activity areas associated with the military occupation at Fort Laramie remain in private hands, protected from destruction for the most part by concerned neighbors. Based on available records, this and later Fort Laramie CCC projects were not associated with the Wyoming Archaeological Survey, but were specifically funded for Fort Laramie after the site was presented to the NPS in 1938.
Concern about the undocumented archaeology at Fort Laramie noted by Smith in 1937 was paramount from its first occupation by the NPS. A series of meetings were held in 1938 and 1939, resulting with the Park Service developing and beginning a formal plan for restoration. The primary objective was to save all the extant buildings by the best preservation techniques possible. That objective continues today with continuing restoration and stabilization plans. More important, those early restoration projects would only be undertaken cautiously and after thorough historical, architectural and archaeological research (Mattes 1980:138). This tradition has continued over the years with the CCC, River Basin Survey (RBS), NPS, and University of Wyoming conducting a series of studies related to restoration projects and occasionally pure research (Walker and De Vore 2008).

With that goal of intensive research in mind, formal archaeological studies began between June and August 1939, at Fort Laramie National Monument by a WPA workforce of 15 enrollees from Camp BR–83, Veteran, Wyoming (a side camp of Lake Guernsey), under the direction of G. Hubert Smith. The three buildings examined were the powder magazine/arsenal (Figure 2), adjacent officers’ quarters, and the infantry barracks on the north end of the Parade Ground (Figure 3). No detailed analyses of the recovered cultural mate-

Following Smith’s 1939 work with the CCC, archaeology was conducted by RBS crews hired specifically on NPS or other federal program funds for various projects. Excavation was undertaken in the fall of 1940 on Officers’ Quarters D and the Butler’s Store (Hendron 1941). This document is one of few early reports that discusses details about artifacts recovered in the excavations and set the tone for all future archaeology reports at Fort Laramie: provide as much detail as possible with the available funding. Archaeology and restorations at Fort Laramie ceased during World War II and did not resume until 1949 when the RBS resumed archaeological work at the fort in response to building restoration compliance and research needs (Mattes 1980).

The 1950s and 1960s saw a major restoration period at the fort where all standing structures had at least stabilization projects, and often major restoration as well (Mattes 1980). These projects were either conducted after archaeological investigations, or archaeologists were called to Fort Laramie because of inadvertent discoveries (Walker and De Vore 2008). The volume of archaeological data gathered over the past 70+ years is phenomenal and has provided more questions than answers about the history of Fort Laramie.

As can be seen by these brief discussions of this early work, the major goal of the NPS in 1938 was to learn about the architectural and occupational history of these structures through archaeological studies. While some today may question excavation techniques used by the WPA or RBS (note the use of a pickax in Figure 3), the crews did discover details we would not know if the projects had not been conducted before restorations began.

For the next 60+ years, a series of investigations were made following the original mandate that no restoration would be accomplished without extensive archaeological research.
(Walker and DeVore 2008). This mandate continues today, drawing on updated survey techniques including extensive use of geophysical equipment for field investigations (Figure 4) (Walker and DeVore 2008). Knowing the history of archaeological work at a locality over the years is critical for proper interpretation of "modern" archaeological surveys, whether they be traditional walk-over pedestrian surveys, or as at Fort Laramie in recent years, geophysical surveys. This knowledge is highly critical when modern studies are conducted at places like Fort Laramie National Historic Site in Wyoming with Euroamerican occupation that has been constant since 1834 and a prehistoric occupation dating back 10,000 years.
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Beginning in 1934 and then continuing uninterrupted from 1937 until 1942, William Webb directed major archaeological excavation projects throughout Kentucky using federal work relief funds. The majority of this work was done through the Works Progress Administration (WPA), but it also included funds from the Federal Emergency Relief Administration (FERA) and labor supplied by the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC).

Fresh from his experience managing large excavations projects for the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) in Alabama and Tennessee, Webb began a statewide archaeological program in Kentucky in 1937. Over the next four and a half years, federally supported excavations were conducted at 72 sites in 17 Kentucky counties (Milner and Smith 1986:27). Surveys were also conducted in a number of other counties that never progressed to excavation projects.

Although Webb’s academic home was in physics, he developed an interest in Kentucky archaeology while participating in statewide geological expeditions with Kentucky’s eminent geologist, Arthur Miller, in the 1910s and 1920s (Schwartz 1967). Eventually, Webb teamed up with zoology professor William Funkhouser to produce the first synthetic account of Kentucky prehistory (Funkhouser and Webb 1928) and a systematic survey of known sites (Funkhouser and Webb 1932). By the early 1930s, Webb had become the most knowledgeable person in the state on Kentucky archaeology.

The WPA archaeology program in Kentucky identified four areas as research priorities. The first area, in western Kentucky, consisted of the lower Tennessee and Cumberland River valleys, which were slated for inundation by TVA. The second area, in south-central Kentucky, was known for its extensive cave development where it was thought the best possibility of finding an association between Pleistocene animals and human remains might exist. The third area, along the Green River in west-central Kentucky, was known for its numerous Archaic shell midden sites. The fourth area, which coincides approximately with the Bluegrass Region in north-central Kentucky, was known for geometric earthworks and mounds of the Adena culture (Milner and Smith 1986:17). The latter two areas were of special interest to Webb because of his previous work in the Tennessee Valley on large shell middens and Copena mound sites.

Ultimately, the selection of sites for excavation was partly driven by the need to salvage remains threatened by dam construction (the lower Tennessee and Cumberland rivers), but, more significantly, areas of the state with high unemployment. This latter concern made the shell mound region of the Green River especially attractive. With the exception of one small project, no WPA work was conducted in the cave region. However, some work was eventually done under WPA auspices in northeastern Kentucky on late prehistoric Fort Ancient sites along the Ohio River.

Webb put the large WPA crews to good use because he believed near total excavation of sites allowed for a more complete reconstruction of the archaeological culture. Webb considered large museum collections to be essential for advancing scientific knowledge and for educational purposes. Webb also emphasized the recovery of human skeletal remains because of their importance for understanding the history of paleopathologies and examining human variation among Kentucky’s prehistoric people (Milner and Smith 1986:14). Webb organized his projects with military efficiency and insisted on standardized recovery and recording methodologies. Per WPA requirements, Webb hired college graduates in archaeology to supervise projects, but insisted they follow his plan of work. Inexperienced WPA work crews were trained on the job, and could work their way up from “shovel men” to archaeological excavators and, in a few cases, to crew supervisors.
Webb's regimental control may have stifled experimentation among his supervisors, but it led to standardized collections of archaeological remains, field forms, photographs, maps, profiles, notes, and other primary documentation that is as good or better than many archaeological collections recovered today. This was due not only to Webb's administrative skills, but also to the outstanding individuals he hired: men like John Cotter, the WPA State Supervisor; William Haag, the WPA Laboratory Manager; and Charles Snow, the physical anthropologist in charge of analyzing human remains.

