¡La SAA regresa a América Latina!
Lima, Perú
8-10 de agosto de 2014

¡La SAA regresa a América Latina! La Sociedad para la Arqueología Americana (Society for American Archaeology) se complace en anunciar la segunda Conferencia Intercontinental para reunir a los especialistas de la arqueología de América y el Caribe en América Latina a realizarse del 8 al 10 de agosto del 2014 la cual será coordinada por Bárbara Arroyo y Luis Jaime Castillo como el coordinador local.

La Conferencia empezará la tarde del 8 de agosto, 2014 con la primera sesión plenaria de charlas. Esa noche, un invitado especial presentará la ponencia distinguida. Las ponencias generales seguirán en sesiones plenarias consecutivas el sábado 9 y la mañana del domingo 10 del 2014.

**Temas de la Conferencia**
- Orígenes del Estado
- Historiografía en Arqueología
- Arqueología y Turismo

**Fechas Importantes**
- 15 febrero 2014—Fecha límite para proponer una ponencia
- Fin de marzo de 2014—Notificación de decisiones
- 1 abril 2014—Apertura del inscripciones
- 30 mayo 2014—Fecha límite para la inscripción de ponentes
- 6 mayo 2014—Fecha límite para la solicitud/renovación de afiliación para 2014
- 1 julio 2014—Fecha límite para la inscripción de asistentes (no presentadores)

Para más información visite SAAweb a www.saa.org
¡Nos vemos en Lima!
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ED ITO R ’S CO R N ER

Anna Marie Prentiss

Anna Marie Prentiss is Professor of Anthropology at The University of Montana

I am highly honored to have been nominated and chosen to assume the editorship of The SAA Archaeological Record. I thank previous editors Andrew Duff and Jane Eva Baxter for their encouragement and for their service over the past six years. As I noted in my proposal, I view The SAA Archaeological Record as essentially the face of the Society for American Archaeology. The magazine provides the opportunity for communication through updates from committees, taskforces, and interest groups, short news blurbs, and letters. It also provides the opportunity for discussion of issues fundamental to the discipline, whether they are practical, ethical, empirical, methodological, or theoretical, as exemplified in recent special issues (e.g., New Directions in Bioarchaeology). Ultimately, the magazine is a portrait of the diverse worlds of American archaeology.

From my perspective, editing The SAA Archaeological Record provides an outstanding opportunity to engage with the widest range of archaeological practitioners. We plan to continue the “Careers in Archaeology” column under associate editors A. Gwynn Henderson and Nicolas Laracuente. Much like my predecessors, I plan to encourage and develop special thematic issues addressing major trends in archaeological thought and practice. At the moment, we are working with several prospective guest editors to cover topics including “archaeology of the human experience,” mountain archaeology, and mentoring in archaeology.

I strongly welcome readers to also submit articles independent of special issues. There are so many exciting research programs and discussions underway that could be highlighted in The SAA Archaeological Record. Be sure to consult the updated style guide under Publications on the SAA website before submitting. Letters to the editor remain an essential forum for discussion of issues in archaeology. Finally, I hope readers will consider sending photographs for the cover of the magazine. While I cannot promise to use every one, it will be great to have a range of images to choose from as we develop the covers of future issues. Remember, they must be at least 300 DPI at a size of 9 x 12 in (2700 x 3600 pixels, or 9 megapixels).

I want to introduce my assistant editor, Kristen Barnett. Kristen is a doctoral student in anthropological archaeology at The University of Montana and a Native Alaskan (Unangan) archaeologist. She is a student member of the Committee on the Status of Women in Archaeology (COSWA), has conducted field research in three countries, and offers significant life experience that will be invaluable as we develop future issues of The SAA Archaeological Record.
The recent essay by Anderson, Card, and Feder, “Speaking Up and Speaking Out: Collective Efforts in the Fight to Reclaim the Public Perception of Archaeology” (The SAA Archaeological Record, 13[2]:24–28, 2013), encourages us to fight the forces that have “hijacked” (p. 27) the public’s perception of archaeology, and they outline a process to do this. I’m uncertain whether archaeologists ever had a claim on those perceptions, or should have one. As long as professional opinions are viewed as mainstream and the other side as alternative, then no hijacking has occurred. Furthermore, other fantasies are more threatening.

First, our knowledge of why people believe fantastic theories has been much improved by the research they have compiled. There is enough evidence to support the generalization that humans don’t live on facts, truths, or science alone. They also use religion, superstition, fiction, lies, misinformation, and metaphors to create meaning in life. Honestly, it would be a bland, ugly world if facts and truth were all we had to sustain us. Fantasy is useful. Certainly, Feder has made a career out of jousting with the con artists and snake oil salesmen; it adds purpose to his life.

I do wonder about scientists who can’t see the world in anything but literal terms. Ghosts, angels, werewolves, and vampires are metaphors for those people, things, and processes in life that challenge us, make us afraid, or feel wonderful. There is nothing wrong with calling your car a guardian angel if it saved your life. A vampire is someone or something that drains your energy, ambition, or motivation, such as unpleasant people or governmental red tape. They are everywhere.

As threats go, the sellers of alternative ideas are minor compared to the oligarchs and politicians draining resources away from our potential use. Our nation’s economic crisis continues and the worst still is likely to come because the credit crisis of 2008–2010 was the vanguard of a much larger problem. In comparison, jousting about the origin of rune stones is a pleasant distraction.

American archaeology also has an internal threat. Like most vampires, this one is seductive, provocative, and promises to give eternal life (job security). Its name is historic preservation. With the rise of the preservation ethic in the 1980s, followed by the SAA ethics revision in 1996, and then topped off with the 2004 revision of the 36 CFR 800 regulations implementing section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, the preservation ethos has consistently worked to reduce archaeological excavations. We used to dig more than we do now.

I, too, have participated in this. In the early 1990s, while working for Fairfax County, Virginia, I always had an excavation underway or planned, and I enabled many others. In federal service for the past eight years, I have facilitated zero excavations. Everyday, I seek to avoid effects to most sites, especially adverse to significant effects. CRM archaeology has been diminished to locating, recording, and avoiding sites. Excavation is generally a last resort or the result of an inadvertent discovery.

In 2004, archaeological excavation became an adverse effect under the revised 36 CFR 800 regulations. This rapidly became an indictment against excavation. At the Meta level it simply connotes that excavation is morally wrong or is too much of a burden (added costs, time, and planning). Regardless of the procedures guiding us to resolve adverse effects, most developers and planners choose not to have adverse effects because of the negative perceptions about creating them or the sense that they are too burdensome. At a macro level, the indictment equates excavation with other adverse effects that archaeologists despise, such as bull dozing without research. We know that excavation is destructive, but now we also damn ourselves for it. At the micro level, excavation potentially creates one of the most absurd situations possible in CRM. Because excavation is still viewed as an acceptable mitigation technique, it is now possible to use an adverse effect to mitigate another kind of adverse effect. The best response to this is to avoid adverse effects of any kind.

That creepy feeling that we are not connecting with and influencing the lay public in ways we expect or desire will continue even if we joust with con artists because we are not listening to the public. The SAA-sponsored Harris Interactive study determined that the primary association lay people have with archaeology is the image of digging. And most of us are doing less and less of the one thing the public associates us with—digging. There is too need to blame others for our social clumsiness.

The best way to connect with the lay public, and to undermine alternative views, is to increase excavations everywhere possible, using the new Gemeinschaft perspectives. Preservation should be an ally, not our master.

Lawrence E. Moore
Tulsa, Oklahoma
Lemoore59@gmail.com
It is hard to believe that it has only been a few months since the SAA annual meeting in Hawaii. As the new president, I feel as though I’ve been through a trial by fire: resolving new issues arising daily, working with the board and executive committee, and learning the where and wherefores of our 50-plus committees, task forces, and interest groups—all the time relying on the SAA staff. I marvel at how easy my predecessors made the job look. Perhaps the aspect that has surprised me the most as president is how big the field of archaeology has become. The SAA has members who are lawyers, teachers, historians, artists, computer scientists, physicists, soil scientists, and so on, all of whom are archaeologists or in some fashion are affiliated with archaeology.

I joined the SAA as a graduate student in the mid-1970s. I wanted the journal, *American Antiquity*, and I wanted to go to the annual meeting. If I joined today, I would still be able to get a journal and go to a meeting, but if that is all I did I would be failing to take advantage of my SAA membership in ways that have been critical to advancing my professional career. There are many reasons to join the SAA. In this column, I will highlight only membership benefits that are new THIS YEAR.

**JOURNALS.** When I joined the SAA, there was one journal that all members received. Today, there are three journals, one of which, *Advances in Archaeological Practice*, has its first two issues accessible to all SAA members via the SAAweb (http://www.saa.org/AbouttheSociety/Publications/AdvancesinArchaeologicalPractice/tabid/1486/Default.aspx). The SAA has a long history of publishing the leading journals in American archaeology. *American Antiquity* was a response to the need for a venue to disseminate the large volume of information resulting from the increase in archaeological investigations in the 1930s. In 1990, the SAA recognized the need for a dual-language journal devoted to Latin America, and *Latin American Antiquity* was born. Today, we once again recognize the need for a new journal to serve a growing constituency within American archaeology, professional practitioners. *Advances in Archaeological Practice* is a full color digital journal published four times a year. Articles focus on how archaeologists approach the archaeological record to learn about the past, to present our results to the public, and to manage archaeological resources for the future. Christopher Dore is *Advances in Archaeological Practice’s* editor and can be reached at advances@saa.org.

**CURRENT RESEARCH ONLINE.** In a world where more than 150,000 undertakings involving cultural resources, much of them archaeological, occur every year, it is impossible to keep up with all the new finds. To assist archaeologists help each other, the SAA brought back Current Research. From its origins in 1962 as a news section in *American Antiquity*, Current Research served as a means of providing quick updates of research. The section was suspended in 1994 to make room for more articles in the journal. In its new incarnation, Current Research has been placed online, hence, its new name, Current Research Online (CRO). SAA members can now post short items about what they have found, where the collections are located, and what they have published, which will allow other archaeologists, descendant communities, and the interested public to keep up to date with archaeological finds around the world. Christian Wells, CRO’s coordinator, will be happy to assist anyone getting started or currently using CRO; he can be reached at ecwells@usf.edu.

**ONLINE SEMINARS.** Successful archaeologists never stop learning. There are always new techniques, new laws and regulations, new finds, and new theories. There also are new ways of teaching and learning, many of which utilize the Internet. I constantly receive solicitations and ads for webinars, instructional videos, and other online products. Rarely are these aimed at archaeologists, and, more often than not, the content is disappointing. The SAA spent several years researching and develop-
ing an approach to online learning that we believe will most benefit our members. The new SAA online seminar series cover a variety of topics, from LiDAR to legislation. Unlike other series, the SAA's is peer-reviewed. Seminar proposals are vetted by the Register of Professional Archaeologists's Continuing Education Certification Committee. Participants in the SAA online seminars can be assured that the program meets the educational needs of archaeologists and that seminars are taught by experts in the field. SAA's first online seminar, "Archaeological Applications of Airborne Laser Scanning," has been developed by the University of Arkansas's Center for Advanced Spatial Technologies and is taught by Rachel Optiz. The two-hour online seminar is on September 17, 2013. For more information, please visit http://www.saa.org/AbouttheSociety/Online-Seminars/tabid/1503/Default.aspx.

DIGITAL CURATION. Curation is a cornerstone of archaeology. Without collections, others cannot evaluate our work, learn new insights, or compare our findings with their own. Traditionally, collections have been physical things—artifacts, samples, field notes, documents, photographs, and maps. Today, many of these items are likely to exist only in digital formats. The digital age also has allowed us to document the archaeological record in new formats, such as LiDAR scans, GIS databases, videos, etc. We now must curate physical objects and digital files and link them together so other investigators can access the entire collection. Not surprisingly, the cost of curation is not insignificant; archaeologists of today need to understand these costs and budget accordingly. The SAA has joined with the Center for Digital Antiquity (CDA) to help student members learn about digital archiving by assisting them through the process with their own collections. SAA student members can upload three files of up to 30 megabytes (MB) a year to TDAR. Best of all, it's free! To learn more, contact CDA at www.digitalantiquity.org.

GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS. Archaeological resources are constantly under threat of disturbance or destruction from forces ranging from economic development to warfare. Most countries have legislation protecting archaeological and historical resources, and many have signed international conventions doing the same. Since its formation, the SAA has promoted new legislation and safeguarded the provisions of existing legislation affecting the archaeological record. It is fair to say that the SAA has focused most of its efforts on the laws and regulations in the United States. While we continue to monitor and pursue legislative and regulatory activities in the United States through the SAA Government Affairs Committee (GAC), last year we formed a parallel committee, the International Government Affairs Committee (IGAC) to focus on the events affecting archaeology outside the United States. GAC and IGAC are two of the most active SAA committees. The SAA writes scores of letters, provides testimony, and engages national governments and their agencies, international development banks, private corporations, NGOs, and other preservation partners in pursuit of enhancing the protection of archaeological resources and supporting archaeologists everywhere. Every month, the SAA efforts in these areas are reported in the GAC/IGAC Alert, which goes free of charge to every member of the SAA who wants it. Recently, we reorganized the Alert to include an Op/Ed section, in which SAA members active in archaeopolitics present their opinions and views. I encourage you to check out the new GAC/IGAC Alert on the member side of SAAweb, https://ecommerce.saa.org/saa/source/security/member-logon.cfm?section=home. To be placed on the mailing list, simply contact david_lindsay@saa.org.

Here, I have only highlighted new benefits. Of course, the complete range of benefits is still there, from member discounts on publications to the awards program, outreach, interest groups, specialized meetings such as the Conferencia Intercontinental in Latin America, to opportunities for SAA service. Joining the SAA is really not simply about a journal and annual meeting. Our activities cover the entire range of archaeological interest, and our efforts span the globe. Existing members should make sure they are fully engaged in the SAA, and archaeologists who are not members should give us another look.
On Meetings
A year ago, in this column, questions about coffee breaks and New Orleans were addressed. It seems there is one more topic that needs airing:

Why Is There No Free Internet Access at the Convention Center?
Free Internet access varies from city to city. In Austin, there is free Internet access at the Austin Convention Center! This is more the exception than the rule. Other cities, such as Memphis, offer the service for a reasonable fee, and SAA had sponsors that provided the service for our attendees. In Honolulu, and in many other major cities, the service would have cost more than $100,000 (some cities have quoted $150,000), and that is the simple reason we do not always have it. It is a question that is asked as we review any site. We know Internet access is important. Sometimes, however, it is simply not economically feasible.

79th Annual Meeting, April 23–27, 2014, Austin, TX
Childcare Will Be Offered!
As decided by the Board of Directors, childcare was in place for the 2013 annual meeting and will be in place for the 2014 and 2015 annual meetings. After the 2015 meeting, the Board will revisit the issue. Registration for “Camp SAA” will be available through the link on the front page of SAAweb (www.saa.org). Should you have any question about the childcare program, please direct it to SAA’s executive director, Tobi Brimsek (tobi_brimsek@saa.org or 1-202-559-4580).

Hotel Information and Logistics
The meeting will take place at the Austin Convention Center and the Hilton Austin, which is the headquarters hotel. The headquarters hotel is 32 steps from the entrance to the convention center. The Radisson Hotel and Suites Austin-Downtown will serve both as an overflow property for attendees and, in part, as a student property, with rates exclusively for students. There is also an exclusive student property, La Quinta Inn–Austin Capitol. Detailed hotel information and links for reservations are available on SAAweb.

A Free One-Year Membership in SAA
All you need to do for a chance at a free one-year membership in SAA is to register at the Hilton Austin, the Radisson Hotel and Suites Austin-Downtown, or La Quinta Inn–Austin Capitol by January 15, 2014, and your name will be entered into a drawing for the one-year membership. There will be a drawing for the headquarters hotel, the overflow/student property, and the exclusively student property. We will provide three one-year memberships – one could be yours!

Over the Summer
In case you have been out of contact for the past few months, there are a few new significant developments that you should be aware of:
• The launch of Current Research Online (CRO)
• The launch of Advances in Archaeological Practice, A Journal of the Society for American Archaeology
• The September launch of the SAA Online Seminar Series
Check out Current Research Online, *Advances in Archaeological Practice*, and the SAA Online Seminar Series through the SAAweb (www.saa.org) homepage. Don’t miss these wonderful new products and benefits from SAA.

**Coming in November—Open Call for Services on Committees**

This November will mark the fourth year in which SAA has made the process for volunteering for committee service an open one. One change that the Board has infused is that starting with the appointments made for 2014, terms for most committees will be three rather than two years.

Appointments through this process will be made for slots available as of the close of the Annual Business Meeting in Austin, Texas.

If you are currently serving on a committee and would like to volunteer for a second term, your volunteer application needs to be done also through the open call. Committee chairs can and should encourage members to apply, as well as to re-apply, for second terms through the open process.