By and large, the most significant WPA research program derived from excavation of Archaic sites in the Green River area (Figure 1) and Adena sites in the Bluegrass (Figure 2). These two programs remain primary research topics today. Unlike much of the TVA work in the southeastern U.S. and the later Bureau of American Ethnology's River Basin Surveys, many of the Kentucky WPA sites were not destroyed or inundated by reservoirs. Long-term research programs, such as the Shell Mound Archaeological Project begun by William Marquardt and Patty Jo Watson (2005), integrate continuing research on museum collections with targeted excavation of existing sites to recover material that was not a routine part of the WPA program. Thirty-seven Green River shell midden sites have been nominated to the National Register of Historic Places, and many of these comprise a thematic National-Historic Landmark district. Likewise, many of the Adena mound sites are also on the National Register.

Today, the WPA collections at the University of Kentucky are still the most requested research materials in the museum. Requests for access to the collection have steadily increased over the 70 years since the last WPA project. As a measure of research access, for example, Figure 3 shows the number of Master's theses and Ph.D. dissertations by year that include primary analyses of the collection (i.e., direct analysis of material rather than relying on published data). Access to the collections is not just a product of University of Kentucky students. In fact, the overwhelming majority of research being conducted on the collections is done by non-UK students (Figure 4). A complete list of scholars requesting access to the collection includes major universities across the U.S. and many international institutions as well (e.g., University College London, Centro Nacional Patagónico, Kitasato University School of Medicine, University of Toronto, University of Kent, Universität Tübingen, among others).

Some have denigrated William Webb because he did not have a professional degree in anthropology, his early techniques were sometimes crude, his management style was dictatorial, and he feuded with his contemporaries in Tennessee and elsewhere over management of the projects.
The substance of Webb’s contribution to archaeology through the WPA program, however, remains solid. Negotiating the bureaucracies of TVA and the restrictions imposed by WPA, Webb put an organizational structure in place for his supervisors to produce useful research. In four and a half years, Webb advanced knowledge of Kentucky prehistory farther than anyone had done before or has done since. Webb’s legacy continues with each new inquiry into the collection and each new discovery of the wealth of information contained in the WPA materials.
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Figure 2. An Adena paired post structure pattern at the base of Crigler Mound (15Be20). Photograph taken November 13, 1941. Digital image from the original print (negative no. 5636), William S. Webb Museum of Anthropology, University of Kentucky.

Figure 3. Number of theses and dissertations using WPA collections completed by year. Total completed is 51; year >2011 indicates research access approved, but thesis not yet completed.

Figure 4. Thesis and dissertation projects by University of Kentucky students versus all other universities. Total for Kentucky, 16, all other universities, 46.

NEW DEAL ARCHAEOLOGY, PART II
NEW CONSIDERATIONS OF OLD DISTRIBUTIONS
SITE OCCUPATIONS AT THE DEPTFORD SITE (9CH2), CHATHAM COUNTY, GEORGIA
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The Deftford site (9Ch2) in Chatham County, Georgia, has been an important location for Southeastern archaeological research for almost a century. Located on bluff edges east of Savannah, Georgia, Deftford was an extensive shell midden with an associated burial mound. Some of the most significant figures in Eastern North American archaeology worked at the Deftford site in the early 1940s, including Joseph Caldwell, Antonio Waring, Preston Holder, and Catherine McCann. During the WPA excavations between 1937 and 1942, a large crew excavated over 40,000 square feet and recovered nearly 100,000 artifacts simply through trowel sorting. All of the maps and many of the original field notes have been misplaced since excavations ended with the onset of World War II, but a detailed artifact analysis in the 1990s has reopened hundreds of old units to future research potential.

Although the site was first excavated close to eighty years ago, the collections have remained an important resource for addressing social questions throughout the prehistoric period on the southern Atlantic coast. In one of the most famous applications of Deftford materials, Joseph Caldwell (1970) created the well-known and well-worn coastal ceramic chronology using stratigraphic evidence from Deftford and other sites in the WPA excavations around Chatham County (DePratter 1991). Decades later, Jerald Milanich (1971, 1972*) used Deftford as a type site to define a Middle Woodland Deftford culture for the coastal region. Although archaeological research on the southern Atlantic coast has been more local and contextual since these earlier culture history applications, the Deftford site has maintained a strong exposure thanks to Caldwell's chronology and Milanich's "culture." Beyond the large ceramic collection, however, we still know very little about this extensive site and how social life changed through time at this prehistoric palimpsest.

Thorough Excavations, Scant Reporting
The WPA excavations in Chatham County, Georgia were led by a group of soon to be well-known archaeologists in Eastern North America. The investigations at Deftford were not continuous, as different portions of the site were excavated at intermittent times throughout the duration of the entire Chatham County project. Antonio Waring and Preston Holder were the first archaeologists to visit Deftford during the project in 1937, where they excavated a few units across the site and established a working ceramic chronology for the region (Waring and Holder 1968; see also Caldwell and Waring 1939). H. Thomas Cain excavated the Deftford Burial Mound (9Ch2a) in 1937, but the primary Deftford excavations did not begin until 1941.

The director of the main Deftford excavations, Catherine McCann, was a graduate student from the University of Pennsylvania and one of the first female archaeologists in the region. McCann is more well-known for her earlier work at the Irene Mound site (9Ch1) (Caldwell and McCann 1941), for which she published work on faunal (McCann 1939a, 1939b) and ceramic materials (McCann 1941; also see Claassen 1999:98). Although many women were involved in the Chatham County excavations, McCann was the only woman in a supervisory position during the entire project. Following her work at Irene Mound, McCann was put in charge of the Deftford excavations in 1940 (DePratter 1991), and Caldwell made McCann the second author on the Deftford site report he began drafting several decades later.

Unlike the Irene Mound site, the Deftford materials were not analyzed directly following the excavations and, to this day, there is no final report for the site. The most comprehensive description is in DePratter's report on all of the Chatham County excavations, including a sample analysis of some materials in the collection and some of Caldwell's incomplete and unpublished drafts. Several factors contributed to this fragmented state. For instance, all the original site maps, profile drawings, and original field notes have been misplaced. Although some of this may be attributed to archival inconsistencies throughout the past several decades,
the excavations at Deptford ended rather abruptly with the onset of World War II and many of the artifacts were hastily boxed, occasionally without provenience information (DePratter 1991:1).

**New Distributions**

Recent developments with the Deptford collections are opening up potential to this commonly cited but mysterious site. Between 1994 and 1997, Mark Williams at the University of Georgia Laboratory of Archaeology directed an extensive analysis of the entire Deptford collection. This analysis, which was funded by the National Park Service, has now reopened the Deptford site to further analysis and interpretations than were previously possible. My undergraduate honors thesis (Dekle 2007) of horizontal ceramic distributions through time is the first attempt to work with the data from the complete artifact analyses (see Dekle 2010 for a more detailed description of the methods and results).

In this research project, Williams and I re-created the excavation grid using the provenience information on the original artifact bags (Figure 1). We then plotted all artifacts horizontally across the 510 7.5 x 10 ft (2.3 x 3.1 m) units at the site, including nearly 72,000 ceramic sherds. Another 17,000 sherds are identifiable by trench number and location, but these long linear trenches are not particularly useful for an accurate spatial analysis. Vertical stratigraphic distributions have not been completed at this time, but level information does exist in the collections database and this research will be instrumental for future work.

Even though the scale is extremely broad, this analysis has exposed some previously unknown facts about the Deptford collections. First of all, the Deptford series is not the most common ceramic type at the Deptford site (Table 1). Chatham County Cord Marked, a Woodland series previously identified by DePratter (1991) in his original work with the Chatham County WPA materials, is the most common ceramic type at the site. Although this type is new and untested, the fact remains that Deptford ceramics do not dominate the collection, and this will have important implications for our understanding of Middle Woodland and “Deptford” culture (Milanich 1971, 1972a; Stephenson et al. 2002). Further, the ceramic spatial distributions indicate that occupation and/or depositional locations clearly shift through time (Dekle 2010).

**Conclusions and Future Suggestions**

In his draft report on the Deptford excavations, Joseph Caldwel expressed some concern about the site’s future research potential. He argued:

> It is rather a pity that the Deptford site has obtained such prominence in the literature, principally, of course, as the

---

**Table 1. Ceramic Counts at the Deptford Site by Series.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceramic Series</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Trenches</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allendale</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altamaha</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewton Hill</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatham County</td>
<td>22,278</td>
<td>5,027</td>
<td>27,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deptford</td>
<td>11,176</td>
<td>2,087</td>
<td>13,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oemler</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuge</td>
<td>4,214</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>4,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Catherines</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Simons</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified Clay Tempered</td>
<td>3,986</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>4,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified Limestone Tempered</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified Mica Tempered</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified Sand / Grit Tempered</td>
<td>8,055</td>
<td>2,058</td>
<td>10,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unyped Decorated</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walthour</td>
<td>5,412</td>
<td>1,209</td>
<td>6,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeden Island</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmington</td>
<td>15,539</td>
<td>4,274</td>
<td>19,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>71,884</td>
<td>16,672</td>
<td>88,556</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
type site for a series of pottery types. The results of the excavations did not come up to expectations, and the termination of the project prevented a detailed analysis of the materials. There is a large amount of pottery from the site, and most of this can be identified. Many of the non-pottery artifacts did not occur in features, but in arbitrary levels in the general digging and there is little certainty as to their cultural affiliations. An analysis of the contents of the features, principally midden pits, needs to be made, but this might not yield as much information as should be gained from other sources, such as smaller, one period sites. Deptford was too large, too mixed, contained more occupations than we were able to recognize at that time, and in hindsight, I believe, the site was carefully, but not brilliantly dug [Caldwell et al. 1973, quoted in DePratter 1991:127–128].

Although Caldwell raises some important issues about the quality of the excavations and curation, there is still research potential in the Deptford collections if we strictly adhere to the surviving provenience information and focus on what information we can infer.

The Deptford collection is already inspiring new questions about prehistoric life at the mouth of the Savannah River as we highlight previously unknown ceramic distributions and question some of our previous assumptions about chronology and prehistoric socialization in the area. DePratter (1991) has already offered an excellent suggestion about furthering our knowledge of the site through detailed cluster analysis, which may expose Woodland and Mississippian “household” concentrations despite the lack of feature and post-hole information. Such analysis has already been conducted at Woodland midden sites in Florida (Saunders 1998; Wallis 2007). Thanks to the University of Georgia’s full-scale analysis in the 1990s, we can now begin such an analysis that will truly enhance our understanding of this significant site and prehistoric life on the southern Atlantic Coast.
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Waring, Antonio J., Jr. and Preston Holder
Very little information is in print about Preston Holder’s extensive, seminal, Works Progress Administration (WPA) era excavations of prehistoric and early-contact Indian sites on the Georgia Coast, from Savannah to St. Simons Island, between April 1936 and February 1938. For reasons that remain obscure, his WPA supervisors in Washington and Georgia did not permit Holder to publish his work-in-progress, discouraged the use of his results for his Columbia doctorate, and effectively hid his formal unpublished reports and relevant papers from scrutiny. In some cases, the supervisors expunged the reports and papers. Under his name, only one meager, two-page note, which was never intended for print publication, briefly describes five of the sites that he excavated in 1936 and 1937 on St. Simons Island. Nonetheless, Holder’s important archaeological work in Georgia is richly attested in relatively unknown, untapped, and unpublished resources, including official and unofficial reports and correspondence; detailed field notes, burial lists, faunal lists, graphs, and maps; laboratory and sherd analyses; contemporary artifact displays requisitioned for locals and tourists; a wide range of photographs; and 33 large bins containing many thousands of classified ceramics. The purpose of this short survey, which is extensively documented in a forthcoming chapter (Kiernan 2012), is to bring these effectively lost and forgotten resources to the attention of the archaeological community.

Holder prepared his lone “publication” as a three-minute talk for Lucy B. McIntire, Division Supervisor of WPA archaeological projects in Savannah, who wanted to report on Holder’s work at the June 12, 1937 meeting of the Society for Georgia Archaeology in Columbus, Georgia. Excusing himself because his work at Cannon’s Point at the northern tip of St. Simons Island was at a critical stage, Holder politely declined her invitation to pay his own way to Savannah to ride with her to Columbus to hear his own paper read. The report was published a year later in the first issue of the Proceedings of the Society for Georgia Archaeology, likely without his knowledge, as Holder was then in graduate school at Columbia. At any rate, “Excavations on St. Simons Island and Vicinity, 1936-1937,” which is familiar to Coastal archaeologists, provides a brief and accurate description of his excavations on St. Simons Island at the Airport (Site I), the Sea Island Mound (II), the Charlie King Mound (III), and Gascoigne Bluff (IV), with a progress report on Cannon’s Point (V). Less well known are the further details of his work at Cannon’s Point, of his two-month excavations at the important Evelyn mounds in north Brunswick (VI), and especially of his five months supervising the first, extensive excavations at the Irene Mound in Savannah.

After lengthy and personally costly delays by the WPA district office in Savannah, Holder began salvage archaeology in May 1936 at the St. Simons Island airport, a WPA project already under advanced construction. His initial workforce consisted of two African American shovel men named Charlie King and George Life (see Figure 1), a white laboratory assistant and shovel man named C. O. Svendsen, the son of the lighthouse keeper, and Holder’s first wife, Ruth. This small, unusually integrated crew, occasionally augmented by other workers at the grudging discretion of the engineer at the airport, accomplished a great deal. By the time the engineer compelled them to leave the site, Holder had mapped, profiled, and meticulously documented 200 burials and their funerary offerings, exposed and plotted 3,000 post-molds, and statistically analyzed 21,000 ceramics and other artifacts. The decorated ceramics prevailingly reflect a culture that over many hundreds of years used carved paddles to stamp the wet clay with complicated patterns known as early Swift Creek or with a previously unknown, handsome design, which Holder designated St. Simons Herringbone Stamp. From the airport, Holder moved his crew to two mound burial sites, the first on the property of Charlie King, one of his first two African American workers, and the other at the northern tip of Sea Island, on the property of one of his main sponsors, the Sea Island Company, which together with the Brunswick Board of Trade and the Society for Georgia Archaeology helped pay his salary before WPA funding cleared.
Figure 1: Preston Holder and his integrated crew at St. Simons Island. Courtesy of the Coastal Georgia Historical Society.