Please be aware that the requested statement is the way in which you will introduce yourself to the committee and share what you can bring to that committee. The statement is key in the decision-making process. At its spring meeting, the Board established the following guidelines, in priority order, for evaluating applications for membership in committees:

1. Specific expertise and/or experience relevant to the committee’s work.
2. Diversity of viewpoints on the committee’s area of work.
3. Recruitment of new committee members to encourage broader member engagement.

These criteria will be provided in the open call, and candidates are asked to address them in their statements.

And a note to students—most SAA committees are structured to have two slots specifically for students. This is a wonderful way for students to become more active within the Society.

SAA committee charges and current memberships are listed on SAAweb. We encourage you to check them out and think about getting involved!

---

**IN BRIEF**

Please be aware that the requested statement is the way in which you will introduce yourself to the committee and share what you can bring to that committee. The statement is key in the decision-making process. At its spring meeting, the Board established the following guidelines, in priority order, for evaluating applications for membership in committees:

1. Specific expertise and/or experience relevant to the committee’s work.
2. Diversity of viewpoints on the committee’s area of work.
3. Recruitment of new committee members to encourage broader member engagement.

These criteria will be provided in the open call, and candidates are asked to address them in their statements.

And a note to students—most SAA committees are structured to have two slots specifically for students. This is a wonderful way for students to become more active within the Society.

SAA committee charges and current memberships are listed on SAAweb. We encourage you to check them out and think about getting involved!

---

**INTRODUCING CURRENT RESEARCH ONLINE**

Current Research, a news section published in *American Antiquity* from 1962 to 1994, has now transitioned to an online format accessible to archaeologists and the public through the SAA web portal. Like the original journal section, *Current Research Online* (CRO) aims to bring greater awareness of current field, lab, and collections work being conducted by archaeologists around the world. A comprehensive, database-driven search application with an interactive, user-friendly interface, CRO offers unparalleled opportunities for archaeologists to share their research, and for the public to get a “sneak peak” into the latest discoveries.

Updated semi-annually, CRO allows for various data management operations, including submissions, review by regional coordinators, data storage, text and spatial (via Google Earth) search functions (via a MySQL database), and formatted output (as Adobe Acrobat PDF files), among other tools.

Entries in the database are currently organized among 21 world regions: Canada, Northwest US, Southwest US, Northeast US, Southeast US, Midwest US, Caribbean, Northern Mesoamerica, Southern Mesoamerica, Central America, South America, Western Europe, Eastern Europe, Mediterranean, North and Central Asia, South/East, and Southeast Asia, Middle East, Pacific Islands, Northern Africa, Southern Africa, and Australia.

Each region has a Regional Coordinator to manage submissions. CRO’s Global Coordinator is E. Christian Wells, Associate Professor of Anthropology at the University of South Florida.

While submissions to CRO are a privilege of SAA membership (including both professionals and students in all settings), the resource is open to the public to search. By providing an internet platform for archaeologists to better connect with the public and with other archaeologists, CRO may globalization archaeology in ways that we have never seen before.

For more information about CRO, please visit http://www.saa.org/CurrentResearch/
Welcome back y'all! It seems like yesterday that the SAA Annual Meeting was held in Austin, but it will have been seven years by the time the 79th Annual Meeting commences. We hope that many of our fellow SAA members will be able to join us in Texas’s capital city on April 23–27, 2014. Austin proudly proclaims itself as “The Live Music Capital of the World,” and there is much to experience in this growing, diverse, and thriving city. Since the 2007 meeting, the downtown area has undergone quite a few changes, with a variety of new entertainment venues, eateries (including food trailers!), and shops, all within easy walking distance of the Austin Convention Center and Hilton Austin. Of course, the historic 6th Street entertainment district is still a popular destination, but we also urge you to explore the Warehouse/2nd Street, Rainey Street, and South Congress districts.

To enhance your visit to the Lone Star State, we have planned some great tours of archaeological and historical interest. Be a part of an exclusive group to receive a guided tour of the Belle shipwreck exhibit at the Bullock Texas State History Museum (http://www.thestoryoftexas.com/) on Friday morning, April 25. Dr. Jim Bruseth, Project Director of the Belle project and Guest Curator for the new core and temporary exhibitions, will share his experiences and talk about the amazing revelations that resulted from the discovery and recovery of the wreck. La Belle was one of the vessels damaged and lost in a winter storm in 1686 during the expedition led by René Robert Cavelier, Sieur de La Salle. Tour participants will learn how this failed attempt to establish a French foothold on the northern Gulf of Mexico coast forced the Spanish crown to strengthen its claim to this part of the New World.

Another option for Friday, April 25, is to spend the day in San Antonio. This tour is your opportunity to experience the state’s Hispanic heritage through visits to the Spanish Colonial Mission San José y San Miguel de Aguayo and the Casa Navarro State Historic Site (http://www.visitcasanavarro.com/index.aspx?page=3). Casa Navarro was the residence of José Antonio Navarro (1795–1871), a rancher, merchant and one of only two native-born Texans to sign the Texas Declaration of Independence in 1836. Tour participants will receive a guided tour of the Casa Navarro compound operated by the Texas Historical Commission. Mission San José, founded in the early eighteenth century, is the largest of the five San Antonio missions and is often referred to as the “Queen of the Missions.” The restored mission is constructed of local limestone and is a beautiful example of Spanish Colonial ornamentation, including painted plaster, carvings, and the famed “Rose Window.” Susan Snow, National Park Service archaeologist with the San Antonio Missions National Historic Park (http://www.nps.gov/saan/index.htm), will accompany and speak to the group about San Antonio’s Spanish Colonial history.

On Saturday, April 26, there are two additional, all-day tours from which to choose. World War II history buffs should not miss the opportunity to journey to Fredericksburg, established
by German immigrants in 1845 in the picturesque Texas Hill Country. This bustling town is where the National Museum of the Pacific War (http://www.pacificwarmuseum.org/), another of the State Historic Sites administered by the Texas Historical Commission, is located. The museum, dedicated to telling the story of the Pacific and Asiatic Theaters in World War II, is composed of a complex of properties, including The Admiral Nimitz Museum (housed in the historic Nimitz Hotel), Japanese Garden of Peace, Pacific Combat Zone, the George Bush Gallery, and other features. The George Bush Gallery chronicles the Pacific War through compelling exhibitions that integrate state-of-the-art media, historically significant artifacts, and photographs.

Or, you may opt for the trip to the Gault Archaeological Site located about 50 miles north of Austin. The site, first investigated by University of Texas anthropologist J. E. Pearce in 1929, more recently has been under the direction of Dr. Michael B. Collins (formerly with The University of Texas at Austin and now affiliated with the Gault School of Archaeological Research at Texas State University; http://www.gaultschool.org/Home.aspx). Excavations have been conducted at the Gault site via partnerships with various universities and with the aid of thousands of volunteers and groups such as the Texas Archaeological Society, PaleoCultural Research Group, and others. These investigations have revealed important information about the sequence of occupations at the site, especially the deeply buried, early Paleoindian deposits. These early deposits have yielded a wealth of artifacts—including over 100 engraved stones!—as well as intriguing features, such as a stone floor. A member of the Gault School of Archaeological Research team will escort the tour group and to this intriguing site.

Do not delay in getting ready for Austin. You will be able to choose one or more of the tours when advance registration opens in mid-December. The month of April is always a great time to be in Austin, and with the 79th SAA Annual Meeting in town, it will be a memorable experience!

## CALENDAR

### SEPTEMBER 17, 2013

SAA’s Online Seminar Series launches with “Archaeological Applications of Airborne Laser Scanning.” Dr. Rachel Optiz, RPA, instructor.

### DECEMBER 16–18, 2013

The 35th Annual Meeting of the Theoretical Archaeology Group (TAG) will be hosted on December 16–18, 2013 by the Archaeology and Anthropology Group in Bournemouth University. Details are now available at https://microsites.bournemouth.ac.uk/tag2013/.

### APRIL 23–27, 2014

SAA’s 79th Annual Meeting will be held on April 23–27, 2014 in Austin, Texas. Annual Meeting information is available on the SAAweb, www.saa.org.

### AUGUST 8–10, 2014

SAA’s Conferencia Intercontinental will be held on August 8–10, 2014 in Lima, Peru. For more information on the conference, visit the SAAweb, web.saa.org

### AUGUST 14–16, 2014

“Quarantine: history, heritage, place.” Sydney, Australia, August 14–16, 2014. This major conference aims to prompt productive conversations among archaeologists, historians, cultural and human geographers, and heritage scholars. Focusing on the places and practices of quarantine, the event is supported by the University of Sydney and will be hosted at the former Quarantine Station at Sydney’s stunning North Head. http://sydney.edu.au/arts/research/quarantine.

### SEPTEMBER 22–27, 2014

The 12th ICAZ meeting will be held on September 22–27, 2014 at the San Rafael Convention Center (San Rafael-Mendoza, Argentina). Please check the conference webpage, www.icaz2014argentina.com, for the last updates and information. For questions, see info@icaz2014argentina.com; facebook: ICAZ 2014 San Rafael.
American Antiquity was my entrée into the SAA. When I started graduate school at the University of New Mexico (UNM) in 1968, I was unaware of the Society for American Archaeology and probably only dimly of conferences. What I rapidly became aware of at UNM were the journals we had to read and which periodically appeared in my fellow students’ mailboxes, to be read, parsed, argued about, and studied. My professors had bookshelves with long runs of multiple journals marching around their walls. I joined the Society to get the journals. It also was expected that we attend conferences, so I went to my first SAA meeting in Santa Fe.

In early 1970, I moved to Washington State University. Graduate students there were expected to attend conferences and to give papers as often as possible. This training set my involvement with the SAA for years to come: a serious professional belonged to professional societies, engaged with the journals, went to the meetings, and gave papers. I learned years later that many of my faculty played other roles in the Society, but I didn’t know that then. And I didn’t play any other roles in the Society for years.

I was focused on other things, and, frankly, committee work was not among my ambitions. I knew it needed to be done and was glad for others to do it. Until, that is, I was asked out of the blue to stand for election to the SAA’s Board of Directors. This surprised me; in my ignorance, I assumed one worked up through the committee structure to get to the Board. I agreed to run because I was honored to be asked, from the sense of professional duty that had been inculcated in me, and with the expectation I would lose the election. To my surprise, I won. I have now served on the Board twice, once as a Director and once as President, and I am currently the Editor of the SAA Press.

I have found my volunteer service with the Society very satisfying. That satisfaction is partially summarized by the phrase “civic engagement” or even “civic entanglement.” The difference between the two is that engagement is being hands on with an issue, whereas with entanglement, you are up to your eyeballs in it. As archaeologists, we are citizens of our discipline and our profession; our citizenship extends beyond our contributions to knowledge, to making the enterprise of archaeology actually work, succeed, and be what we think it should be. Archaeology and the Society face complex challenges that require the talents of the entire membership to address. Civic engagement or entanglement can take many forms, ranging from public archaeology through engagement or entanglement with descendant communities to service on SAA’s many committees; committees far easier to join than I once realized. Engagement or entanglement can be outwardly focused, as, for example, through the International Government Affairs Committee, or internally, through one of the awards committees. (I have learned that granting and receiving awards from one’s colleagues is quite important.) Another part of the satisfaction has been the opportunity to identify directions I thought the society and the discipline needed to move toward and working to make that happen. Our society offers many opportunities.

Last, volunteering with the Society has personal benefits; frankly, it’s fun. My networks have been greatly expanded and enriched; I have made many friends. There is a notion that we all have collegia, networks of people we tend to interact with, with whom we share ideas and work. These can be self-reinforcing and comfortable. As a volunteer, I have met and worked with people I knew only slightly or not at all; we haven’t always agreed, sometimes have never agreed, and yet have joined each other’s collegium and become friends. Some of these connections cross-cut disciplinary cleavages, enriching us both. I value that highly. Become engaged; better yet, become entangled.
February 1974. That’s when Stuart Streuver visited my high school in Connecticut and pulled me into the archaeological vortex. I can’t tell you exactly what he said, but he made archaeology sound intriguing, challenging, and gritty. I convinced my folks to let me go to Kampsville, “The Valley,” during the summer for college credit (for the uninitiated, “The Valley” is the Illinois Valley, not to be confused with the Valley of Mexico). I was assigned to work at the Koster site (Figure 1). It was one of the first sites at which archaeologists recognized the potential for deeply buried occupations. Twenty-six different occupations were identified at the site, and I spent 10 of my 13 weeks digging sterile soil between several of the occupations. In the end, I was rewarded for my perseverance with three weeks in Horizon 11, an Early Archaic occupation dating ca. 9,500 B.P. It was remarkable! The preservation, the density of material, the age! What’s more, the program gave me an interdisciplinary perspective that would shape my career.

My experience in Kampsville convinced me both that I wanted to be an archaeologist and that I wanted to work in the Midwestern U.S. I asked my high school guidance counselor to recommend a Midwest college with strong classics and archaeology programs. Beloit College in Beloit, Wisconsin, was the best fit for me.

During Beloit’s 16-week field school in far northern Wisconsin, we spent most of our time working on the mainland, although we did have the opportunity to work on two of the Apostle Islands. I spent weeks of survey not finding a single site. Fortunately, however, I did have the opportunity to work at the Marina site, a remarkable historic fur trade site, and also at P-Flat, a late prehistoric fishing station.

Field school promoted in me more than an appreciation for archaeology, however. Bob Salzer stationed our field headquarters in the middle of the Red Cliff Reservation. I think Bob wanted to encourage his students to recognize the importance of establishing a relationship with tribal communities when conducting archaeological investigations. Although as a student I didn’t have much opportunity to address archaeological issues with tribal members, I came away from field school with a respect for tribal peoples.

Beloit offered (and continues to offer) great opportunities for undergraduates, and during the summer between my junior and senior years, I co-directed the Phase I investigations of the Exxon Mine site in Crandon, Wisconsin. It was my first paid job and my introduction to cultural resource management (CRM) and contract work. Working with Jennifer (Musil) Kolb, another undergraduate, we supervised a crew of 18. While our survey didn’t find many sites, I was gratified years later to hear from a colleague that our notes were helpful in reconstructing our investigations and interpreting the collections.

As I approached graduation from Beloit, panic set in. Where was I going to work? What was I going to do? Through some networking with the Kampsville clan, I landed a job back in the “The Valley” on a major highway project. I began as a tech and by the end of the summer, I was promoted to supervisor. I spent nearly two solid years in the field, working on the Kuhlman and Elizabeth mound sites (Woodland mortuary sites in west-central Illinois), excavating charnel structures, crematories, and both central tomb and accretional interments (Figure 2). It was a remarkable opportunity to examine the mortuary practices of different populations and to consider cultural variability in social structure as reflected in burial practices. During that time, I worked with a number of individuals who helped direct me to the Michigan State University (MSU) graduate program.

The MSU program suited my interests. I was inspired by its four-discipline approach and by the faculty. The cultural anthropologists on faculty, as well as archaeologist Chuck Cleland, taught me the value of ethnography. Moreau Maxwell, who epitomized the archaeological generalist, charmed me with stories of working with hunter-gatherers and introduced me to cultural ecology. My major professor, Bill Lovis, not only educated me, but also nurtured and advocated for me.
Following a semester of hunter-gatherer coursework with Maxwell and a summer of survey in Michigan’s Upper Peninsula, I became intrigued by cultural ecology and was drawn to paleoethnobotany. Under the tutelage of the MSU faculty—and taking full advantage of the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC) program offered through the Big Ten Intercollegiate Consortium—I was trained in paleoethnobotany by Dick Ford and Gayle Fritz at the University of Michigan (Figure 3).

I was following a Ph.D. trajectory, and I made it through course work and comps, but I needed a break. The lure of “The Valley,” its archaeology, and students drew me back. I worked as a field school director and then, later, was the Director of Education for Kampsville’s Center for American Archeology. I was home. The archaeology was rivaled only by the people who loved working there and the remarkable beauty of the valley. I took on the responsibility of leading ecology hikes and talking about the use of wild plants. It was through my two years working there that my understanding of prehistoric plant exploitation was solidified, and I realized that my love of archaeology was tied, in part, to the people who enjoy learning about it.

It was also during my days as Kampsville’s education director that I realized how much I valued making archaeology relevant to the public. One of the most memorable experiences of my career came when I gave a National Science Foundation promotional presentation to students at an inner city high school in St. Louis. It was clear from the onset that science and its application to studying prehistoric Native American populations was of little interest to them. So, I turned the talk around on the fly, providing analogies to human evolution and African origins, forensics, and archaeological research related to slaves. They loved it! Someone who spoke to them! It was one of the most gratifying presentations I have given.
Rejuvenated after this two-year sabbatical, I returned to graduate school to finish my dissertation, examining hunter-gatherer diet choice among Archaic and Woodland populations in the Saginaw Valley of Michigan. Initially, I supported myself as an anthropology instructor at MSU, teaching introductory anthropology, human evolution, and cultural ecology.