Holder’s excavations of these two mounds are helpfully commemorated in a large, professionally executed, profile, contour, and location map, which I discovered in 2007 among the Papers of Antonio J. Waring, Jr., at the National Anthropological Archives of the Smithsonian Institution in Suitland, Maryland (Figure 2). The inventory listed it as “Map of St. Simons Island, Georgia—Chirby King Mound,” which I assumed must be a mistake for “Charley” King. Because it was rolled too tightly to open without damaging it, the map first required professional restoration. Once flattened, treated, and conserved, however, the map repaid the cost with a surprise bonus of the Sea Island Mound; confirmed the misspelling of Charlie King’s name; and disclosed important details about the sites and Holder’s methodology. The profiles delineate three layers of the burial mound at Sea Island, for example, and expose the severe pitting of the surviving area of the Charlie King mound, which road workers had heavily quarried for sand. The contour map at Sea Island mound shows the pits dug by pothunters before Holder arrived. And the location maps for both sites, laid out by Holder fortunately sent to Frank Setzler at the Smithsonian Institution and to other involved parties, as Kelly lost track of his own copies. Because it shows how generously Holder, though deep in his studies at Columbia, shared the details of his WPA excavations, I will cite from the descriptions of Cannon’s Point (Site V) and the Evelyn Mounds (Site VI) from a January 1939 letter to Joseph Caldwell. Holder had hired Caldwell as his assistant and intended replacement at Irene in September 1937, but Kelly decided that Caldwell was not ready to supervise five months later, at the end of January 1938, when Holder left for graduate school. When he was about to succeed the second of two interim supervisors, both of whom he had served as an assistant, at the Irene Mound in January 1939, Caldwell repeatedly importuned Holder for information about Irene and his earlier work on the lower coast. In his five-page, single-spaced reply, Holder reminds Caldwell of the huge sherd collection, with site numbers (I-VI) marked on each sherd, “establishing the ware-categories for the Coast,” which Holder had organized in shoe boxes in Savannah. Because Caldwell was confused about the site designations in the field reports to Kelly and on the sherds, Holder offered to answer any specific questions. He even agreed to a proposed trip to Savannah, provided his expenses were paid, although “it seems foolish to make a trip like that only to explain the site-designations.” Holder’s reply to Caldwell’s questions about the site designations furnishes a convenient set of descriptions of all the Lower Coast sites, an explanation of trench and station and depth marks on sherds, and other useful clarifications. A short paragraph on Gascoigne Bluff (Site IV) explains that test-pits revealed identical wares to those at the Airport, suggesting a wide, sprawling occupation by this culture on the island.

At Cannon’s Point (V) Holder excavated five distinct locations, designated V A-E. Perhaps writing from a recent cursory look at his report to Kelly, Holder somewhat conflated his descriptions of V A and V B in his letter to Caldwell. According to his formal report, it was V A, not V B, where he dug a trench 5 feet deep and 45 feet long and found almost pure shell with virtually no midden deposits or sherds. At V B he thoroughly explored 500 square feet of level shell areas, but found only a fragmentary human tibia and femur, some midden pits, and no post-molds or other evidence of permanent occupation. The most fruitful excavations were at Site V C, in the expansive open field south of the river, where he and his crew uncovered extensive evidence of village occupation, a large number of “finely executed, grit-tempered, well-
Figure 2: Restored map of the Chirby King Mound. Courtesy of the National Anthropological Archives.
fired cord-marked and Lamar Complicated Stamped and fine check-stamped” sherds, as well as an amorphous, but undoubtedly artificial, burial mound, previously disturbed by plowing and pot-hunting. Explorations at V D and V E did not produce significant results, although for V E Holder added the interesting detail that the extent of the work consisted of “cleaning off profiles already left by excavations for road-work.” We know that at least from the time of Fanny Kemble in the 1830s shells from the middens were used to pave the roads on the island.

Evelyn Plantation (Site VI) was also excavated in five locations, which Holder designated VI A-E. He was particularly proud of this site, where he had identified the first unambiguous chronological sequence of ceramics in Georgia. He assumed that Caldwell would remember it, because Holder had taken him to see it several times. “This is my baby,” he told Caldwell, “and it’s up to me to walk the floor with it. I have the data available here, sherd-counts, etc., and there is no reason for your lab to worry about the thing.” This compelling site, still significantly preserved in the neighborhood now built around it, includes VI B, a huge, truncated, pyramidal mound, thought to be William Bartram’s famous “tetragon terrace.” About 50 yards to the west is Mound VI C and its adjacent borrow pit, where Holder recorded the stratigraphy of Swift Creek over Vining (i.e. Deptford) Simple Stamped and Deptford Check Stamped ceramics, a type Holder himself first described. He warned Caldwell to be careful with this collection, as well as with those designated VI SP 1-7, “which represent collections from stratigraphic pits at various points on the site. These should be kept intact,” he cautioned, “and not mixed with other sherds.” Holder also found at this site the first whole, boldly executed, Swift Creek pot on the Coast. He took an excellent photograph of it, but the pot itself disappeared in the 1960s.

Holder’s least-known and most poorly understood work was at the Irene Mound in Savannah from early September 1937 to the end of January 1938. For example, Paul Fagette (1996) thought that Holder worked for his successor, Vladimir Fewkes, in February 1938, while the better-informed Edwin Lyon (1996) leaves the false impression that Holder left the project in the lurch, rather than preparing for his replacement and training him in January, before Fewkes took over in February. In fact, Holder set up a huge, classified, ceramic repository in Savannah to train his assistants, including Caldwell, to recognize sherd types in the field. He prepared a comprehensive, 35-page, series of methodological guides for his successor. He also sent a seven-page interim report on his work-in-progress to Kelly on 30 November 1937, and a detailed, 12-page, final report on 24 January 1938, a week before he departed for Columbia. Holder sent the final report and the guides to the Smithsonian’s WPA representative, Vincenzo Petruzzo, who had reassured Holder that any final publication on the Irene Mound would most likely be coauthored by the four archaeologists who worked at the site. It remains a fascinating, if unsettling, subject of further research to learn why Preston Holder’s excellent reports on his excavations in Glynn and Chatham counties were never published.
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All the King’s Horses: Essays on the Impact of Looting and the Illicit Antiquities Trade on Our Knowledge of the Past
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A
ngel Mounds (12Vg1) is a palisaded Mississippian town with 11 earthen mounds on the Ohio River near Evansville, Indiana, and was occupied from A.D. 1050 to 1450 (Black 1967; Hilgemann 2000; Monaghan and Peebles 2010). Although first documented in the late nineteenth century, no systematic excavations were undertaken until 1939 with a Work Projects Administration (WPA) project under the direction of Glenn A. Black, Indiana’s “first full-time archaeologist” (Black 1944, 1967:20–26; Griffin 1971:13; Kellar 1965, 1971; Madison 1988, 1989:121–151; Purdue 1897; Ruegamer 1980:257–297; Stinson 1883; Thomas 1894). The Angel site had been purchased the previous year by the Indiana Historical Society (IHS) through the generosity of Eli Lilly and at the suggestion of Warren K. Moorehead, who visited the site with Lilly in 1931; Moorehead claimed that it was “the most important place archaeologically” in the Hoosier state (Griffin 1971; Madison 1989:142; Moorehead 1931).