I loved teaching and, in particular, getting students to think about cultural diversity and get beyond their ethnocentrism. However, student debt and the lure of fieldwork drew me back to CRM, and about a year and half before finishing my dissertation, I returned to CRM. At first, I worked on a project-by-project basis, but soon after, I took a full-time position as project archaeologist/principal investigator with Commonwealth Cultural Resources Group, Inc. (CCRG) in Jackson, Michigan. Interestingly, I found that the structure of a full-time job and the report preparation it required provided the discipline I needed to finish my dissertation. I completed my Ph.D. in 1993 and continued working with CCRG on projects throughout the Great Lakes.

Then, in 1994, an in-house WisDOT field coordinator position opened up with the Museum Archaeology Program (MAP) at the Wisconsin Historic Society (WHS). I wore many hats there: coordinating field crews, assisting as principal investigator on projects, and directing paleoethnobotanical research for the program.

However, as is apt to happen with archaeologists, I met one and fell in love. I left my full-time position with MAP in 1996, marrying Mark Bruhy, then Heritage Program manager at the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest in far northern Wisconsin, and moving north to join his family. Over the next several years, I continued to do paleoethnobotanical analysis for MAP. I worked on marketing my analytical skills to other CRM firms and returned to teaching, getting a part-time teaching appointment at the local community college in our town. Balancing several jobs, I was able to bring in a full-time income, but I found it tiring, bouncing between teaching and analysis. Fortunately, however, CCRG was looking to open an office in Wisconsin and I was looking for a full-time position that afforded advancement.

In the fall of 1999, I opened CCRG’s Wisconsin office in my home. I contacted former WisDOT colleagues I had worked with at MAP, asking for connections in engineering firms that did WisDOT work. I gradually attracted new clients and worked with some from our Michigan office on Wisconsin jobs. I served as principal investigator and project manager, and our Michigan office field staff did the field investigations. In addition to archaeological investigations, we also conducted architectural/historical studies, using our Michigan staff and a Wisconsin-based consultant. Increasingly, clients were drawn to the full-service historic preservation services we could offer.

In 2001, we moved out of my home and into an office in Minocqua. Slowly, we added staff. Our client base continued to grow, but our far northern Wisconsin location provided limited employment opportunities. We found it hard to attract staff whose spouses/partners were also seeking employment. So, in 2011, we moved CCRG’s Wisconsin office to Milwaukee where we were able to hire additional staff.

My work with CCRG gave me the opportunity to remain involved in public outreach. For a week or so each summer, I teamed with my husband co-directing “Passport In Time” projects with the Forest Service on a range of historic and prehistoric sites throughout the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest (Figure 4). It was a great opportunity to reconnect with the public and to pursue mutual research interests with my husband.
I continue to find great satisfaction in my work, managing staff responsible for both archaeological and architectural/historic resources. As my responsibilities have shifted—from the field and analysis to management—so, too, has my focus. Now, I deal more with historic preservation concerns relating to compliance with state and federal laws and evaluating the effects of projects on historic properties. By participating in a number of training programs and a broad range of projects, I have gained a thorough understanding of historic preservation legislation. This enables me, as a representative for the agencies for whom I work, to ensure that significant archaeological and architectural/historic properties are protected and preserved whenever possible.

I also have been fortunate to serve for the past 10 years on the Wisconsin Burial Sites Preservation Board, a state appointment. In this position, I work closely with tribal representatives, the WHS staff, and the public to ensure that Wisconsin’s state burial site law is properly implemented. The Board addresses issues relating to the preservation of burial sites and the disposition of burials and associated grave goods that have been disinterred by project activities that are not under the jurisdiction of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act.

Recently, I became involved in the American Cultural Resource Association (ACRA), whose mission is to promote the professional, ethical, and business practices of the cultural resources consulting industry. I have found their newsletters, annual meeting, and advocacy work to be important sources of information. I also think that for those who are considering a career in historic preservation, ACRA will be an invaluable resource in terms of educating and advocating for the future of our field.

While much of my time now is devoted to project management, I still pursue my paleoethnobotanical research with the assistance of staff whom I have helped train, in part through internships coordinated through the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. Most recently, through participation in a sponsored symposium for the Midwest Archaeological Conference, I had the chance to pull together 20-plus years of research relating to late prehistoric era subsistence practices.

It is now nearly 40 years since Stuart Streuver introduced me to archaeology. When I look back on my career, I think of the remarkable people I have met, the great sites I have had a chance to work on, the site preservation and mitigations I have assisted with, and all that I have learned about peoples of the past. All because of that single school visit! I hope that, at some level, I can and do serve as an ambassador for archaeology and historic preservation, making it relevant to the public, while also protecting and promoting endangered cultural resources.
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On January 11, 2013, an Internet activist, Aaron Swartz (Figure 1) took his own life at the age of 26. Swartz faced severe criminal charges for attempting to mass-download scholarly articles. His tragic death still reverberates around a community of activists that value sharing of knowledge and a free and open Internet. His death also places a spotlight on the ethics of academic publishing practices, requiring us to reexamine how we conduct and communicate archaeology.

The story of Swartz's death involves JSTOR (http://www.jstor.org). Most archaeologists are familiar with the online journal repository, originally funded by the Mellon Foundation. In some ways, JSTOR is a resounding success, as it serves many scholars worldwide, including archaeologists. Unlike many digital scholarly communications initiatives, JSTOR is also financially “sustainable.” It is held up as a model for how to do digital scholarship correctly. It serves a large community and does not have to come back year after year begging for more grant money. JSTOR’s revenues come largely from subscriptions. If you do not have an affiliation with a subscribing institution to JSTOR, you do not get access to the vast majority of its resources. In other words, JSTOR sustains itself by setting up a “paywall.” That paywall blocks some 150 million attempts to access JSTOR every year.

Swartz was allegedly caught attempting a mass download of some 4.8 million articles from the JSTOR repository via MIT’s network. Although JSTOR did not pursue charges, U.S. prosecutors indicted Swartz with criminal hacking, and he faced 35 to 50(!) years in federal prison. Essentially, U.S. prosecutors charged Swartz with cyber-terrorism, all for downloading academic articles in a manner that did not damage MIT’s network or JSTOR (according to expert witnesses involved in the case). According to Swartz’s family, this legal hounding directly motivated his suicide.

This obviously is a tragic case, and another sad example of routine abuse of the legal system with regard to intellectual property and computer crime. JSTOR did not want to threaten Swartz with decades of prison time for downloading articles. But, in the end, that did not matter. He still faced a draconian prison term, roughly equivalent to the punishment for second-degree murder because he allegedly violated network “terms of service” contractual rules that JSTOR put into place around research materials.

The tragic case of Aaron Swartz highlights the ethical urgency of debating Open Access. However, before exploring this topic, we need to first introduce why Open Access (Figure 2) is even an issue. As defined by Peter Suber, one of the leaders of the Open Access movement, Open Access literature is “. . . digital, online, free of charge, and free of most copyright and licensing restrictions.” The World Wide Web makes Open Access feasible by dramatically reducing dissemination and copying costs. Nevertheless, although the Web makes the sharing of content very inexpensive, producing high-quality information, including peer-reviewed literature, remains expensive. Debate over the direction of research publication revolves around how production, editing, and peer-review costs should be financed. The case of Aaron Swartz illustrates the high legal and ethical stakes involved in this debate.
Paywall Dangers and Peer-review Papers as Gray Literature

Swartz’s case shows the dangers of our discipline’s normative practice of fee-based (paywall) access to scholarship. Paywalls, enforced by “terms of service” and strong copyright laws create a legal context with punishments in excess of those dealt to human traffickers. As outrageous as that sounds, Swartz’s case shows how our legal institutions treat violations of network terms of service and copyright more seriously than slavery. It is unlikely that the SAA, the Archaeological Institute of America (AIA), or the American Anthropological Association (AAA) would want to press felony charges or long prison terms if someone illegally downloaded a journal article from one of their servers. JSTOR did not press for prosecution either. Nevertheless, Swartz faced spending the rest of his life behind bars.

Although many archaeologists would be saddened to hear of Swartz’s case, they do not consider themselves to be “hackers.” Writing a program to automatically download JSTOR articles lies well outside the skill sets and inclinations of most SAA members. Nevertheless, the legal implications of Swartz’s case should still worry the SAA and its membership.

Archaeologists regularly lament the inaccessibility of CRM research locked in “gray literature” reports, and a number of archaeologists have worked to make such reports more publicly available. Yet, to anyone outside of journal paywalls, mainstream publications are as inaccessible as gray literature. Many researchers, particularly our colleagues in public, CRM, and contract archaeology or those struggling as adjunct faculty, either totally lack or regularly lose affiliations with institutions that subscribe to paywall resources such as JSTOR. Many of these people beg logins from their friends and colleagues lucky enough to have access. Similarly, file-sharing of copyright-protected articles is routine. Email lists and other networks regularly see circulation of papers, all under legally dubious circumstances.

Many of us have encountered these underground networks for sharing research but have not considered the risks associated with sharing research outside of official channels. To note that this situation endangers many SAA members is no hyperbole. While Table 1 provides much more background information, below we highlight some of the legal risks involved in conventional publishing:

- Sharing logins to gain access to university library systems can involve grave legal risks. It violates the same sort of violations of terms-of-service that made Aaron Swartz face up to 50 years in prison. For instance, JSTOR’s terms of service (that Swartz allegedly violated in his felony charges) specifically prohibit actions such as sharing logins.
- Sharing papers (mainly in email, but also social networking sites) also carries risks, mainly in civil and not criminal law. This could change if the “Stop Online Piracy Act” (SOPA) passes, making many more copyright crimes felonies. Already, mass copyright lawsuits with financially ruinous penalties happen—even involving 100,000 people at a time, including children.
- Law Professor John Tehranian (2007) published a study in which he calculated a jaw-dropping $4.5 billion (the “b” is no typo!) in potential copyright liability involved in routine academic research and instructional activities over the course of a single year.

Copyright has expanded over the years into a more-or-less absolute and perpetual property right. In fact, no U.S. copyrighted works entered into the public domain last year. It is already illegal for even libraries to circumvent technological copyright protections (DRM) to archive and preserve electronic books and
### Table 1. Informative Links

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Links and References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>JSTOR</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  - Jennifer Howard, writing for the Chronicle of Higher Education, on JSTOR’s access issues: [http://chronicle.com/blogs/wiredcampus/jstor-tests-free-read-only-access-to-some-articles/34908](http://chronicle.com/blogs/wiredcampus/jstor-tests-free-read-only-access-to-some-articles/34908)  
  - JSTOR’s terms of service: [http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp](http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp) |
| **Aaron Swartz’s criminal case and death** |  
  - MIT’s paper The Tech on Swartz’s indictment: [http://tech.mit.edu/V131/N30/swartz.html](http://tech.mit.edu/V131/N30/swartz.html)  
| **Open Access** |  
  - A canonical definition of Open Access by Peter Suber: [http://legacy.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/brief.html](http://legacy.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/brief.html)  
  - Special issue on Open Access in archaeology, edited by Mark Lake, published in the paywall journal World Archaeology: [http://www.tandfonline.com/toc/rwar20/44/4](http://www.tandfonline.com/toc/rwar20/44/4)  
  - Office of Science and Technology Policy (Whitehouse) open access memorandum: [http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/ostp/ostp_public_access_memo_2013.pdf](http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/ostp/ostp_public_access_memo_2013.pdf)  
  - Nature’s editor on open access: [http://www.guardian.co.uk/science/2012/jun/08/open-access-research-inevitable-nature-editor](http://www.guardian.co.uk/science/2012/jun/08/open-access-research-inevitable-nature-editor)  
  - Summary of AAA issued a report (available only to AAA members) on the lack of sustainability of open access in anthropology: [http://aaanet.org/press/an/0507/davis.html](http://aaanet.org/press/an/0507/davis.html)  
  - Mixed reactions to the Finch Report (UK) open access recommendations: [http://legacy.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/newsletter/09-02-12.htm#uk-ec](http://legacy.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/newsletter/09-02-12.htm#uk-ec) |
| **Law and “Terms of Service”** |  
  - The Electronic Frontier Foundation (EFF), a civil liberties group, on Terms of Service: [https://www.eff.org/deeplinks/terms-of-%28ab%29-use](https://www.eff.org/deeplinks/terms-of-%28ab%29-use) |
| **Copyright’s expanding scope** |  
  - How copyright term extensions led to nothing entering the public domain in the US: [http://web.law.duke.edu/cspd/publicdomainday](http://web.law.duke.edu/cspd/publicdomainday)  
  - Mass litigation and massive fines for copyright infringement: [https://www.eff.org/wp/riaa-v-people-five-years-later](https://www.eff.org/wp/riaa-v-people-five-years-later)  
| **Business practices in scholarly publishing** |  
  - Boycott efforts protesting Elsevier’s lobbying for copyright expansions and stiffer punishments: [http://www.guardian.co.uk/science/2012/feb/02/academics-boycott-publisher-elsevier](http://www.guardian.co.uk/science/2012/feb/02/academics-boycott-publisher-elsevier)  
  - Cathy Davidson (director of HASTAC, a digital humanities center) commenting on Swartz’s death and academic publishing: [http://hastac.org/blogs/cathy-davidson/2013/01/15/tragedies-scholarly-publishing-2013](http://hastac.org/blogs/cathy-davidson/2013/01/15/tragedies-scholarly-publishing-2013)  
other media. Worse, Elsevier, the world’s leading commercial scientific publisher, lobbied in favor of SOPA, a bill that would have made copyright infringement, even without a commercial motivation, a felony offense. That would have put many routine library activities, including preservation of the published archaeological record, at grave risk.

The evidence is clear that current intellectual property rules carry significant legal risks for everyone. It is worse for researchers at the margins of the profession who lack their own institutional logins. Essentially, paywalls create a criminalized underclass of researchers who bend and break rules to participate in their professional community. It is a perverse travesty that we have relegated essential professional communications to a quasi-legal/illegal underground, when supposedly we are a community dedicated to advancing the public good through the creation of knowledge about the past. Like it or not, this legal context shapes academic communication and shapes its ethics.

Moving beyond Narrow Visions of Sustainability

If you are lucky enough to have a stable university affiliation, copyright and terms-of-service issues may seem removed from your reality or daily concerns. University libraries typically insulate faculty from the escalating costs of publication because libraries, not faculty, do the purchasing (or, more truthfully, the renting, because once a library stops subscribing, access to back issues also ceases) of access to commercial and semi-commercial publication repositories. Faculty members take access largely for granted. This mindset is pervasive. We are certain that many reading this paper may dismiss its concerns thinking: “If it ain’t broke, don’t fix it.”

But publication is broken and desperately needs to be fixed.

Recently, Jason Baird Jackson (2010) asked: “Last year, did you get paid nothing to work hard for a multinational corporation with reported revenues of over a billion dollars?” He was referring to scholars that write, edit, and perform peer-review services for journals managed by commercial giants like Elsevier, Springer, Wiley Blackwell, and Taylor & Francis. His question highlights some uncomfortable truths about scholarly communication. Publicly sponsored research, often conducted by scholars at public universities, gets written up, edited, and reviewed without direct compensation, only to become commercial intellectual property that universities must purchase, at exorbitant and rapidly growing prices (3–5x the rate of inflation), back from publishers (Kansa 2012). The largest commercial science publishers routinely see profit margins in excess of 30 percent, making the industry more profitable than the oil business. That profitability comes from dominating the circulation of knowledge—knowledge that is mainly created through public dollars in the form of grant-funded research.

Intellectual property barriers and cost escalations certainly do not help small publishing houses specializing in books and monographs or society publishers such as the SAA. The cost escalations of the big commercial science publishers translate to fewer funds to buy humanities and social science books and journals (Davidson 2013). It is self-defeating for archaeology’s professional societies to fight Open Access, since they are simply helping to perpetuate cost-escalations in the areas of publishing in STEM (science, technology, engineering and medicine) fields that university administrators prioritize over the humanities and social sciences. Our professional societies need to consider this larger economic reality when determining their positions on Open Access (Kansa 2012).

The negative impact of publication’s costs increases and other dysfunctions diffuse widely, making them difficult for faculty to notice. But they do contribute to the general bloat of overhead and costs that leaves less room and money for teaching and research. In a recent case, Cambridge University Press, Oxford University Press, and SAGE Publishers sued Georgia State University (GSU) over e-reserves to curtail “fair use” (limitations in copyright law to allow research, instruction, critique, and free speech). The suit was dismissed, but at the cost of over $3 million in legal fees to GSU. In dismissing the case and siding with GSU, the judge ordered the plaintiffs to cover the university’s legal fees. However, the publishers
have filed appeals, and the legal bills continue to pile up as the matter remains unresolved. Depending on the outcome of the appeals, GSU may still end up saddled with the high costs of defending “fair use” from legal challenge.

For perspective, $3 million could have fully endowed a new professorial chair in archaeology, relieved some student debt, funded research, bought archaeological monographs, or supported new high-quality, peer-reviewed Open Access publishing venues. Worse, the high costs and risks of defending against such charges, even when dismissed(!), creates a chilling effect across all higher education institutions. Fair use has a great deal of ambiguity, making it very risky to defend in court (Lessig 2004:187). Although the publishers lost in the first round of this case, they still signaled to universities the threat of future litigation. This will no doubt motivate university administrators to make it much more cumbersome and costly for faculty and students to exchange publications in instructional settings.

The Georgia State case highlights the dangers of thinking too narrowly about “sustainability.” Fixating on narrowly defined notions of sustainability leads to what economists call a collective action problem. Each individual project or organization tries to survive so they have a strong incentive to monetize their intellectual property (via paywalls and absolutism in copyright). Damaging negative externalities (legal risks and costly barriers) are problems for others. Thus, the current system pits the interests of professional societies and publishers against those of society members, students, adjuncts, CRM researchers, libraries, funding agencies, and the public.

Despite all of these dysfunctions, professional societies representing archaeology typically undermine or avoid Open Access and cling to paywalls. They do so out of fear, not malice. They worry that a loss of subscription revenue will make it impossible to support editing and peer-review activities essential to quality publication. They also worry that they will lose dues-paying members should publications be openly available. Although these are valid concerns, Open Access financing models and years of experimentation teach us that the status quo of paywalls need not be an ugly necessity (Suber 2012:Chapter 7). Some points:

- **Green Open Access.** In a February 22, 2013 statement, the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP 2013) endorsed a “green” model of Open Access, where copies of peer-review publications become available in Open Access repositories after an embargo period. Green Open Access enables publishers to profit on exclusive access for a limited time. Unfortunately, most green models have a limitation in that even after articles are publicly available, they are still under “all rights reserved” copyright. This can still inhibit reuse and make reuse costly and legally risky. Routine reuse such as duplication of a previously published image for comparison as well as innovative approaches such as text-mining still can be stymied in costly and complex licensing and permissions negotiations (Kansa 2012). Nevertheless, green models will surely be an important step forward from the current status quo.

- **Article processing fees (Gold Open Access).** Article processing fees, such as the $1,350 charged by the Public Library of Science (PLoS) for immediate, free-of-charge, Open Access publishing in their peer-reviewed journals, represent the most widely known model. This level of expense is far too high for archaeology, a field struggling with limited grant budgets (which rarely include funds for publication). But smaller, author-side fees may be feasible by subsidizing publication costs from other sources. Such subsidies may be an ethical necessity, since any fee to publish represents a barrier. Publication fee structures may need to be modeled like SAA membership dues, with different costs charged to researchers at different career stages and affiliations.

- **Membership fees.** PeerJ, an important new commercial publisher, thinks it can make a profit by publishing free and open peer-review papers financed with only $495 in membership dues levied on contributing authors per year. That price-point has greater feasibility than PLoS charges, but most archaeologists will still need subsidized support. The recently launched PeerJ is currently only focusing on biomedical sciences, so its application to archaeology needs more investigation.

- **Redirection and subsidies.** The points above indicate that subsidies likely need to play an important role in financing Open Access. The most obvious source for such subsidies comes from redirecting
library subscription income to directly underwrite Open Access publication costs. The particle physics community recently made this shift: libraries, physics journals, and other stakeholder came together to form the SCOAP3 (http://scoap3.org/) consortium that now directly finances Open Access publishing. This kind of approach needs to be explored for archaeology.

Open Access does not represent an unachievable, utopian position. On the contrary, Open Access is a viable strategy to overcome a myriad of dysfunctions plaguing academic publishing that range from extremism in copyright to price-gouging by monopolistic publishers. Our professional societies serve their memberships poorly when they call into question the financial feasibility and sustainability of Open Access without addressing or even acknowledging the dysfunctions of the current publishing status quo. Even Harvard University, the wealthiest academic institution in the world (and an organization not known for its radicalism), claims that it can no longer afford scholarly publications. Harvard recently began urging its faculty to publish in Open Access venues. The editor of Nature, one of the most prestigious titles in scientific publishing, also believes a shift to Open Access is inevitable.

Despite all of these recent developments, the leadership of the SAA, AIA, and AAA still cling to the notion that Open Access represents a threat to sustainability. We disagree, and argue that paywall business models show signs of deep trouble when they motivate suing customers (as illustrated in the GSU case) and out-pricing even the deepest pockets of Harvard University.

**Leadership and the Public Interest**

The authors of this paper are all very well aware of the costs of publication. Two of us (Kansa and Whitcher Kansa) run Open Context (http://opencontext.org), an Open Access publisher of archaeological data. Developing and undertaking editorial and peer-review processes to publish higher-quality archaeological data provides us with a good understanding of the real labor costs involved in publication. Goldstein, a former editor of *American Antiquity*, one of the flagship journals in archaeology, also has substantial experience and expertise with the cost and effort required in publication.

However, publication costs make up only a fraction of the larger costs of doing quality archaeological research. Good research requires costly training, facilities, access to remote locations, workers, labs, equipment, curation, and site conservation. Often, these costs are financed through public funding or publicly regulated philanthropy. But even in cases where research costs are not directly financed through public support, field work is a highly regulated activity. Archaeological field work is almost universally governed or, in the case of cultural resource management (CRM), mandated by public laws and agencies.

In other words, there is a clear public interest in archaeological research, and it extends to the dissemination of that research. In recognition of this, archaeological dissemination practices should work toward building public knowledge goods. The Open Access critique of status quo publishing is that conventional publishing models subvert the public interest and do not produce public goods, despite public mandates and financing of research. Conventional publishing channels public support of research exclusively into private hands.

Archaeology’s professional societies should not be dragged kicking and screaming toward sharing the outcomes of their publicly supported and publicly regulated research. If archaeology does not seriously engage with the Open Access issue, it runs the risk of alienating many of its stakeholders. Granting agencies, libraries, universities, the press, and members of the public all increasingly recognize the costs and other dysfunctions of paywalls and restrictive intellectual property barriers in scholarship. We see clear evidence for increasing pressure and momentum for change. In response to a White House petition, signed by over 65,000 people, the Obama administration recently announced a new policy directing all federal granting agencies to require Open Access to peer-review papers within a year of publication. In addition, the “Fair Access to Science and Technology Research Act” (FASTR) is now working its way through Congress, and there are similar bills pending in the legislatures of three states.
Archaeology needs to better acknowledge and adapt to this new reality (Lake 2012). Not all models of Open Access would necessarily be in the interests of the SAA or its members. For example, the UK government-sponsored Finch Report recommended some Open Access policies that may be very difficult to apply in the cash-strapped humanities and social sciences. That is why the SAA and other professional societies representing archaeologists need to step ahead of the issue. Instead of entrenching themselves in a moribund and unsustainable status quo of paywalls, archaeological societies should take the opportunity to help shape policies that implement Open Access in a manner that promotes and does not diminish our discipline.

Recommendations for the SAA

The transition to Open Access will not be easy, but it is necessary. Fortunately, the SAA can take some immediate, if incremental, steps to address the challenge of improving publication and making it more equitable. Below we list some recommendations to guide the SAA to better align the communication of archaeological research to the SAA’s own ethical principles, many of which read like a call for Open Access:

• **Gain experience with Open Access.** The SAA needs to better understand the opportunities and costs associated with Open Access. It needs to experiment and learn exactly how to run a sustainable peer-reviewed Open Access publishing service. This experience will give the SAA the needed understanding to better articulate policy recommendations to our financial backers. The SAA need not do this alone. It can partner with other societies, university library groups developing scholarly communications infrastructure, or other commercial or nonprofit Open Access publishers.

• **Refrain from lobbying against or weakening Open Access.** Both the AAA and the AIA joined with monopolistic publishers like Elsevier in lobbying against Open Access (Kansa 2012). These actions debase these scholarly societies and put them into the camp of commercial giants that promote oppressive intellectual property laws that further commoditize knowledge; harm research, teaching, and free-expression; and endanger their own memberships.

• **Seek legal protections for researchers, students, and the public.** The SAA also can make a public statement calling for a more equitable and just balance in computer-security and copyright law and in the interpretation of such laws with regard to scholarly works. Legal frameworks governing publication need to better reflect our values and protect researchers, instructors, students, and other members of the public in accessing and using published research.

• **Encourage quality and prestige in Open Access archaeology.** Even if the SAA does not launch its own Open Access titles, the SAA leadership should encourage greater professionalism and professional recognition for Open Access. The SAA should encourage senior scholars to join editorial boards of Open Access journals and should provide peer-review and other services to Open Access titles to increase their prestige, acceptance, and quality.

• **Publicly endorse Open Access as a goal to work toward.** The SAA can issue a public statement that Open Access represents a goal for the organization, even if it is currently not financially feasible. The SAA needs to investigate funding and organizational requirements to sustain quality Open Access publishing and make it a goal to build the public support and financial resources needed to adopt publication models that better promote the common good of public knowledge. In other words, if we cannot finance Open Access with currently available funding, the SAA needs to make sustainable Open Access to peer-reviewed publications the goal of future fundraising and public policy campaigns.

Conclusions

Media industries have pushed for “the best laws money can buy” (Samuelson 2005) and have pressured legislative bodies and law enforcement agencies to enact stricter controls, more intrusive surveillance, and harsher (actually oppressive) punishments for copying. Unfortunately, these laws not only apply to popular music and movies, they also govern scholarly communications. This transformed legal context, together with massive industry consolidation, makes conventional research publishing very different and much more costly and legally dangerous than the pre-Internet era.
Something is obviously very wrong when a majority of researchers lack the means to legally participate in their own discipline’s communications and when university presses sue universities over e-reserves. The current situation works to nobody’s interest, except for large conglomerates such as Elsevier. Professional societies need to openly acknowledge the costs and draconian legal risks of our current publishing model. If Open Access is too difficult to finance with our existing resources, we need to clearly communicate to public and private granting foundations and other financial supporters the damage done by privatizing research and under-investing in the public good. Pretending that all is fine and well with our current pay-wall approach to publishing will do nothing to solve our discipline’s finance problems. It will only perpetuate a crippling and dysfunctional publishing system that enriches monopolistic media conglomerates, commoditizes our intellectual outputs, and deprives us of intellectual freedom in teaching and research.

Open access offers a publishing model far better aligned to our needs and values. It is time for our discipline to work toward Open Access and a more optimistic and equitable vision for archaeology in the twenty-first century.
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1. Gold Open Access is a more open approach, where peer-reviewed papers are immediately available, free-of-charge, under liberal licensing conditions.
MAYBE INDIANA JONES ISN’T SO BAD AFTER ALL
SURVEY RESULTS OF MEDIA INFLUENCES ON LIBERAL ARTS STUDENTS

Ryan M. Seidemann

Ryan M. Seidemann is Assistant Attorney General and Section Chief, Lands and Natural Resources, Civil Division, Louisiana Department of Justice.

In 2006, William A. Turnbaugh wrote a brief article for The SAA Archaeological Record detailing the findings of an informal survey that he had conducted of his introductory-level students in anthropology at the University of Rhode Island. One of the purposes of this survey was to informally gauge the influence of popular culture on people’s perceptions of anthropology. Turnbaugh found that a sizeable number of his students had seen the Indiana Jones and Jurassic Park films and that some of them had been influenced by these films to learn more about anthropology.

Turnbaugh also noted that among the shortcomings of his survey was the lack of insight into whether non-anthropology students were influenced in their preconceptions of the field of archaeology by popular culture versions of archaeology. At the time Turnbaugh’s article was published, I was teaching largely freshman-level liberal arts courses at the Baton Rouge campus of the University of Phoenix. Outside of their campuses in the southwestern United States, the University of Phoenix did not then offer any courses related to anthropology (with the possible exception of an ancient to medieval Western Civilization survey class). This situation, one in which I had access to university-level students with no prior or current exposure to anthropology courses, was the perfect opportunity to fill in some of the gaps in Turnbaugh’s study. Thus, over the next three years, I surveyed over 200 students with questions similar to those used by Turnbaugh. Admittedly, my survey, like Turnbaugh’s, was informal. However, its results are nonetheless interesting as an informal window into the general adult public’s knowledge of archaeology and how that knowledge is shaped by popular culture, at least in south Louisiana.

The survey, which was structured similarly to that described by Turnbaugh, was handed out to students in the first moments of each of 22 classes in criminal justice, religion, history, philosophy, political science, and sociology that I taught between 2006 and 2009. In each of the 22 classes, every student was given the questionnaire. Rather than polling only certain types of classes, I decided to survey all of the classes that I taught during the 2006–2009 period. Further, the students were instructed to put away all electronic devices during the survey so that the answers would truly represent their own knowledge. The students were given around 10 minutes to anonymously answer questions relating to their knowledge of archaeology (i.e., What is archaeology? What do you think of when you hear the word archaeology?). In all, surveys were completed by 232 students, varying in age from 19 through 60, and the responses differed in some noteworthy ways from those collected by Turnbaugh.

What was most striking was the number of students who responded that they did not know the answer to certain questions or who simply did not answer the questions. Because, as with Turnbaugh’s survey, the questions were open-ended (in order to avoid potential biases from providing a selection of possible answers), many of the answers given are difficult to quantify. However, the unknown/unanswered ques-
tions are another matter. When asked “What or who do you think about when you hear the word archaeology?” 8.91 percent of the respondents had no answer at all. The most popular response to this question did relate (at least in some way) to archaeology. Some iteration of “bones” or “skeletons” constituted 10.04 percent of responses. To this very general question, the references to popular culture were minimal: Indiana Jones (1.41 percent), The Mummy (.19 percent), and Jurassic Park (.09 percent).

Mercifully, only .09 percent of respondents answered “nerds,” as compared to the more politically correct “intellectuals” or “smart people” at 0.93 percent. As best I can tell from these results, a tiny portion of the survey group thought that archaeologists were intelligent and perhaps a bit obsessive in nature, and a small percentage (i.e., .09 percent) expressed this assessment using the derogatory term “nerd” rather than something more complimentary. Interestingly, unlike a few seemingly off-the-wall responses such as “kids I grew up with” (one response) or “hip hop” (one response), the bulk of the responses were related (at least tangentially) to archaeology: history (8.82 percent), science/scientist (7.60 percent), artifacts (6.85 percent), digging (5.53 percent), “old things” (5.07 percent), and fossils (4.97 percent). The remaining 39.32 percent of the responses were comprised of isolated or low-percentage answers, with the notable exception of dinosaurs/paleontology (2.91 percent).

Turning specifically to the influence of popular culture on students’ perceptions of archaeology, the venerable Indiana Jones continues to carry the public’s imagination, even (at the time of the surveys) 25–28 years after the release of Raiders of the Lost Ark. Of the responses to the question of whether the students had ever seen a real or fictional archaeologist in the media, Indiana Jones garnered the highest percentage at 12.55 percent. The number does not appear to have been influenced by the 2008 release of the fourth Indiana Jones movie, with 6.67 percent of the responses coming before the release date and 5.88 percent coming after the release date. The remaining sources with more than one response were: The Mummy (3.53 percent), Jurassic Park (2.75 percent), Discovery Channel (2.35 percent), National Treasure (1.18 percent), Discovery Channel (1.18 percent), Bone Collector (1.18 percent), CSI (1.18 percent), and The Librarian (.78 percent). More than half of those surveyed were nonresponsive to this question (64.71 percent).

Thus, though by a small margin and a small amount, Indiana Jones still represents the primary example of an archaeologist in the media among the sample cohort for this informal study (and likely for much of the rest of the public). The median age of respondents identifying Indiana Jones as an example of an archaeologist in the media was 34 (mean = 35.09), an age consistent with these individuals being grade-school-aged when the first three Indiana Jones movies were released in the 1980s. However, the age range for this response was 20–60 years-old, suggesting that the films have had an impact on the public’s perception of archaeologists outside of the Generation X cohort.

Perhaps a more heartening series of responses to this limited survey came in the form of what archaeology-related television shows these students had watched. Aside from the disappointingly large nonresponsive group (48.20 percent), nonfiction, largely documentary, television venues prevailed in the answers. The five primary responses to this question were: Discovery Channel (16.19 percent), History Channel (12.95 percent), PBS (5.04 percent), National Geographic (1.80 percent), and The Learning Channel (1.80 percent). Of the remaining responses, an additional 7.19 percent were comprised of a collection of nonfiction sources (for a total percentage of nonfiction television responses of 44.97 percent).

Similarly to Turnbaugh’s findings, many of the more recent films with some archaeological aspect to them, such as the Tomb Raider series, barely appeared as responses in the surveys. Also consistent with Turnbaugh’s conclusions, the results of these surveys are difficult to generalize and, without more in-depth interviews, do not provide insight into exactly how the sources influenced students’ preconceptions of archaeology.
While initially disappointing (i.e., I can’t believe that this many people have no idea what I do), the high rate of nonresponsiveness may be an indication that many people are a tabula rasa with regard to their preconceptions of archaeology. This lack of knowledge may be an informal indicator of Turnbaugh’s (2006:25) query: “do mass media really influence our discipline?” It looks like the answer to this question might be: maybe not as much as we would like to think. In the end, the results of this informal survey may serve partially to corroborate Turnbaugh’s hypothesis that “potential and future anthropology students may be choosing to view films with prehistoric themes more frequently than, say, English majors or art students” (2006:25). With an average rate of Indiana Jones viewership of 20.2 percent in his anthropology classes, compared to my students’ Indiana Jones viewership of 12.55 percent, perhaps the general public just is not as interested in such films as are potential anthropology students.