During most of the 1930s and 1940s, Lilly was the president of both Eli Lilly & Company, a large pharmaceutical manufacturer in Indianapolis started by his grandfather and namesake, and the IHS, a private, nonprofit organization dedicated to preserving and interpreting Indiana’s heritage (Madison 1989; Ruegamer 1980:257). Lilly began his interest in archaeology as a collector of prehistoric antiquities. By 1930 his attention shifted from buying objects for personal enjoyment to fostering scientific research of the prehistoric past, epitomized by his Prehistoric Antiquities of Indiana, the first comprehensive publication on Indiana prehistory (Lilly 1937).

The 1931 Lilly and Moorehead field trip to Angel Mounds also included Black, who at the time was a serious avocationalist from Indianapolis, as the driver and guide. Black impressed both Lilly and Moorehead with his self-taught knowledge of archaeology. With Lilly’s support, the IHS hired Black that same year and then sent him for formal training at the Ohio Historical Society under Henry C. Shetrone for eight months. After he returned, he quickly rose in the professional ranks, which included his role as a founding member of the Society for American Archaeology as well as his serving in nearly every capacity on its board (Vice-President, 1939–40; Council Member, 1940–41; President, 1941–42; Treasurer, 1947–51) (Kellar 1964, 1965, 1971).

Ironically, as steadfast Republicans Lilly and Black were opposed to President Franklin D. Roosevelt’s New Deal programs, but later decided that they would be “crazy for not getting some of that easy money back that we are all paying out” (Black 1938; Madison 1989:144). The Indiana Historical Bureau sponsored the WPA work at Angel Mounds, but the IHS still provided the bulk of the state’s contributing funds for this project, including the salary of Black and assistant William Rude, who had worked with Black previously at Nowlin Mounds (Black 1936). The IHS also became the repository for all of the materials and associated records, providing public access for research. This role was passed to the Glenn A. Black Laboratory of Archaeology (GBL) at Indiana University in 1965 (Griffin 1971).

Between 1939 and 1942, a total of 277 men excavated nearly 37,000 m2 at the Angel site, uncovering a large section of the east village, tracing the course of the palisade, and dissecting Mound F almost completely (Black 1967:22, 26). From the beginning, Black wanted to focus the WPA work on ordinary village life. Because the ongoing WPA excavations at the Tennessee Valley impoundments seemed to center on earthworks, Black believed the focus at Angel Mounds should be on occupation areas to identify everyday life at the site and that a “more realistic picture would result with the discovery and exploration of the city dump, burial grounds of the ordinary folk, and the dwellings sites of the dominant element of the population” (Black 1967:229). The East Village excavation was the epitome of this effort, opening nearly 17,000 m2 and exposing a complex/dense arrangement of house trenches, pit features, burials, and a stockade with bastions along its eastern edge.
Most of the WPA crew members were unskilled laborers in their thirties and forties with families from the Evansville vicinity. As an example, Thomas A. E. Boyd, who is now 92, was one of the youngest on the crew and is the only one still living. In an oral interview conducted in 2010, he described Black as a polite man, but serious about archaeology. Boyd’s job, like most of the unskilled laborers, was to shovel skim and then wheelbarrow the dirt. Comparing work at Angel Mounds to his previous WPA and CCC employment, Boyd said that it was hard work, but better than other make-work jobs because of its scientific significance. In the end, the relief workers were all just happy to have a job.

WPA archaeological investigations were suspended early in 1942 for the duration of World War II, but excavations began anew through Indiana University as soon as peace was declared. In 1944, Black was appointed as a Lecturer at Indiana University where he taught three classes and a field school at Angel Mounds each year between 1946 and 1962. With this shift, Black began to view Angel Mounds as a hands-on classroom to teach the next generation of archaeologists. The WPA survey, excavations, and artifacts collected provided a strong foundation from which Black trained students on excavation methodology and prehistoric culture, but at a slower pace than the WPA era. Over 100 students participated in Black’s Angel program, 35 percent of whom were female during a time when women were often not allowed in the field. Many of his students went on to become prominent archaeologists, including William Dancey, Charles Faulkner, Robert Funk, Alice Kehoe, and James Kellar.

The Angel site was and continues to be at the forefront of new and multidisciplinary applications to archaeological research. Black and Lilly were on the cutting edge of archaeological research with their use of aerial photography (Black 1967), botanical studies of vegetation and their relationship to archaeological features (Zeiner 1944, 1946), zooarchaeology (Adams 1945), radiocarbon dating, and proto-magnetometry (Black and Johnston 1962; Johnston 1964). Six of the first ten radiocarbon dates processed by the University of Michigan in 1949 and 1950 were from Angel Mounds and the first magnetometry survey on an archaeological site in the North America was undertaken at Angel Mounds (Black and Johnston 1962; Johnston 1964).

Black had almost finished the scholarly culmination of his labors, Angel Site: An Archaeological, Historical, and Ethnological Study (Black 1967), when he died from a heart attack on September 2, 1964 (Black 1967). This two-volume set was completed by James Kellar, his former pupil and the first director of the GBL, which opened in 1971 at Indiana University in Black’s honor and again through the generosity of Lilly.

Mound Construction and Chronology

Of WPA-era excavations at Angel Mounds, the East Village was the largest, but Mound F turned out to be more ambitious and interesting in terms of human landscape and site chronology. However, Mound F was not part of the original excavation plan. The excavation grew from Lilly’s discussion
with Fay Cooper-Cole at the University of Chicago concerning evidence of a flood during the occupation at the Kincaid site in Southern Illinois (Black 1967:229). Cooper-Cole (1951) believed that this flood caused the Kincaid village to be abandoned for a period of time, which intrigued Lilly. Even though the East Village evidenced no such inundation during its occupancy, Lilly nevertheless believed that the largest mounds at the Angel site (A, E, and F) would be great places to find proof of the timing and magnitude of this flood above the Wabash River. Regardless of Black's skepticism about the flood, Black needed little urging to excavate one of the mounds. He chose Mound F mainly because Mound A was too big and daunting and Mound E was covered with trees, which he erroneously believed would preserve the mound.

Black planned to “peel” the mound by stripping discrete fill layers to expose occupation surfaces and then excavate those surfaces. He placed his first trench, which was 2.2 feet deep, on the southeastern margin of the mound to create a working surface, and discovered “a small fireplace...about 1 foot below the mound surface” (Black 1967:234), which he took to demarcate the pre-mound-construction ground surface. He then proceeded to cut perpendicular trenches into the mound to discover “inner mound” layers. In this manner, Black began stripping what he would later call the “secondary mound fill,” which was about 2–3 m thick, and ultimately exposed the “primary mound surface,” which had a large multichambered building, rich in features, contexts, and artifacts (Black 1967:242–244). No buildings were discovered on the top of the secondary mound fill (i.e., pre-excavation platform of Mound F), although historic and prehistoric burials were abundant within the secondary fill (Black 1967; Sullivan 2010). By November 1941, Black had removed the entire mound cap and excavated most of the primary mound surface. What he discovered during this dig proved remarkable and continues to be a research focus for the GBL.

Black never completed his excavation of Mound F because of World War II and then his death in 1964, which was shortly after he and Richard Johnston renewed excavations under the primary mound surface. Johnston, and then John Dornin, continued to excavate Mound F as Indiana University field schools in 1964 and 1965. Although these excavations have never been completely analyzed, another mound platform surface, which was informally referred to as the “Inner Mound,” was discovered about 1 m under the primary mound surface and included structures. The excavation of Mound F discovered at least two mound platform surfaces containing building buried within Mound F. Importantly, the final platform that existed when the site was abandoned by A.D. 1450 included no structures. Future research includes reopening Mound F in 2012 as a field school to document the remaining section of the inner mound and determine its age and method of construction.
Data from the WPA Mound F excavations continues to contribute to the research agenda at Angel Mounds. Mound F data has been used in several dissertations and research projects (e.g., Hilgeman 2000; Monaghan and Peebles 2010; Schurr 1989a, 1989b, 1992, 1997). Some of the earliest radiocarbon dates applied to archaeology derived from Mound F and the Mound F collection continues to provide radiocarbon samples from which site chronology was developed (Hilgeman 2000; Monaghan and Peebles 2010). Additionally, these and other ages from Mound A provided a new understanding of Angel Mounds development indicating that Mounds A and F were first constructed about A.D. 1050–1100 (coincident with the founding of the site) and like the rest of the site, were abandoned by A.D. 1450. Unlike the WPA Mound F excavations that essentially destroyed it, the recent work at Mound A by Monaghan and Peebles (2010) used small-diameter solid-earth cores and resistivity profiles to reconstruct mound stratigraphy and chronology with only minimal impact to the mound. The structures associated with a the primary mound surfaces in Mound F and Mound A indicate that they were used until about A.D. 1400 when their buildings were dismantled or burned and the platforms covered with a fresh layer of mound fill just prior to site abandonment. This final filling episode to cap the mounds may be a “ceremonial closing” of the site (Monaghan and Peebles 2010). In fact, the best-known artifact at the site, a 25 cm high kneeling man fluorite figurine, was discovered one foot below the top of the secondary mound fill and supports the notion of a ceremonial end for at least Mound F.

Chasing Palisades

The palisade was the third focus of the WPA excavations in 1939 as well as subsequent field schools and exploratory magnetometry work (Black 1967; Black and Johnston 1962; Johnston 1964). This work identified two major palisade sets, both of which contain bastions: the “outer palisade,” which surrounded the entire perimeter of the settlement, and the “inner palisade,” which bisected the site’s interior. Both of these bastions had a contemporaneous wall or “screen” that was erected in front of the Inner and Outer palisades. The presence of bastions strongly implies that these palisades were defensive (Fontana 2007:73; Keeley et. al. 2007; Milner 1999). In the past decade 12 new AMS dates have been obtained and suggest that both palisades stood for the duration of Angel’s occupation. Magnetometry work that was begun in 1958 has continued during the 1990s and 2000s and has identified additional screens and new palisade segments (Ball 1999; Peterson 2010). A 2011 field school will build on this previous research and attempt to clarify the technology and chronology of these multiple fortification fences.

Ceramics and Chronology

The GBL currently curates nearly 2 million pottery sherds from Angel Mounds. The majority of these were collected during the WPA era excavations, but limited research had been conducted on these materials until the 1980s by Sheri Hilgeman (Curry 1950a, 1950b; Hilgeman 1985, 1991, 2000; Kellar 1967). Hilgeman’s dissertation research analyzed nearly 23,000 sherds from the Angel site, including all decorated fragments, effigies, and handles in the GBL collection, to determine the variety and frequency of types and to create a ceramic seriation that followed changing plate and handle forms.

Her research also focused on Negative Painted Pottery (NPP) from the Angel site and the Lower Ohio Valley. NPP vessels are primarily plates and carafe-necked water bottles with common designs of filled bounded triangle areas and Southeastern Ceremonial Complex motifs of a cross-in-circle and the sun circle. Most scholars, including Hilgeman, suggest that these vessels were ritual wares used for special ceremonies or feasts (e.g., the Green Corn Ceremony).

The Angel site has more NPP (4,569 sherds) than any other site in the United States, suggesting that this site may be the origin and hearth of NPP technology in the Midcontinent. In Hilgeman’s (2000) culminating publication, Pottery and Chronology at Angel, she presented a refined typology of...
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NPP and utilized spatial data, experimental archaeology, and ethnohistorical research to determine its fabrication and cultural function. Recent research has begun to critically test Hilgemann's interpretations with advanced analytical methods (e.g., GIS, residue analysis, synchrotron) to clarify the manufacture, use, chronology, and inter- and intrasite distribution of this pottery type (Baumann et al. 2010; Gerke 2010).

Bioarchaeology

Excavations, mainly during the WPA project, uncovered nearly 300 burials at Angel Mounds that varied primarily by location; some in Mounds F and I, others near the palisades, but most in the East Village. Black (1967) carefully recorded their position (flexed or extended), orientation, and grave goods, but their stratigraphic and contextual information were described in less detail. Mark Schurr (1989) used this data to develop chronology and to examine diet and mortuary practices at Angel Mounds. He also applied fluoride dating to determine that most East Village burials were interred late in the site occupation and through stable isotope he determined that the Angel population was heavily dependent on maize (Schurr 1989, 1992, 1997, 1998; Schurr and Powell 2005; Schurr and Schoeninger 1995).

Current research on the WPA-era burials is now applying ancient DNA (aDNA) analysis. This research has focused on mitochondrial DNA and has addressed many questions first advanced during the WPA excavations (Marshall 2010). For instance, Charla Marshall has determined as part of her dissertation that the genetic relationship between the “conjoined twins” identified by Black (1967:206–207) was inaccurate (McCormick and Kaeble 2009). Her research has also illustrated the presence of a rare mitochondrial subhaplogroup in ancient North America. Unfortunately, only 10–25 percent of the 100 individuals sampled by Marshall has yielded enough DNA for analysis. This poor DNA recovery is attributed primarily to excavation techniques from the WPA era since these resulted in the human remains being sun dried, which is known to cause irreparable damage to DNA in archaeological bones (Bollongino and Vigne 2008).

The Legacy

Ultimately, nearly 2.4 million artifacts were collected during the WPA excavations. Each had to be washed, roughly classified, labeled, and a corresponding catalog card created. The collections themselves, however, were not studied in any detail at that point and some parts have yet to be analyzed. Subsequent work must take into account the manner of excavation—their archaeological context—which might constrain the use of the WPA data to help address current research questions. Regardless, these materials and their contents have been sufficient to answer questions of health and disease in the Angel population (Schurr 1989a, 1997, 1998; Schurr and Powell 2005), provide a chronology based on ceramic form and decoration (Hilgemann 2000), yield another independent chronology based on the absorption of the element fluorine by bone (Schurr 1989b), provide material for absolute chronology using radiocarbon, AMS, and luminescence techniques (e.g., Monaghan and Peebles 2010), and offer the potential for the study of human diet and adaptation. The WPA efforts can also provide testimony on agricultural practices, offer broad measures of hunting and gathering wild plants and animals, and answer a range of questions about the production and use of stone tools. Since 2005, archaeological field schools at Angel Mounds have included small, focused excavations and broad programs of remote sensing to better understand the archaeological contexts defined by Black’s excavations. In 2011, the fieldwork will continue by reopening and expanding off of Black’s WPA work in the East Village and along the Palisade to study/compare old data with new techniques.
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WE WANT YOU!
VOLUNTEERS NEEDED FOR THE ANNUAL MEETING!