In the end, does this study definitively show that those unable to enroll in anthropology or archaeology classes are less apt to be consumers of archaeology-themed media? No. The sample is too small and the survey is too informal. However, this study does suggest that Turnbaugh’s hypothesis—that those who seek out anthropology or archaeology classes have had more exposure to archaeology-themed media—is at least plausible. Anecdotally, as an archaeologist who enrolled in his first anthropology class solely as a fan of Indiana Jones, I find it at least possible that these media influences are not all detrimental to our profession. If nothing else, though often greatly detached from reality, popular culture does sometimes raise awareness and interest in archaeology among the public.

Reference Cited

Turnbaugh, William A.


EDITOR’S CORNER, from page 2

I am very pleased to include in the current issue several articles previously accepted by Jane Eva Baxter. It has been a delight working with Jane during the last nine months as we transitioned to the new editorship. I also thank all authors for working with us during the editorial transition. Articles in this issue cover a diverse array of important topics, including open access publishing, the public image of archaeology and education, archaeological ethics, fundraising, the Register of Professional Archaeologists, and archaeological history, analysis, and interpretation. I hope readers will find these contributions to be stimulating and provocative. Readers will want to read Kansa et al.’s article on open access publishing closely since, as the authors make abundantly clear, the age of open access publishing is upon us, bringing significant implications that must be considered carefully by the Society for American Archaeology.

On a personal note, I am excited to include in this issue Hawley et al.’s article on the archaeology of Middle Holocene bone beds. One of my early book purchases as an undergraduate archaeology student in Florida was Thomas Shay’s (1971) The Itasca Bison Kill Site: An Ecological Analysis, published by the Minnesota Historical Society. It was the beginning of a career-long fascination with foraging societies and the methodological challenges associated with their archaeological record. While the Itasca bison kill is cycling back into my life, this old site will be “new” to many readers, highlighting the importance of revisiting older collections with new questions and methodological approaches. And once the doors are reopened, we may find ourselves travelling to exciting new places. I am onboard as Editor of The SAA Archaeological Record. Let’s get going!
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Since the first explorations of the 1800s, Southwest archaeology has repeatedly reinvented itself. Some of the shifts were methodological, such as when tree-ring dating and the Pecos classification allowed archaeologists to master time in the 1920s. Other shifts involved changing attitudes toward archaeological sites, such as what happened when the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 led to the evolution of “the Section 106 process.” One encouraging development—spurred by the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990—is the steadily growing dialogue between Native Americans and those who study their ancestors. The outcome is not always restricted to refining how archaeologists study the past, as the recent case of Pottery Mound shows.

Between 1350 and 1500, Pottery Mound was a Pueblo village and ceremonial center on the Rio Puerco west of Los Lunas, New Mexico. In 1954, Frank Hibben started excavating Pottery Mound with the permission of the Huning family, which owned the ranch where the site is located. With Hibben’s encouragement, in 1978 the Huning family donated Pottery Mound to the University of New Mexico (UNM). The quitclaim deed stipulated that UNM could use the property “solely for academic purposes in the investigation and study of archaeology.” If Pottery Mound ceased to have “archaeological value,” the property would revert to the Huning family.

The conditions for transfer reflected attitudes of the time. With the passage of the Antiquities Act of 1906, the rationale for protecting most archaeological sites was to reserve them for professional excavation—which would cause their partial or complete destruction. Only a few visually impressive sites were likely to be preserved in order to inspire and educate the public.

In practice, Pottery Mound’s remoteness (as well as “turf” issues that persisted until Hibben’s death in 2002) discouraged further archaeological research. Instead, the site became a white elephant for the university. The Rio Puerco’s meandering course threatened to destroy the entire site by undercutting the alluvial deposits on which it sits. In 1981, at UNM’s request, the Corps of Engineers built a 200-m long earthen dike in the Puerco floodplain to deflect flood waters away from the site. Since 1981, site loss due to channel shifting has ceased, but the diversion dike has eroded and someday will fail. Moreover, the 11-m drop from the site to the floodplain has powered sheet erosion, soil piping, and arroyo cutting that is creeping into the surviving portion of the site. Based on preliminary inquiries, an effective erosion control program could cost hundreds of thousands of dollars.

The site also was the target of illegal artifact collecting and digging, but enforcement of New Mexico’s antiquities laws was not practical. The remote location meant that most of such activities went unobserved. Even if someone had called the police, it would have taken law officers more than an hour to reach the site (assuming they could get past the ranch’s locked gate and knew where to look). The site survived illegal activities mostly because the location was as remote for law breakers as it was for law enforcers.
The neglect of Pottery Mound reached the point where no one at the university knew how to reach it. Meanwhile, Isleta Pueblo purchased the ranch from the Huning family, so that the university’s nine-acre parcel became an island within Tribal land.

In 2004, with the Pueblo’s help, UNM re-established access to Pottery Mound and began a program of site monitoring and limited data collection. The new work reflected changes in laws, attitudes, and practical circumstances. Before fieldwork began, UNM held an on-site meeting with Isleta representatives to determine which field activities were acceptable to the Pueblo (e.g., mapping) and which were not (among them, new digging). The fieldwork continued until 2011 and provided information that greatly assists in the interpretation of the collections and field records from half a century before.

At the same time, the new activity at the site brought old issues back to the fore. UNM’s inquiries about site erosion assistance led nowhere (e.g., the program that had allowed the Corps to build the diversion dike in 1981 no longer existed). There were erosion control programs that could be applied to Isleta lands, but Pottery Mound’s status as a state-owned inholding precluded their use. Although Isleta was willing to use its police powers to suppress illegal collecting and digging at the site, its officers had no jurisdiction on the parcel where Pottery Mound was located. Attempts to authorize the Pueblo’s officers to cross onto university land ran into insurmountable legal issues. Meanwhile, a telling incident occurred when a cowboy working for Isleta encountered artifact collectors at Pottery Mound and informed them that they were breaking the law. They responded, across the barbed-wire fence, that they were not on Isleta property, and went on with their collecting.

It had become clear that Pottery Mound was threatened not only by its remoteness and by the Rio Puerco, but also by the ownership split between UNM and the Pueblo. In particular, continued university ownership of the site prevented Isleta from developing site protection measures based on resources not available to the university. In response, Isleta obtained the reversion rights to the property from the Huning family and requested that UNM transfer Pottery Mound to the Pueblo. The request gained the full support of UNM’s archaeology faculty. As part of the subsequent negotiations, Isleta was able to show support for the transfer from New Mexico’s other Pueblos. In December 2012, the UNM Board of Regents voted to deed Pottery Mound to Isleta, while retaining access to the site for non-disturbing scholarly activities.

We wish to make note of the transfer in The SAA Archaeological Record because it shows how times have changed. The transfer happened in part because it is no longer possible to think of Pottery Mound as a place to mine data whenever the university wished. Instead, before all else, Pottery Mound is what is left of a village where Pueblo people lived, had a rich ceremonial life, and were buried. During the discussions leading up to the transfer, individuals on both sides of the table often spoke of “giving back” Pottery Mound. Strictly speaking, that is incorrect; Pottery Mound was a gift from the Huning family to UNM, and from UNM to Isleta. But in a deeper sense, those were the right words to use. After losing control of an ancestral village, the Pueblo people have it back. We hope that as debates about site stewardship continue, the transfer of Pottery Mound will serve as a useful example.
NEW DEAL ERA DISCOVERY AND INVESTIGATION OF MIDDLE HOLOCENE BONEBEDS IN THE UPPER MIDWEST

Marlin F. Hawley, Matthew G. Hill, and Christopher C. Widga

Marlin F. Hawley is Archaeology Curator at the Wisconsin Historical Society. Matthew G. Hill is Associate Professor at the Department of Anthropology, Iowa State University. Christopher C. Widga is Assistant Curator of Geology at the Illinois State Museum.

Eighty years have passed since the 1932 election of Franklin D. Roosevelt, which resulted in a series of relief initiatives designed to ameliorate the effects of a global economic depression. Key relief programs included the Federal Emergency Relief Administration (FERA); the Civil Works Administration (CWA); Emergency Civil Works (ECW, aka Civilian Conservation Corps [CCC]); the Public Works Administration (PWA); National Youth Administration (NYA); and, finally, the Works Progress Administration (WPA). To varying degrees, all sponsored archaeological projects, although this was not their primary mission. Even so, the impact on American archaeology was profound (Fagette 1996; Lyon 1996; Means 2013).

In the Midwest, New Deal archaeological fieldwork is only just beginning to be historicized, with laudable recent publications on work in Illinois (McCorvie 2008) and Iowa (Doershuk and Cordell 2013). In Minnesota and Wisconsin, there were surveys, excavations of precontact Native American and post-contact Euro-American sites, and mound restorations, but unraveling the history and impact of New Deal relief agencies in these efforts has hardly begun. Here, we take a step in the direction of documenting New Deal archaeology in the upper Midwest through a review of the discovery and investigation of three major middle Holocene bonebeds. In chronological order by the date of discovery, these are the Nye Bison (47PK206) and Interstate Park Bison (47PK36) sites in Wisconsin and the Itasca Bison site (21CE1) in Minnesota (Figure 1).

In the concluding section, we touch on our work with the extant faunal collections from these sites, highlighting the implications for middle Holocene archaeology and paleoecology, as well as the importance of long-term preservation of scientific collections.

Nye Bison Site

Beginning in mid-1934, FERA sponsored a statewide liming project, which used crushed limestone, marl (a calcareous clay found on glacial lake beds), and sludge from paper manufacturing to de-acidify forest soils for agriculture. Six localities were selected in Polk County,
The liming project’s main goals were to create jobs in the production and transport of marl; animal bone and other materials, including wood and other botanical remains, were gathered incidentally by the workmen and UM visitors. Despite this shortcoming, a sizeable and important collection of bison bones was assembled from the locality. The extant collection is currently curated by the University of Wisconsin Zoology Museum.

**Interstate Park Bison Site**

Interstate Park straddles the spectacular Dalles of the St. Croix River, with units on both the Wisconsin and Minnesota sides of the river. It is Wisconsin’s oldest public park, and like many in the state at the time, it remained undeveloped. The CCC, which was administered by the National Park Service (NPS), took on the task of developing park infrastructure, with Camp Interstate’s (CCC Company 633) workforce of 150–200 men constructing roads, trails, buildings, and sanitation facilities (Figure 2). While digging a pipe trench on August 12, 1936, workmen encountered a number of large bones, stained dark from the surrounding peat (Hawley et al. 2007; Palmer 1954; Pond 1937). The site is located a few miles from the Nye Bison site.

Camp Interstate’s superintendent was Alonzo W. Pond, a University of Chicago trained archaeologist who had conducted fieldwork in France, Algeria, and Mongolia while at Beloit College and for the NPS at Jamestown Island and Mammoth Cave. In a repeat of Nye, a few days after the discovery of the bones, Pond dispatched the camp geologist, Howard S. Kunsman, to take a few specimens to UM, where they were shown to Professor Eddy. The diagnosis was bison, probably the extinct form *Bison occidentalis*.

Pond submitted a request to investigate the discovery on September 1, 1936, and after a delay while the NPS deliberated, excavation resumed on September 21, though now within a grid of 5-x-5-ft units. Saturated conditions necessitated daily pumping. On October 21, workmen made another discovery, this time of a 10.75-in. (27.3 cm) bi-pointed copper tool known as a pike. Mindful of the discoveries at Folsom and other sites, Pond was upset by its removal from the deposits. As troubling for him, though, was the reaction of the NPS to this new discovery, for, to his astonishment, he was ordered to stop digging. Pond had long detested the NPS bureaucracy and interdepartmental squabbling (at Jamestown Island), and when
about this time he was ordered to Omaha to resume his duties as an archaeologist, he refused and resigned instead.

In conjunction with the stop-work order, the NPS dispatched one of its geologists, Chalmers L. Cooper, to evaluate the site. With Cooper present, digging resumed in early November. Within a few days, two additional finds were made: a bison cranium and two small, side-notched projectile points. Samuel Eddy, who, it turns out, was a regular visitor to the site, was present and confirmed the species as *Bison occidentalis*. (Jenks also visited the site.) The small points were a puzzle, as neither even vaguely resembled the Folsom point. How old they were was a mystery, however. The putative age for the deposits derived mainly from the presumptive antiquity of the bison remains. With Kunsmann in charge, a small crew remained active at the site deep into the winter of 1936 (when temperatures dipped well below freezing).

After these latter finds, Pond alerted Charles E. Brown, Wisconsin Historical Museum chief, and W.C. McKern, an archaeologist at the Milwaukee Public Museum. He also pointedly advocated formation of a committee of representatives from the state’s historical and scientific community to oversee and offer recommendations to the NPS. Early in 1937, the so-named Committee to Investigate the Discovery at Interstate Park convened in Madison. Members included Brown and Ralph Linton (University of Wisconsin), as well as the state geologist, a zoologist, and representatives of the NPS and Wisconsin Conservation Department. For Pond, the purpose of the committee was to prevent the NPS from usurping control of the dig and ownership of the collections. The selection of members—representing archaeologists, a zoologist, and a geologist—suggests, though, that in a nod to Folsom, and in the event of additional discoveries, it might also be empowered as a committee of expert witnesses. Incidentally, although the Milwaukee Public Museum made use of WPA funds for improvements, McKern denied the possibility of diverting any to assist with fieldwork.

Hampered by the economic privations of the time, the committee accomplished little beyond commissioning a short report by Kunsmann (1937), summarizing the 1936 fieldwork. Together the committee and NPS implemented a publicity ban until all excavation and analyses were completed. On this point, Pond, who remained in the area and regularly visited the excavations, took issue—much to the consternation of camp and NPS officials. After he snapped several photographs at the site, the acting camp superintendent even tried to block processing of the film in nearby St. Croix Falls! The NPS, though, also ignored the policy, readily permitting Cooper to present at the annual meeting of the Geological Society of America (Cooper 1937) and, perhaps, at the 1937 International Symposium on Early Man in Philadelphia.

The committee and the NPS also agreed on additional investigation, and plans were made for a second season. Kunsmann and a student of Linton’s, George A. Lidberg, supervised the CCC crew once fieldwork resumed in June 1937. During the first season, a block of contiguous units set over a dense part of the bonebed and totaling 1603 square feet (149 m²) was opened. In contrast, information on the 1937 season is scant, as records have not yet been found in the pertinent archives, but the season apparently included excavation of non-contiguous pits and trenches. The full extent of the excavations remains unknown, but may have been as much as 500–600 m² (5380–6450 square feet). Altogether, over 1400 bison, deer, and elk bones were saved—some 300 from the 1936 season and over 1100 from the 1937 work.
In early 1937, the committee grudgingly allowed Pond to present on the finds at the Wisconsin Archeological Society annual meeting; his remarks were subsequently published in *The Wisconsin Archeologist*. Pond (1937:51) argued for an age of at least 10,000–12,000 years, noting that the find “would indicate that the oldest inhabitants of America were skilled metal workers as well as artists in stone.” In spite of this assessment (which was not shared by E.B. Howard, a leading Paleoindian researcher, or even McKern), the work came to an ignoble end. Fieldwork ended in September, but notwithstanding support for a full, final report by the NPS and the committee, none was ever drafted. The committee disbanded in 1940, well after the participants in the investigations had dispersed to new jobs. The copper pipe was donated to the Wisconsin Historical Museum and bones to the University of Wisconsin Geology Museum; these were later permanently transferred to the Milwaukee Public Museum. The two small points disappeared, stolen at the camp sometime in 1937.

**Itasca Bison Site**

Itasca State Park hosted two WPA camps and two CCC camps in the mid- to late-1930s to as late as 1942 (Figure 3). As with Interstate Park, the focus of the various camps was the construction of park infrastructure. Sometime in 1937, work crews rebuilding a bridge on Nicollet Creek near Lake Itasca encountered bones deeply buried in a peat bog. As with the previous discoveries, Eddy’s services were called upon for identification. Pronounced once again as *B. occidentalis*, UM archaeologists and Minnesota conservation officials arranged a dig from July 12 to August 25. Jenks was nominally in charge; however, day-to-day fieldwork was supervised by Jenks’ student Lloyd A. Wilford. Saturated conditions forced nearly constant pumping and the construction of a cofferdam while the dig proceeded. The field crew was staffed by several UM students and 10–12 workmen trucked from the Lake Owaindid WPA camp. While the students drafted maps, made cross-section plans, and took samples, the WPA workers did the digging. Wilford’s (1937) crew excavated four trenches flanking the road and bridge, totaling some 440 m² (4,736 square feet), from which were recovered bones and occasional chipped stone artifacts. Specialized samples were gathered for analysis by a multidisciplinary cadre of scientists at UM and elsewhere. Shortly after the close of the excavations, Jenks (1937:243) published a preliminary report in *Science*, remarking that “the work has rescued some two thousand knife-marked, food-refuse animal bones, with bone and stone artifacts.” Among the species identified were not only bison, but elk, caribou, bear, moose, and wolf, along with fish and turtle bones. Jenks did not offer an age estimate, but in light of the presence of “fossil” bison, he did not really have to by this time. Many equated *Bison occidentalis* with Folsom, even if this and the other bonebeds bore no clear evidence of this ancient culture. Eddy (1937) suggested that these bonebeds were on the order of 15,000–18,000 years old, and no doubt Jenks was in agreement with him.