For the 77th annual meeting in Memphis, Tennessee, SAA is seeking enthusiastic volunteers who are not only interested in archaeology but also looking to save money and have fun.

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

Training for the April 18-22 meeting will be provided from detailed manuals sent to you electronically prior to the meeting along with on-the-job training. As always, SAA staff will be on hand to assist you with any questions or problems that may arise.

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

Applications will be accepted on a first-come, first-served basis. The deadline for applications is February 1, 2012, so contact us as soon as possible to take advantage of this wonderful opportunity!

See you in Memphis!
### ASSETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>December 31, 2010</th>
<th>December 31, 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and Cash Equivalents</td>
<td>$ 2,106,730</td>
<td>$ 2,096,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Receivable, Net</td>
<td>21,259</td>
<td>8,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pledges Receivable, Current Portion</td>
<td>17,899</td>
<td>22,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued Interest Receivable</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>1,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid Expenses, Current Portion</td>
<td>64,260</td>
<td>42,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposits, Current Portion</td>
<td>5,621</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Current Assets</strong></td>
<td>2,216,596</td>
<td>2,171,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PREPAID EXPENSES, Net of Current Portion</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLEDGES RECEIVABLE, Net of Current Portion</strong></td>
<td>14,195</td>
<td>15,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INVESTMENTS</strong></td>
<td>2,400,793</td>
<td>2,055,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROPERTY AND EQUIPMENT, Net</strong></td>
<td>26,450</td>
<td>44,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPOSITS</strong></td>
<td>455</td>
<td>6,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets</strong></td>
<td>$ 4,658,489</td>
<td>$ 4,295,881</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT LIABILITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable and Accrued Expenses</td>
<td>$ 53,419</td>
<td>$ 65,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Dues, Current Portion</td>
<td>425,770</td>
<td>497,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions</td>
<td>141,363</td>
<td>156,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings and Other</td>
<td>349,624</td>
<td>345,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Deferred Revenue</strong></td>
<td>916,757</td>
<td>999,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Current Liabilities</strong></td>
<td>970,176</td>
<td>1,064,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEFERRED MEMBERSHIP DUES, Net of Current Portion</strong></td>
<td>31,680</td>
<td>33,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities</strong></td>
<td>1,001,856</td>
<td>1,098,865</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NET ASSETS

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>1,978,019</td>
<td>1,630,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undesignated</td>
<td>661,455</td>
<td>694,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board-Designated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporarily Restricted</td>
<td>261,465</td>
<td>186,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanently Restricted</td>
<td>755,694</td>
<td>685,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net Assets</strong></td>
<td>3,666,633</td>
<td>3,197,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net Assets</strong></td>
<td>$ 4,658,489</td>
<td>$ 4,295,881</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# SOCIETY FOR AMERICAN ARCHAEOLOGY

## STATEMENTS OF ACTIVITIES AND CHANGE IN NET ASSETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUE AND SUPPORT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Dues</td>
<td>$735,481</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$735,481</td>
<td>$679,186</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$679,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Meeting</td>
<td>638,602</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>638,602</td>
<td>475,790</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>475,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>284,778</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>284,778</td>
<td>299,964</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>299,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Programs and Services</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>16,168</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization and Administration</td>
<td>222,166</td>
<td>96,234</td>
<td>69,863</td>
<td>388,263</td>
<td>295,658</td>
<td>133,444</td>
<td>42,511</td>
<td>471,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Programs and Services</td>
<td>4,687</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,687</td>
<td>7,654</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards</td>
<td>16,545</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16,545</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Assets Released from Restriction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Programs and Services</td>
<td>21,467</td>
<td>(21,467)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30,194</td>
<td>(30,194)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue and Support</strong></td>
<td>1,924,566</td>
<td>74,767</td>
<td>69,863</td>
<td>2,069,196</td>
<td>1,798,854</td>
<td>103,250</td>
<td>42,511</td>
<td>1,942,625</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## EXPENSES

### Program Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>78,668</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>78,668</td>
<td>94,168</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Meeting</td>
<td>405,311</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>405,311</td>
<td>316,471</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>338,847</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>338,847</td>
<td>365,389</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Programs and Services</td>
<td>217,951</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>217,951</td>
<td>239,148</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Programs and Services</td>
<td>89,241</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>89,241</td>
<td>100,456</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards</td>
<td>22,902</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22,902</td>
<td>11,594</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>1,152,920</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,152,920</td>
<td>1,117,226</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Supporting Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management and General</td>
<td>438,455</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>438,455</td>
<td>417,803</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Development</td>
<td>18,204</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18,204</td>
<td>21,193</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>456,659</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>456,659</td>
<td>438,996</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CHANGE IN NET ASSETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHANGE IN NET ASSETS</strong></td>
<td>314,987</td>
<td>74,767</td>
<td>69,863</td>
<td>459,617</td>
<td>240,642</td>
<td>103,250</td>
<td>42,511</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## NET ASSETS, Beginning of Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET ASSETS, Beginning of Year</strong></td>
<td>2,324,487</td>
<td>186,698</td>
<td>685,831</td>
<td>3,197,016</td>
<td>2,083,846</td>
<td>83,448</td>
<td>643,320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## NET ASSETS, End of Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET ASSETS, End of Year</strong></td>
<td>$2,639,474</td>
<td>$261,465</td>
<td>$755,664</td>
<td>$3,856,633</td>
<td>$2,324,487</td>
<td>$186,698</td>
<td>$685,831</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Position: Assistant Professor and Associate Professor  
Location: Tulsa, Oklahoma  
The University of Tulsa, a selective private institution, is adding two archaeologists to its Department of Anthropology as part of a newly approved Ph.D. program. The department seeks (1) a tenure-track Assistant Professor with Ph.D., and (2) a tenured Associate Professor. Regional and topical specialties are open but should complement those of the existing faculty. We welcome applications from specialists in faunal analysis, bioarchaeology, geomorphology, etc. Both appointments involve teaching a range of classes at the undergraduate and graduate levels, and applications will be strengthened by demonstrated excellence in teaching. For the tenured position, preference will be given to advanced candidates who have been successful in securing outside funding for their research. Salaries are competitive. Applications should include a curriculum vita, a statement of research interests, teaching evaluations (if available), and contact information for professional referees. Review of applications will commence December 1, 2011, and will continue until the positions are filled. Address applications to Michael E. Whalen, Chairman, Department of Anthropology, The University of Tulsa, 800 South Tucker Drive, Tulsa, OK 74104-3189. Questions or requests for further information should go to: michael-whalen@utulsa.edu. The University of Tulsa is an EEO/AA employer.

Position: Assistant Professor (2 positions)  
Location: Carrollton, Georgia  
The Department of Anthropology at the University of West Georgia invites applications for two tenure-track positions at the Assistant Professor level, beginning August 2012. Ph.D. in Anthropology and college teaching experience are required by the contract start date. We seek two broadly-trained archaeologists who have a commitment to undergraduate teaching and an active research agenda which includes an understanding and appreciation of culture. Ability and interest in teaching Introduction to Anthropology (4-subfield), a wide range of archaeology courses, including area and topic courses related to one’s research interests, an archaeological field methods course and courses that will support our developing Physical Anthropology or Linguistics programs are highly desired. Archaeologists who specialize in prehistoric and historic periods will be considered. One of the positions will be appointed to be the director of the Antonio J. Waring Archaeological Laboratory, which is a curation and research facility. For the Directorship, experience in the curation of archaeological collections is required, as is a research agenda that focuses on Southeastern United States. We seek a person who has a strong interest in developing the Waring Lab as a focus of research and education for the department, community and region. For the other position, geographic area is open. If interested, please send a letter of application, current curriculum vitae, and the names of three professional references to Dr. Karl Steinen, Department of Anthropology, University of West Georgia, Carrollton, Georgia 30118 or send email applications to anthrop@westga.edu. Each position will be reviewed separately. Clearly indicate in the cover letter whether applicant is applying for “Director/Archaeologist” or “Archaeologist.” Separate applications are required for each position. Application screening will begin on December 15, 2011 and will continue until the positions are filled. Salaries are competitive. Please send any questions to ksteinen@westga.edu. West Georgia is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution.

Position: Assistant Professor  
Location: Poughkeepsie, NY  
The Department of Anthropology at Vassar College invites applications for a
tenure-track position at the assistant professor level in archaeology. Vassar College is an equal opportunity/affirmative action employer and is strongly and actively committed to diversity within its community. The successful candidate will have a record and vision of research and teaching on the archaeology of North America, particularly historical archaeology. We especially encourage candidates who have conducted research in issues of power, inequality, and creativity in American cultures, will involve students in field and laboratory research, and will contribute to multidisciplinary programs such as Native American Studies; Science, Technology & Society; Environmental Studies. Teaching load in the first year is four courses; after that it is five courses per year. Vassar is a highly selective, coeducational liberal arts college of about 2,450 undergraduates (no graduate students) located in the beautiful and historic Hudson Valley 75 miles north of New York City. The city of Poughkeepsie benefits from rich cultural diversity and convenient commuter rail access to New York City. Candidates must have Ph.D. in hand by July 1, 2012. To apply, please visit http://employment.vassar.edu/applicants/Central?quickFind=51227 to link to the posting for this position. Candidates should submit a letter of application, C.V., graduate school transcript (unofficial copies accepted for initial application), course syllabi, and at least three letters of recommendation. Applicants wishing to be considered for an interview at the AAA Meetings in Montreal must submit materials by Nov. 1; all applications received before Nov. 15 will be given full consideration.

### NEWS & NOTES

**Sixth Annual Dissertation Research Grants in Historic Preservation.** SRI Foundation is pleased to announce that it again will award two $10,000 SRIF Dissertation Research Grants to advanced Ph.D candidates. Two classes of award will be considered. The first class of award will be given to students who expand the scholarly impact of one or more completed historic preservation projects. The second class of award will be given to students who advance the practice of historic preservation. Awards will be made to the top two proposals, regardless of class of award.

Applicants for the first class of award (e.g., in archaeology, cultural anthropology, historic architecture) must use information derived from one or more already completed historic preservation projects as their primary source of data (e.g., a series of compliance-driven cultural resource inventories, large-scale excavations, historic property recording projects). Applicants for the second class of award (e.g., in anthropology; history; architecture; historic preservation planning, law, and public policy) must undertake research directed primarily to understand and improve the practice of historic preservation (e.g., designing local historic preservation plans, developing Tribal historic preservation programs, investigating creative alternatives to standard mitigation for historic architectural resources and archaeological sites).

Detailed information on this dissertation research grant program, including an application form, will be posted on the SRIF Foundation website (http://www.srifoundation.org) under Educational Opportunities and Resources by October 1, 2011. Applications will be accepted through Friday March 1, 2012. The SRIF Dissertation Research Grant Review Committee will evaluate all proposals and make funding recommendations to the SRIF Board of Directors who will make the final award decisions. Winning applicants will be notified during the week of April 9–13, 2012. Grant funds will be released within 60 days of award notification.

For more information, contact Dr. Carla Van West at 505-892-5587 or cvanwest@srifoundation.org

### CALENDAR

**2012**

**JANUARY 13–15**

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

**JANUARY 14–15**

The 13th biennial Southwest Symposium will be held at the University of New Mexico, January 14–15, 2012. Four sessions will focus around the conference theme Causation and Explanation: Demography, Movement, Historical Ecology. The conference is hosted by the University of New Mexico and the
learned about social status differences and their material manifestation.

The creative environment and the latitude for pedagogical experimentation fostered by the community college and institutional financial backing contributed to the success of our revitalization plan. Students can now earn a concentration in Anthropology along with their Associates’ degree. They can choose from 18 different anthropology courses that span the discipline, and our fill rates have jumped substantially. And it has been a pleasure to work with great students and dedicated faculty.

Student learning is at the heart of the community college experience, and those who enjoy teaching should seriously consider this kind of academic position. There are more students than ever attending community colleges, yet fewer faculty who are trained in the four fields. One can start preparing by attending an undergraduate and/or graduate school that values the four-field approach, or at least three fields. Teach classes in grad school and teach across the discipline. Get field experience outside of the immediate area in which you are interested—working in the USA is vastly different from working in Mexico or Central America. Get a range of experiences (teaching, fieldwork, travel, research, grants, publishing, museum, CRM, fellowships, tour guide) to see what you like to do. Archaeology at a community college is what you make it.
NOW AVAILABLE AS KINDLE® EDITIONS!

NEW! Northwest Coast:
Archaeology as Deep History
By Madonna Moss

Voices in American Archaeology
Edited by Wendy Ashmore,
Dorothy Lippert, and Barbara J. Mills

California’s Ancient Past:
From the Pacific to the Range of Light
By Jeanne E. Arnold and Michael R. Walsh

Ethics in Action:
Case Studies in Archaeological Dilemmas
By Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh,
Julie Hollowell, and Dru McGil
SEND US YOUR POSTERS!

Don't forget to submit your Archaeology Week /Month Poster to SAA for the 2012 contest. This year's contest will include posters dated April 2011 through March 2012

- Submit a cover sheet with contact name, title, mailing address, email, and phone number. Please include written permission to display images of winning posters on the SAAWeb and in the newsletter of the SAA Council of Affiliated Societies.


- Email a digital copy of the poster to Maureen_Malloy@saa.org

All submissions received by the deadline will be displayed in the exhibit hall at the annual meeting in Memphis, Tennessee, April 18–22. Meeting participants will vote for their favorite poster and the top three winners will be announced at the SAA Business Meeting on Friday April 20, 2012.

Check out the archive of winning posters on SAAWeb at http://www.saa.org/publicftp/PUBLIC/resources/ArchMonthforpublic.html

The poster archive includes winning images dating back to the first competition, held in 1996.