As with the other two sites, there was no final report on the work, but unlike Nye and Interstate Park, the site was reinvestigated in detail in the early 1960s by C.T. Shay (1971). The 1937 excavations were truly multidisciplinary and anticipated by nearly 30 years Shay’s ecological approach; had the earlier work been fully reported, it would have had a significant impact on archaeological practice. The 1937 and later collections are curated by the Minnesota Historical Society.

**Learning from New Deal Era Legacy Collections**

Our historical research on the Nye, Itasca, and Interstate Park sites illuminates a little known facet of Depression-Era federal funding
and activities in the upper Midwest. Increasingly, archaeologists are realizing the great potential of many New Deal era collections (e.g., Crothers 2011; Means 2013) and we would be remiss to not mention several broader implications of our research on the extant collections, which exemplify the justification for long-term preservation of museum collections in general. Admittedly, each of the collections from these sites is beset by problems that impose analytical and interpretative challenges, but as our results demonstrate, much can still be learned from them. At a fundamental level, the collections constitute a corpus of “hard evidence” for prehistoric mammalian biogeography and provide the irreplaceable empirical foundation upon which ideas about prehistoric human foraging behavior, contemporary management of ani-

Figure 4. Bull bison crania from the Nye Bison site.
Analyses of the remains do not support the inferences offered by Eddy and Jenks (1935), Pond (1937), or Jenks (1937) that these are bison kill-butchery or kitchen middens sites. Bone modifications associated with carcass butchery and processing—for example, stone tool cut marks and hammerstone impact fractures—are not evident. Also, younger and older animals outnumber prime-age individuals. For these reasons, and despite the presence of associated artifacts or putative artifacts, we interpret Interstate Park and Nye as palimpsests where (mostly) bison died periodically due to starvation, disease, or old age, including 42 bison, 9 elk, and 1 white-tailed deer at Interstate Park and 41 bison at Nye. The situation at Itasca is generally similar, but is frustrated by the post-excavation loss of many specimens excavated by Jenks and Wilford and a complex depositional history (Widga 2006). The extant Itasca collection includes 21 bison and a suite of other taxa.

This research examines the timing of the regional extension of *B. occidentalis* into the upper Midwest. This extension is chronologically defined by 14 dates on bone from 7 sites. The easternmost dates are from Anderson Peat Mine, while the westernmost (included here) are from Granite Falls in west-central Minnesota. Based on this information, *B. occidentalis* persisted in the region for about 4,000 years, between ca. 9000–5000 cal B.P., with the greatest presence between ca. 8000–7000 cal B.P. This inference is strongest for northwestern Wisconsin, where the combined dates from Nye and Interstate Park suggest a continuous presence during this period. This chronology relies heavily on the application of recent advances in bone dating to specimens excavated years, and sometimes decades, earlier (Figure 5).

In the Midwest, faunal collections from “wet” sites such as Nye, Interstate Park, and Itasca stand in dramatic contrast to those from roughly coeval “dry” archaeological deposits. The zooarchaeological record for this general time period is generally highly fragmentary and difficult to interpret. While new archaeological sites will undoubtedly be discovered in the future, poor to nonexistent preservation of faunal (and plant) material at such places will continue to be the rule. To this end, wet sites serve as robust, complementary sources of empirical information for elucidating prehistoric faunal exploitation. We contend that substantive advances in archaeological (and paleoecological) knowledge will be derived from such contexts.

Finally, engaging bison as a potential focal prey species implicates the social and economic behavior of early- to middle-Holocene foragers since, for example, fecundity, life history, group size and composition, and division and organization of labor are correlated with residential mobility and base camp activities. Coupling appropriate frames of reference from bison (and other prey species paleoecology) with detailed assessments of tool stone patterning, site structure, site location, site function, assemblage composition, and so on, will enable researchers to make fresh, substantive advances to regional prehistory.
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USING SOCIAL NETWORKS TO FUNDRAISE
CROWDFUNDING FOR THE ARCHAEOLOGIST

Matthew Piscitelli

Matthew Piscitelli is a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Anthropology at the University of Illinois at Chicago and a graduate research assistant at the Field Museum. He is Co-director of the Huaricanga Archaeological Research Project (http://diggingperu.wordpress.com).

Fundraising is one of the most essential steps in running a successful excavation or field survey. In fact, it may be the most essential step. Without monetary support to purchase equipment or feed and house a field crew, an archaeological project is unviable. Unfortunately, the grant application process is time consuming, and larger awards, such as those offered by the National Science and Wenner-Gren Foundations, are extremely competitive. For example, the success rate for NSF applications for doctoral dissertation grants was 39 percent for the 2012 fiscal year (John Yellen, personal communication 2013). While archaeologists at museums, universities, and other major institutions have access to alternative sources of funding like internal awards and private donations, such fundraising opportunities are not available to everyone. Furthermore, some archaeological projects, particularly preliminary fieldwork, may require only a small amount of seed money to get off the ground. Recently, social networking through crowdfunding has become an alternative to traditional manners of fundraising for archaeologists to generate small amounts of financial support for their projects.

In the first section of this article I offer a brief explanation of crowdfunding, list basic terminology, and discuss its legality. In the next section I ground crowdfunding as a financial strategy within the context of an archaeological project. Lastly, I relate my experiences and provide some helpful hints and suggestions for a successful crowdfunding campaign.

What Is Crowdfunding?

Crowdfunding is the collective effort of individuals who network and pool their money, usually via the Internet, to support efforts initiated by other people or organizations (Ordanini et al. 2011). The financial contributions from investors are used to fund both for-profit and non-profit initiatives. This approach to raising capital involves soliciting large numbers of individuals for donations/sponsorship without expected financial return, lending, or investment for profit. Crowdfunding is a popular means to raise money for a wide variety of causes, including disaster relief, artistic endeavors, political campaigns, movie production, computer software development, and startup companies.

Crowdfunding involves three different types of contributors. First, innovators propose an original idea and decide to use crowdfunding as a means to gain access to a group of supporters. This group of supporters, the second type of contributor, is known as the crowd. These individuals take a risk and expect a payoff either in terms of financial returns or the satisfaction of supporting what they feel to be a worthwhile endeavor. The third contributor is the crowdfunding organization that brings the innovator and the crowd together.
Today there are over 450 crowdfunding platforms. These organizations can be divided into basic types. Relational mediators, such as Kickstarter, serve as intermediaries (record companies) to link innovators (recording artists) with supporters (fans). Other companies, like Kapipal, serve as social gatekeepers to facilitate the successful exchange of money between innovators and their existing social networks. Growth engines, on the other hand, eliminate the intermediary role in crowdfunding and use existing financial support to invest in select proposed ideas.

The diversity of crowdfunding organizations can be overwhelming. Nevertheless, careful research into how these platforms operate and a clear idea of your fundraising goals will allow you to pick the best crowdfunding site for you. It is important to consider factors like success rates, payment flexibility, and social outreach. According to the “Stats” section of the Kickstarter website, for example, the platform has yielded $429 million since 2009—the most of any other crowdfunding organization. However, Kickstarter also takes the largest cut. This includes a 5 percent flat rate on all money earned, as well as an additional 3 to 5 percent payment posting fee on all transactions because they are conducted through a third party (Amazon). High rates may inhibit the success of small-scale projects. Furthermore, although project innovators receive 90 percent of the funds raised, if they do not reach their initial goal, all of the contributions are returned to the crowd. Other companies (e.g., Indiegogo and Peerbackers) allow innovators to keep any funds they raise, but may charge a higher base rate in addition to the payment processing fees in exchange for that flexibility. The selection process for inclusion into crowdfunding organizations also varies across platforms. Most, if not all, will ask for a preview of the project to ensure that it is appropriate for general consumption. Only a few, however, will turn away reasonable ideas. Some websites, like Rock the Post, are extremely selective (according to their website, they reject 90 percent of projects), but in return offer personal assistance and crowdfunding advisors to provide tips and suggestions for running a successful crowdfunding campaign.

Given the very recent explosion of crowdfunding as a business approach, legal guidelines have been slow to catch up. It should be noted that I am hardly a legal authority on the matter. Nevertheless, soliciting from the general public is most often illegal unless the opportunity has been filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (within the United States). Non-profits, however, are exempt from such filing but may encounter a slew of other legal hurdles. In 2012, the Obama administration passed the JOBS Act, which lifted a previous ban against public solicitation for private companies raising funds (Jumpstart Our Business Startups Act, 2012). The passing of the JOBS Act has thus made it clear that using a crowdfunding platform is an entirely legal endeavor. Since then, crowdfunding has received considerable legal freedom and continues to flourish in the business world.

My Experiences with Crowdfunding

I first tried crowdfunding as a fundraising technique for my dissertation project after an unsuccessful round of grant applications. Due to the rapid deterioration of my target archaeological site in Peru, the fieldwork needed to begin as soon as possible (Figure 1). Although I had received several internal grants from my university, as well as a few small external ones, it was clear that I needed to think about alternative funding sources.

I have found that whenever I share stories about my discoveries or even mention that I am an archaeologist, the reaction from family and friends is usually one of surprise and amazement. I am sure that many other archaeologists have had similar experiences. The lure of exotic locations and the thrill of new discoveries contribute to the romanticized ideas of archaeology, and this generates considerable interest
across a wide variety of individuals. The individuals with whom we interact on a daily basis likely support us in our endeavors, and may even be willing to do so financially. For me, crowdfunding became a medium to accumulate small donations from those supportive and dedicated family and friends.

After a thorough Internet search, I chose Peerbackers as my crowdfunding platform. I was initially drawn to the website by the simplicity of its design and by the organization’s helpful adviser services. I was also looking for an organization that would dispense the funds that were raised even if the goal was not met. Additionally, the success fee (5 percent) and third-party payment processing fee (2.9 percent) were relatively low. I created a project and listed it on their webpage (Figure 2).

The Peerbackers platform is similar to a social gatekeeper model. While the project is posted, it is the responsibility of the project creator to promote their project and drive potential supporters to the website. I started this effort by sending a generic email message to all of the contacts in my address book. Unfortunately, I did not look carefully at who received the message and who did not. This oversight had both positive and negative consequences. It reached the public relations branch of the American Anthropological Association and led to an interview on crowdfunding anthropology for their “Ordinary Anthropologists Doing Extraordinary Things” podcast series. Unfortunately, my generic email was also received by an automated service that sent my contact information to every car dealership in the Chicagoland area. Consequently, I spent the next two weeks responding to solicitation phone calls and deleting emails inquiring about my interest in purchasing an automobile.

Peerbackers generally tends to rely on the existing social network of project innovators; however, as my project was generating considerable interest, they were able to post my project on their homepage. Advisers from Peerbackers suggested reconnecting with my supporters. Having already asked them once for donations, I was uncomfortable “reminding” them about my project again and did not send supplementary requests for donations. Nevertheless, I successfully raised the equivalent of a small internal grant to supplement my other sources of funding.

Crowdfunding Archaeology

Crowdfunding in archaeology is now steadily growing. For example, DigVentures is an organization committed to raising seed capital for archaeological projects around the world. They have selected the Bronze Age site of Flag Fen in Cambridgeshire, England, as their flagship excavation and—in the spirit of their online motto—they are using crowdfunding to put “archaeology in your hands.” CommonSites is a web-based platform that aims to create relationships among funders, partners, and communities in the heritage sector. Their ultimate goal is to encourage ethical and sustainable heritage practices around the world through crowdfunding conservation-oriented projects. In a similar vein, the Sustainable Preservation Initiative has launched a crowdfunding campaign to save two Peruvian archaeological sites through economic development in local communities.
While the aforementioned projects suggest that crowdfunding is becoming a trend in archaeology, it is still underutilized as a means of fundraising for young scholars who need small amounts of money for expenses like airline tickets or funding a pilot project. Here are a few tips that I hope will stimulate further interest in using crowdfunding as an alternative means of fundraising:

• **Utilize your online network.** The Internet is your greatest source of potential donors. Create a Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn, or YouTube account and spread the word about what you are trying to do.

• **Keep your language accessible.** Your supporters will likely not have advanced degrees in anthropology. Therefore, you should phrase your project in terms that they will understand. Avoid jargon.

• **Answer the “big” questions.** Potential donors will want their money to fund projects that they think are meaningful. If you keep your project goals broad—for example, to study the role of religion in the development of Andean civilization—investors will feel that their capital is going to something that will have an impact on society.

• **Be specific.** Tell donors what their money will be used for, whether it is to buy an airline ticket or a piece of equipment. Tangible results encourage investment because donors can see and follow the outcomes.

• **Aim small.** Keep your fundraising goal under $10,000. Most (85 percent) of donations are $50 or less, and lofty goals require considerably more people for support. It is reasonable to fund projects of $2,500 within a 30 day period with only 10 to 20 backers.

• **Create a realistic tiered rewards system.** Many crowdfunding websites require innovators to create a list of rewards for donors. These rewards are listed along a tiered system with more elaborate gifts for larger donations. Data from crowdfunding platforms indicate that the majority of pledges are from the $50 tier, representing 25 percent of all earnings. The $100 tier is a near second at 16 percent. Lower tiers, such as less than $25, represent only 5 percent of all pledges. It may be best to avoid those small gifts, although a $10 level may be best to encourage any and all participation. Offering simple thank you cards or photos from the site for all donations and handmade local crafts for $50 donations is reasonable. Do not offer to fly donors out to your site in exchange for a $150 pledge.

• **Follow up.** Consider your crowdfunding campaign as a journey and your donors as your companions. In fact, their decision to fund your project likely reflects a desire to participate and, in a way, live vicariously through your fieldwork. Send periodic emails to donors with progress updates and fun pictures. Send thank you cards to show your appreciation for their support. Start a website or blog and even record videos of your excavations and post them to YouTube. By building these new relationships, you are cultivating a network of potential financial backers for the future.
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Professional archaeologists develop their careers in myriad ways. A recent article by Capron (2012) provides a personal description of one career path: college at Southwestern University; summer visit to an archaeological excavation; college transfer to Texas A&M University; summer archaeology field school at the Stacy (O. H. Ivie) Reservoir Project; graduation from Texas A&M (presumably a BA degree in Anthropology); contract archaeology jobs for six years around the Midwest of the United States; move from Texas to Indiana for graduate school at Ball State University; MS degree in Archaeological Resources Management with a minor in Historic Preservation; temporary employment by the federal Bureau of Land Management (BLM) in Wyoming; marriage and motherhood; and permanent BLM employment in Wyoming since 1990. After more than 20 years of BLM employment, Capron became the cultural lead in the State Office for the Wyoming BLM in 2008.

Capron’s career trajectory is not uncommon among registered professional archaeologists (RPAs). This article aims to provide readers with a quantitative glimpse of our colleagues who have chosen to apply to the Register of Professional Archaeologists (Register) by explicating the patterns observed during our tenure on the Register’s board of directors from 2010 to 2012.

Methodology

Each month, the business office of the Register receives applications from across the USA and abroad. The business office then sends the Registrar packages of applications on a monthly basis. There are two forms of applications: the Short Form and the Long Form.

Generally, only the Registrar reviews Short Form applications. However, from time to time, the Registrar may request assistance from the two-member Registrar Advisory Committee (RAC) if a decision is uncertain for any particular application. Additionally, the Registrar may request further information from an applicant if information is incomplete or unclear.

The Registrar and the RAC review Long Form applications. When the business office receives a Long Form Application, a copy is sent to each member of the RAC for review. Each RAC member completes a comment sheet and returns it to the Registrar and the business office. The Registrar then makes the final recommendation. If further documentation is requested of an applicant through the business office, the additional information is distributed upon receipt. During the 2010–2012 period, decisions on Long Form applications usually were unanimous, although in a few instances, the Registrar provided a tie-breaking decision.

For all reviews, the Registrar classifies applications in one of three categories—“Accept,” “Tentative Accept,” and “Deny.” The meanings of the first and last categories are obvious. The “Tentative Accept” cat-
Category generally means the Registrar requests either (a) additional information to sway a final decision toward Accept or Deny, or (b) input from the RAC. Applicants may informally appeal a “Deny” decision and the Registrar may request additional information and supporting documentation on a case-by-case basis.

Results

During the time period under consideration, a total of 566 packets were reviewed. Slightly more applications were reviewed during 2011 (n = 264) than in 2010 (n = 221). During the first quarter of 2012, a total of 81 applications were reviewed. This number represents an increase over the quarterly numbers of the previous two years, if an even distribution is assumed for all quarters of each year (i.e., average of 66 per 2011 quarter, average of 55 per 2010 quarter).

Of the 566 packets reviewed, over 500 were Short Form applications and approximately 65 were Long Form applications. Over the 2010–2012 period under consideration, six to nine times more Short Form applications were received annually than Long Form applications.

Over the 2010–2012 period, 557 of the 566 packets (98 percent) were submitted by applicants claiming the USA as their home address. The other nine applicants claimed Canada (n = 7), Costa Rica (n = 1), and the Republic of Ireland (n = 1) as their homes. Those claiming the USA as their home came from every state, except Iowa and Nebraska, as well as the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands (Figure 1). Californians vastly outnumbered all other applicants (Table 1).

The overall acceptance rate by the Register is very high. Approximately 93 percent of all applications were accepted over the 2010–2012 period. Table 2 shows the proportion of applications accepted each year, also illustrating a somewhat higher proportion of applications accepted in 2011 over the other two years. The top reasons for registration denial include the following:

- No graduate thesis, graduate thesis is not archaeological, or no comparable graduate thesis-like report or publication with robust archaeological content. In some cases, the graduate thesis was purely descriptive without evidence of “substantive data analysis” pertaining to archaeology.

- Insufficient examples and quantities of qualifying archaeological field and laboratory experience. For example, applications were denied if they did not specify the number of weeks spent on each required task.

Some applicants did not have a graduate degree in a field acceptable to the Register and/or substantial graduate education in archaeological methods and theory (e.g., Engineering, Psychology, Public Administration, Spatial Science). The majority of applicants who fell into the Deny category were invited to address deficiencies in their application packets by submitting additional documentation, including a Long Form Application, if appropriate. Additional documentation was requested of those applicants in the Tentative Accept category.

Table 1. Top Three Rankings of USA Home Locations: States, Territories, and District of Columbia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking (by Count)</th>
<th>Home Location (Count)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>California (103)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Florida (n = 32); Arizona (n = 30), Texas (n = 30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pennsylvania (n = 23); Georgia (n = 21), New York (n = 21), Oregon (n = 21)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Proportions of Applications Accepted by the Register, January 2010–March 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Percent Accepted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January–December 2010</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January–December 2011</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January–March 2012</td>
<td>91.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unweighted Average</td>
<td>92.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The majority of applicants had recently graduated with advanced degrees. As seen in Figure 2, most applicants received their graduate degrees in the decade beginning with the year 2000 (n = 272 or 48 percent), followed closely by graduates in the decade of 2010 (n = 213 or 38 percent). The vast majority of applicants during 2010–2012 had MA degrees, followed in abundance by PhD and MS degrees (Figure 3). Applicants with Master of Historic Preservation (MHP) degrees accounted for only 1 percent of applications to the Register.

Almost 87 percent of applicants received their graduate degrees from institutions in the USA. The top three non-USA countries from which applicants received their graduate degrees were the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (UK), Canada, and Australia (Figure 4). The number of UK graduate degrees far surpassed those from institutions in other non-USA countries. This phenomenon is largely due to the fact that one-quarter of these applicants received their graduate degrees from the University of Leicester, which offers several graduate degrees in Archaeology and related disciplines through distance learning (Table 3).

For example, the University of Leicester’s website for the PhD in Archaeology states that “PhD candidates on distance learning programmes can complete their degree in a minimum of three years. Those who need longer to complete their degree can take up to six years.” According to the University of Leicester’s website, there is no difference between the PhD earned through distance learning and the campus-based equivalent. This PhD program requires candidates to undertake a substantial research project summarized in a thesis (at least 80,000 words long) and defended in an oral examination. Prior to acceptance into the program, applicants for the Archaeology PhD track must possess a first or upper-second class honors degree from a UK university or an equivalent qualification from an overseas institution, professional experience in the proposed field of research, knowledge of the material which is to form the basis of research, experience with the methodological skills needed, and access to any necessary specialist facilities. In terms of acceptance to the Register, an applicant with a graduate degree earned through distance learning had to demonstrate the same academic training qualifications and were held to the same levels of field and laboratory experience as any other applicant.

The next most frequent UK institution from which Register applicants were awarded graduate degrees was the University of Sheffield. However, the only graduate degree possibly related to Archaeology offered through distance learning is the MA in Biblical Studies. The online modules do not include rigorous archaeological content, and it is highly unlikely that an applicant with this degree would be accepted to the Register. None of the six applicants possessed this online degree.

As stated above, graduate degrees were granted to the majority of applicants to the Register from over 150 institutions located in the USA. The top 10 rankings in Table 4 summarize those institutions by number of applicants.
One of the key reasons that East Carolina University (ECU) had the highest number of applicants to the Register is that ECU is currently one of only a few graduate institutions in the USA offering an interdisciplinary Master’s degree in maritime history and nautical archaeology. In fact, 67 percent of applications received from ECU graduates during 2010–2012 claimed graduate degrees from this program (with the remainder coming from Anthropology), which clearly distinguishes ECU from other graduate institutions in the USA and abroad. According to the website for this program (http://www.ecu.edu/cs-cas/ maritime/), most graduates have gotten jobs as “Contract Archaeologists, Government Cultural Resource Managers, Museum Archaeologists, Curators, Museum Directors, National and State Park Staff, Conservators, and Teachers at all levels.” Perhaps registration distinguishes these ECU graduates from salvagers and underwater treasure hunters.

Fourteen out of the 15 applicants with MA degrees from Northern Arizona University (NAU) received their degrees in Anthropology, with the final applicant earning a degree in Geography. The reason that NAU’s MA program in Anthropology produces so many applicants is less clear than the ECU example described above. However, the NAU program’s website touts its location on the Colorado Plateau as being an important factor for prospective students to consider, as close cooperation with nearby local, state, and federal organizations and agencies provides increased field opportunities with other institutions, such as the Museum of Northern Arizona, the Navajo Nation Archaeology Department, the US Forest Service, and the National Park Service (http://nau.edu/SBS/Anthropology/Degrees-and-Programs/Master-of-Arts/).

Of final interest to those considering a career as a registered professional archaeologist is the vast range of academic programs from which applicants to the Register have obtained their graduate degrees. Applicants claimed graduate degrees from as many as 61 different programs during the 2010–2012 time period. Figure 5 summarizes the disciplines organized into groups. By far, the largest group of academic disciplines represented by applicants to the Register is the “Anthropology or Other Related” group, which includes degrees in Anthropology, Applied Anthropology, Anthropological Sciences, Anthropology & History, Biological

### Table 3. Graduate Degrees and Postgraduate Credentials: Distance Learning, University of Leicester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Degrees Offered through Distance Learning Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology &amp; Ancient History</td>
<td>PhD, Postgraduate Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology &amp; Heritage</td>
<td>MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Classical Mediterranean</td>
<td>MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Archaeology</td>
<td>MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum Studies</td>
<td>PhD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: http://www2.le.ac.uk/study/ways/distance.

### Table 4. Top 10 Graduate Institutions in the USA, Ranked by Number of Applicants to the Register

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Number of Applicants</th>
<th>Graduate Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>East Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Northern Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Arizona State, Sonoma State, Washington State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Arizona, Eastern New Mexico, Florida State, Texas A&amp;M, West Florida, Wisconsin-Milwaukee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Colorado-Boulder, Florida, Massachusetts-Boston, Portland State, SUNY Binghamton, Tennessee-Knoxville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Arkansas, California State-Long Beach, California State-Sacramento, Hawaii-Manoa, Montana, New Mexico State, Oregon, Southern Illinois - Carbondale, William &amp; Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Alabama-Tuscaloosa, Ball State, California-Davis, California State-Bakersfield, California State-Chico, California State-Fullerton, California State-Northridge, Indiana Pennsylvania, Louisiana State, Nevada-Reno, Oklahoma, Oregon State, Temple, Wichita State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Georgia, Illinois State, Kansas, Maryland, Ohio State, Pittsburgh, San Diego State, South Florida, SUNY Albany, Syracuse, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Brigham Young, California-Berkeley, California State-Los Angeles, California State, Santa Barbara, Central Washington, Cincinnati, Colorado-Denver, Georgia State, Maine-Orono, Michigan Technological, Mississippi State, North Texas, Rutgers, Southern Mississippi, Texas - Austin, Tulane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table 4 data includes unspecified institutions.
Anthropology, Forensic Anthropology, Physical Anthropology/ Bioarchaeology, and Social Science (Paleoanthropology). With almost three times fewer applicants, the “Archaeology or Other Related” group is the next largest and includes the widest diversity of programs, including Archaeology, Historical Archaeology, Industrial Archaeology, Archaeology & Heritage, Public Archaeology, Experimental Archaeology, Nautical Archaeology/Anthropology, Maritime History and/or Underwater or Nautical Archaeology, Applied Archaeology, Anthropology and Applied Archaeology, Archaeology and Ancient History, European Archaeology, Classical Archaeology, Egyptian Archaeology, Egyptology and Near Eastern Archaeology, Interdisciplinary Archaeological Studies, Greek and Roman Archaeology, Mediterranean Archaeology, Human Osteology and Funerary Archaeology, Archaeology and Paleoanthropology, Osteoarchaeology and/or Forensic Archaeological Sciences, Landscape Archaeology, Archaeological Practice, Archaeological Science, Environmental Science-Archaeology, and Geoarchaeology.

Although as many as 60 percent of RPAs are employed in cultural resources management (CRM) in the USA or cultural heritage management outside of the USA (see below), it is surprising that the “CRM, Historic Preservation or Other Related” group accounts for only 3 percent of graduate degrees held by applicants to the Register. This group includes degrees in Cultural Resources Management (CRM), Archaeological Resource Services or Archaeological Resource Management, Resource Management (Archaeology focus), and Historic Preservation.

The “Geology, Geography or Other Related” group includes applicants with graduate degrees in Geology, Geosciences, Geography or Physical Geography, Applied Geography, and Climate Change and Quaternary Studies. Applicants with graduate degrees in History, Art History, Early American History, or Public History were placed in the “History or Other Related” group. Those applicants to the Register with graduate degrees in Maritime Studies or Marine Affairs and Policy comprise the “Maritime” group since Archaeology is not specified in the degree names.

Other disciplines with a geographic or temporal focus but lacking archaeology in the degree names are lumped together in the “Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, Classics, Pacific Island Studies, Prehistoric Forager Ecology” group. The last group, “Other,” includes all other programs from which applicants received their graduate degrees, such as American Studies or American and New England Studies; Land Use Planning Policy or Urban Affairs and Public Policy or Urban Planning, Design Use and Development; Paleopathology or Human Osteology and Paleopathology, Engineering; Spatial Science; Public Administration; and Psychology.

Who Are the RPAs? A 2011 Snapshot

In September 2011, Burrow presented a paper to the European Association of Archaeologists (EAA) meeting in Oslo that sought to characterize the Registrants at that time (Burrow 2011). Where do they work? What type of work do they do? To which societies do they belong? Obtaining wholly accurate information on these and other questions can be done only through a survey process greatly more rigorous than the methods used to generate the data presented at EAA and here. The study did, however, benefit from several previous pieces of research and commentary that provided both data and valuable insights (Altschul and Patterson 2010; Association Research, Inc. 2006; Dore 2004; Jeske 2002; McGimsey 2003; Register of Professional Archaeologists 2003; Snow 2006).
Figures 6 through 11 present the results of the 2011 analysis. Figure 6 shows the basic information on the number of Registered Professional Archaeologists by year from 2000 to 2011. This charts an almost consistent upward trend, with the number approximately doubling from 1,233 in 2000 to over 2,400 by the fall of 2011. While these numbers are interesting, they are of limited value without a sense of what proportion they form of the total number of archaeologists who could be registered if they chose to be. Altschul and Patterson (2010) estimated that there were about 9,000 archaeologists who would qualify for registration in the United States, indicating that the Register could eventually be well over three times its present size.

Figures 7 and 8 explore the role of RPA’s four sponsoring societies in providing the recruiting base for the Register. Unsurprisingly, the Society for American Archaeology, with its large membership, also has largest number of RPAs, followed by the Society for Historical Archaeology (Figure 7). When these numbers are expressed as percentages (Figure 8), it can be seen that about 17 percent of the membership of the sponsoring societies are RPAs. This percentage goes up to almost 25 percent of the SHA, while the Archaeological Institute of America is the lowest with only about 7 percent.

In what employment sectors do these professional archaeologists work? This question was addressed by the simple, although admittedly approximate, method of analyzing email address suffixes (Figure 9). This suggests that over 60 percent of RPAs are in the private cultural resource management sector, followed by educators and then by federal, state or local government employees.

When this data is presented as numeric totals by employment sector (Figure 10), using the figures estimated by Altschul and Patterson (2010), it can be seen that private CRM has both the largest number of archaeologists by total and the largest number of RPAs. While this could perhaps be predicted, what is also notable is the both high total number of government-employed archaeologists and relatively small number of those who are RPAs. This was a surprise because it has been a general assumption at the Register that it was in the academic sector that support was weakest. This might have been true at one time, but no longer seems to be so.

This analysis is presented even more starkly in Figure 11. In 2011, it appears that about 23 percent of qualified U.S. archaeologists were RPAs. This percentage increases to almost 30 percent in the CRM sector, is just under 25 percent in academia, but is well under 10 percent in the government sector. Why do so many qualified individuals choose not to become RPAs? Data gathered in 2005 (Association Research, Inc. 2006:17) indicated a general belief that “the services were relevant only to a group to which the respondent did not belong, or that the Register’s services answered needs that were already being met elsewhere.”

The concern must be to ensure that the Register is not seen as only relevant for, or catering to, some “kinds” of professional archaeologists and not others. The overarching purpose of the Register, it is
worth reiterating, is to promote professionalism in archaeology in all its aspects. As the preamble to the Register’s Code of Conduct puts it, “The privilege of professional practice requires professional morality and professional responsibility, as well as professional competence, on the part of each practitioner.”
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CALL FOR AWARD NOMINATIONS

The Society for American Archaeology calls for nominations for its awards to be presented at the 2014 Annual Meeting in Austin. SAA’s awards are presented for important contributions in many areas of archaeology. If you wish to nominate someone for one of the awards, please send a letter of nomination to the contact person for the award. The letter of nomination should describe in detail the contributions of the nominee. In some cases, a curriculum vita of the nominee or copies of the nominee’s work also are required. Please check the descriptions, requirements, and deadlines for nomination for individual awards. Award winners will receive a certificate. An award citation will be read by the SAA president during the annual business meeting, and an announcement will be published in The SAA Archaeological Record.

Award for Excellence in Archaeological Analysis

Award Description: This award recognizes the excellence of an archaeologist whose innovative and enduring research has made a significant impact on the discipline. This award now subsumes within it three themes presented on a cyclical basis: (1) an unrestricted or general category (first awarded in 2001); (2) lithic analysis; and (3) ceramic analysis. The 2014 Award for Excellence in Archaeological Analysis will be presented in the Lithic Analysis category.

Who Is Eligible to Submit Nominations or Apply for the Award: Any SAA member may nominate an individual for this award. Awardees must be members of the SAA.

Nomination/Submission Materials Required: Nominators must submit a letter that describes the nature, scope, and significance of the nominee’s research and analytical contributions, as well as the nominee’s curriculum vita. Support letters from other scholars are welcome, as are any other relevant documents. Please send submissions to the committee chair.

Nomination/Submission Deadline: January 4, 2014

Committee Chair Contact Information: Anna M. Prentiss, Department of Anthropology, University of Montana, Missoula, MT 59812, tel: 406-243-6152, e-mail: anna.prentiss@umontana.edu

Book Award

Award Description: The Society for American Archaeology annually awards two prizes to honor recently published books. One prize is for a book that has had, or is expected to have, a major impact on the direction and character of archaeological research. The other prize is for a book that is written for the general public and presents the results of archaeological research to a broader audience. The Book Award committee solicits your nominations for these prizes, which will be awarded at the 2014 Annual Meeting of the SAA. Books published in 2011 or more recently are eligible.

Who Is Eligible to Submit Nominations or Apply for the Award: The Book Award committee solicits applications for these prizes. Books published in 2011 or more recently are eligible. In the Scholarly Book Award category, the first author must be a member of the SAA, and all members receive the award. In the Popular Book Award category, all authors may be members or non-members of the SAA and all authors receive the award.

Nomination/Submission Materials Required: One copy of the nominated book must be sent to each member of the committee. Please contact the chair of the committee, Lisa LeCount, for an updated list of the committee members.

Nomination/Submission Deadline: December 2, 2013

Committee Chair Contact Information: Lisa J. LeCount, Department of Anthropology, University of Alabama, 19 ten Hoor Hall, Tuscaloosa, AL 35487-0210, tel: 205-348-3733, e-mail: llecount@as.ua.edu

Crabtree Award

Award Description: The SAA presents the Crabtree Award annually to an outstanding avocational archaeologist in remembrance of the singular contributions of Don Crabtree. Nominees should have made significant contributions to advance understandings of local, regional, or national archaeology through excavation, research, publication, site or collections preservation, collaboration with the professional community, and/or public outreach.

Who Is Eligible to Submit Nominations or Apply for the Award: Anyone may submit a nomination. The committee does not accept self-nominations. Awardees may be members or non-members of the SAA.

Nomination/Submission Materials Required: Nominators...
should submit a current curriculum vita, a letter of nomination, and letters of support.

Nomination/Submission Deadline: January 3, 2014

Committee Chair Contact Information: Bonnie Pitblado, Anthropology Department, University of Oklahoma, 455 West Lindsey, Dale Hall Tower 521, Norman, OK 73019, tel: 405-325-2490, e-mail: bonnie.pitblado@ou.edu

Award for Excellence in Cultural Resource Management

Award Description: This award will be presented to an individual or a group to recognize lifetime contributions and special achievements in the categories of program administration/management, site preservation, and research in cultural resource management. It is intended that at least one award will be made each year and the category will rotate annually. The 2014 Award for Excellence in Cultural Resource Management will be presented in the Program Administration/Management category. Candidates may include individuals employed by federal, state, or local government agencies, museums, and similar institutions who have developed and or implemented public policy, regulations, and ordinances that further cultural resource site protection and historic preservation on a local or regional basis.

Who Is Eligible to Submit Nominations or Apply for the Award: Any professional archaeologist may submit a nomination for this award. Awardees may be members or non-members of the SAA.

Nomination/Submission Materials Required: Nominators must submit a curriculum vita along with any relevant supporting documents. All nomination materials are to be submitted electronically.

Nomination/Submission Deadline: January 10, 2014

Committee Chair Contact Information: Linda Mayro, Pima County Government, 201 N. Stone Ave. 6th Floor, Tucson, AZ 85701, tel: 520-724-6451, e-mail: Linda.Mayro@pima.gov

Dissertation Award

Award Description: Members (other than student members) of SAA may nominate a recent graduate whose dissertation they consider to be original, well written, and outstanding.

Who Is Eligible to Submit Nominations or Apply for the Award: Nominations must be made by non-student SAA members (although the nominee need not be a SAA member) and must be in the form of a nomination letter that makes a case for the dissertation. Self-nominations will not be accepted.

Nomination/Submission Materials Required: Nomination letters should include a description of the special contributions of the dissertation and the nominee's current address. Nominees must have defended their dissertations and received their Ph.D. degree within three years prior to September 1, 2013. Nominees are informed at the time of nomination by the nominator and are asked to submit ONE COPY of the dissertation in PDF FORMAT ON CD-ROM by October 15, 2013 (to be mailed to the committee chair, Katina Lilios). If this format is not possible, please contact the chair.

Nomination/Submission Deadline: October 15, 2013

Committee Chair Contact Information: Katina Lilios, Department of Anthropology, 114 Macbride Hall, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa 52242-1322, tel: 319-335-3023, e-mail: katina-lilios@uiowa.edu

Fryxell Award for Interdisciplinary Research for 2015

Award Description: The Fryxell Award is presented in recognition for interdisciplinary excellence of a scientist who need not be an archaeologist, but whose research has contributed significantly to American archaeology. The award is made possible through the generosity of the family of the late Roald Fryxell, a geologist whose career exemplified the crucial role of multidisciplinary cooperation in archaeology. The award cycles through zoological sciences, botanical sciences, earth sciences, physical sciences, and general interdisciplinary studies. The Fryxell Award for 2015 will be presented in the General Interdisciplinary category.

Who Is Eligible to Submit Nominations or Apply for the Award: Any professional archaeologist may submit nominations for this award. Nominees must be SAA members by the time of their nomination.

Nomination/Submission Materials Required: Nominators must submit a letter that describes the nature, scope, and significance of the nominee’s contributions to American archaeology, as well as the nominee’s curriculum vita. Support letters from other scholars are helpful. Four to six are suggested. Please send submissions to the committee chair.

Nomination/Submission Deadline: February 4, 2014

Committee Chair Contact Information: Ben Fitzhugh, Department of Anthropology, University of Washington, M32 Denny Hall, Box 353100, Seattle, WA, 98195-3100, tel: 206-543-5240, e-mail: fitzhugh@uw.edu

Geoarchaeology Interest Group M.A./M.S. Research Award

Award Description: The Geoarchaeology Interest Group M.A./M.S. Research Award provides support for thesis
research, with emphasis on the field and/or laboratory aspects, for graduate students in the earth sciences and archaeology.

**Who Is Eligible to Submit Nominations or Apply for the Award:** Recipients of the Geoarchaeology Interest Group M.A./M.S. Research Award will be students who are (1) actively pursuing the M.A. or M.S. degree in earth sciences or archaeology (please indicate which on application); and (2) applying earth science methods to archaeological research.

**Nomination/Submission Materials Required:** The application should consist of a research proposal no more than three pages long that describes the research and its potential contributions to *American archaeology*, a curriculum vita, and two letters of support, including one from the committee chair that certifies that the student is conducting the proposed research along with the expected date of completion of the degree. Electronic submissions as pdfs sent to the committee chair are preferred. File names must include the applicants surname or last name and the award (Douglas C. Kellogg Fund for Geoarchaeological Research) must be clearly indicated in the proposal.

**Nomination/Submission Deadline:** November 29, 2013

**Committee Chair Contact Information:** Sarah C. Sherwood, Environmental Studies, 735 University Ave, University of the South, Sewanee, TN 37383, tel: 931-598-3396, e-mail: sherwood@sewanee.edu

**Douglas C. Kellogg Fund for Geoarchaeological Research**

**Award Description:** The Douglas C. Kellogg Award provides support for dissertation research, with emphasis on the field and/or laboratory aspects of this research, for graduate students in the earth sciences and archaeology. Under the auspices of the SAA's Geoarchaeology Interest Group, family, friends, and close associates of Douglas C. Kellogg formed a memorial in his honor.

**Who Is Eligible to Submit Nominations or Apply for the Award:** Recipients of the Kellogg Award will be students who are (1) actively pursuing the Ph.D. degree in earth sciences or archaeology; (2) applying earth science methods to archaeological research and (3) seeking to engage in a career in geoarchaeology.

**Nomination/Submission Materials Required:** The application should consist of a research proposal no more than three pages long that describes the research and its potential contributions to *American archaeology*, a curriculum vita, and two letters of support, including one from the chair that certifies that the student is conducting the proposed research along with the expected date of completion of the degree. Electronic submissions as pdfs sent to the committee chair are preferred. File names must include the applicants surname or last name and the award (Douglas C. Kellogg Fund for Geoarchaeological Research) must be clearly indicated in the proposal.

**Nomination/Submission Deadline:** November 29, 2013

**Committee Chair Contact Information:** Sarah C. Sherwood, Environmental Studies, 735 University Ave, University of the South, Sewanee, TN 37383, tel: 931-598-3396, e-mail: sherwood@sewanee.edu

**Dienje Kenyon Memorial Fellowship**

**Award Description:** In honor of the late Dienje M. E. Kenyon, a fellowship is offered to support the research of women archaeologists in the early stages of their graduate training. An award of $500 will be made to a student pursuing research in zooarchaeology, which was Kenyon's specialty. To qualify for the award, applicants must be in the early years of an M.A. or Ph.D. graduate degree program focusing on archaeology. Strong preference will be given to students in the first two years of their graduate program working with faculty members with zooarchaeological expertise.

**Who Is Eligible to Submit Nominations or Apply for the Award:** Female graduate students in archaeology are eligible to apply, with preference for students in first two years of training working with faculty members with zooarchaeological experience.

**Nomination/Submission Materials Required:** A submission for the Dienje Kenyon Fellowship is required to have 1) a statement of proposed research related to zooarchaeology, toward the conduct of which the award would be applied, of no more than 1500 words, including a brief statement indicating how the award would be spent in support of that research, 2) a curriculum vita, and 3) two letters of support from individuals familiar with the applicant's work and research potential (one of these letters must be from the student's primary advisor, and must indicate the year in which the applicant began graduate studies). The statement of proposed research and curriculum vita should be sent as an email attachment in Microsoft Word to the committee chair. Letters of support should be e-mailed separately by the people providing them.

**Nomination/Submission Deadline:** December 15, 2013

**Committee Chair Contact Information:** Barnet Pavao-Zucker, 1013 E University Blvd, PO Box 210026, Tucson, AZ 85721-0026, tel: 520-626-3989, e-mail: bpavao@email.arizona.edu
**Award for Excellence in Latin American and Caribbean Archaeology**

**Award Description:** The Award for Excellence in Latin American and Caribbean Archaeology will be presented annually to an individual who has made a lasting and significant contribution to the practice of archaeology and/or to the construction of archaeological knowledge in Latin America or the Caribbean. In selecting the recipient of this award, the committee will pay particular attention to the cultural context in which the nominee works and to the different pathways to creating and promoting excellence in Latin American and Caribbean archaeology. The award is open to individuals at any point in their careers.

**Who Is Eligible to Submit Nominations or Apply for the Award:** Any SAA member may nominate an individual for this award. Awardees must be members of the SAA.

**Nomination/Submission Materials Required:** Nominators are required to submit 1) a nomination letter, 2) a detailed curriculum vita of the nominee that includes a complete bibliography of local and international research publications, 3) a brief description of the academic and/or cultural impact of research, publications and other relevant activities and 4) at least two supporting letters; one supporting letter should be from a Latin Americanist or Caribbeanist. All nominations and supporting documents are requested in PDF format to be sent via email to the committee chair.

**Nomination/Submission Deadline:** January 4, 2014

**Committee Chair Contact Information:** Adolfo Gil, Museo de Historia Natural de San Rafael. Parque Mariano Moreno, CP (5600) San Rafael (Mza.), Argentina, tel: 54-260-154632558, e-mail: agil@mendoza-conicet.gob.ar or adolfogil@arqueologiamendoza.org

**Lifetime Achievement Award**

**Award Description:** The Lifetime Achievement Award is presented annually to an archaeologist for specific accomplishments that are truly extraordinary, widely recognized as such, and of positive and lasting quality. Recognition can be granted to an archaeologist of any nationality for activities within any theoretical framework, for work in any part of the world, and for a wide range of areas relating to archaeology, including but not limited to research or service. Given as the Distinguished Service Award between 1975 and 2000, it became the Lifetime Achievement Award and was awarded as such for the first time in 2001.

**Who Is Eligible to Submit Nominations or Apply for the Award:** Any professional archaeologist may submit nominations for this award. Nominees must be SAA members by the time of their nomination, and the strongest nominees will have made significant contributions to both the organization and to the range of archaeological practice that in which SAA members participate.

**Nomination/Submission Materials Required:** Nomination letters should include a letter of nomination, outlining the nominee's lifetime accomplishments, as well as a curriculum vita of the nominee. Additional letters of support are not required, but the strongest nominations, historically, have included a minimum of five (5) letters of support; some have had more than fifteen (15) letters of support. Nominators are required to collate all nomination materials into one single Adobe Acrobat pdf document to be emailed to the committee chair, Dean Snow.

**Nomination/Submission Deadline:** January 3, 2014

**Committee Chair Contact Information:** Dean R. Snow, 409 Carpenter Building, Penn State University, University Park, PA 16802, tel: 814-865-2509, e-mail: drs17@psu.edu

**Fred Plog Memorial Fellowship**

**Award Description:** An award of $1,000 is presented in memory of the late Fred Plog to support the research of a graduate student with ABD who is writing a dissertation on the North American Southwest or northern Mexico or on a topic, such as culture change or regional interactions, on which Fred Plog did research.

**Who Is Eligible to Submit Nominations or Apply for the Award:** All student members of SAA in good standing who are ABD by the time the award is made at the Annual Meeting of the SAA are eligible to apply for the award.

**Nomination/Submission Materials Required:** The application consists of 1) a research proposal no more than three pages long that describes the research and its potential contributions to American archaeology, 2) a curriculum vita, and 3) two letters of support, including one from the dissertation chair that indicates the expected date of completion of the dissertation.

**Nomination/Submission Deadline:** December 9, 2013

**Committee Chair Contact Information:** Maxine McBrinn, Curator of Archaeology, Museum of Indian Arts and Culture, P.O. Box 2087, Santa Fe, NM 87504-1260, tel: 505-476-1260, e-mail: maxine.mcbrinn@state.nm.us

**Award for Excellence in Public Education**

**Award Description:** This award acknowledges excellence in the sharing of archaeological information with the public. The award is conferred on a rotating, 3-year cycle of categories
between curriculum, community, and media and information technology. The 2014 Award for Excellence in Public Educa-
tion will be presented in the Curriculum category.

Who Is Eligible to Submit Nominations or Apply for the Award: Any member of SAA may submit a nomination file, although awardees are not required to be members of the SAA.

Nomination/Submission Materials Required: Nominators will work with the Chair to assemble a nomination file that will include 1) the nomination form and 2) a formal letter of nomination that identifies the nominee and summarizes their accomplishments. These accomplishments should be contextualized by addressing the following types of questions: How does it fit within the practice of public education and archaeology? What is the impact on relevant publics beyond the discipline of archaeology (general public, special interest groups, pre-collegiate or non-traditional students, others)? In addition, the nomination file should include a copy (or samples) of the specific achievement and supporting materials that document results. This material should clearly demonstrate the case being in the nomination letter. For example, supporting evidence might document the impact of a specific program in terms of the numbers of the public involved, personnel qualifications and deployment, the frequency or longevity of programs offered, formal evaluation results, and/or feedback from the audience. Endorsements from secondary nominators are welcomed (please, no more than three). Prior nomination does not exclude consideration of a nominee in subsequent years. Designers of programs or products may nominate their own work. Electronic submissions are encouraged. If a nomination package is mailed, six (6) copies of the nomination package (including supporting materials) must be submitted.

Other Special Requirements: The Committee Chair of the committee will work with nominators to ensure a complete nomination. Nominators are encouraged to contact the Chair by November 1, 2013 to begin this process.

Nomination/Submission Deadline: January 10, 2014

Committee Chair Contact Information: Lynn M. Alex, 5 The Woods NE, Iowa City, IA 52240, tel: 319-338-3770, e-mail: lynn-alex@uiowa.edu

Gene S. Stuart Award

Award Description: An award of $2,000 is made to honor outstanding efforts to enhance public understanding of archaeology, in memory of Gene S. Stuart (1930-1993), a writer and managing editor of National Geographic Society books. The award is given to the author of the most interesting and responsible original story or series about any archaeological topic published in a newspaper or magazine.

Who Is Eligible to Apply or Submit Nominations: The award is given to single or multiple authored articles, stories, or series of stories published in newspapers or magazines. The emphasis is on publications available to the general public (rather than limited distribution newsletters), and online publications are not excluded. The award honors good writing that brings awareness of archaeology to the public eye. Nominations can be submitted by authors themselves, by magazine/newspaper editors, or by readers. Authors or newspaper editors will work with the committee chair to assemble and submit a nomination file. Awardees may be members or non-members of the SAA.

Nomination/Submission Materials Required: Nominators will work with the committee chair to assemble a nomination file that will include the nominated article, which should have been published within the calendar year of 2013. An author/newspaper editor may submit no more than five stories or five articles from a series. Nomination packets may be submitted electronically as PDFs via email to the committee chair. If submitting hard copies, six copies of each entry must be submitted by the author or an editor of the newspaper.

Nomination/Submission Deadline: January 10, 2014

Committee Chair Contact Information: Kirk D. French, Department of Anthropology, 120 Carpenter Building, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802, tel: 814-865-1142, e-mail: kirkdfrench@psu.edu

Student Paper Award

Award Description: This award recognizes an outstanding student conference paper based on original research.

Who Is Eligible to Submit Nominations or Apply for the Award: All student members of SAA in good standing whose paper abstract has been accepted by the SAA for the upcoming annual meeting are eligible to participate. All co-authors must be students, and the first author must be a member of the SAA. All co-authors share the award.

Nomination/Submission Materials Required: The paper abstract must be accepted by SAA for the upcoming annual meeting. All co-authors must be students, and the first author must be a member of the SAA. The paper must be double-spaced, with 1-inch margins and 12-pt font. Please do not submit raw data unless they are to be presented as part of the paper itself. An average 15-minute paper is approximately 8 pages long (double-spaced, not including references cited). Any paper longer than this will be docked points.

The student must submit electronic copies of 1) a separate title page with name and full contact information; 2) the conference paper containing slide call outs and references; and 3) pdfs of all PowerPoint slides, with numbered captions, to
be used in the oral presentation. Please DO NOT put your name anywhere besides the cover sheet so that your paper may be reviewed anonymously by the committee. Please send submissions to the committee chair.

The student must have a faculty or supervisory sponsor review the paper before the student submits it to the Student Paper Award Committee. The faculty/supervisory sponsor must send an email to the submission address at the time of paper submission saying that he/she has read and approved the paper being submitted.

Nomination/Submission Deadline: March 15, 2014

Committee Chair Contact Information: Lynn Fisher, Department of Sociology/Anthropology, University of Illinois Springfield, 1 University Plaza, MS UHB 3038, Springfield, IL 62703, tel: 217-206-7938, e-mail: lfish1@uis.edu

Student Poster Award

Award Description: This award acknowledges the best student presentation of archaeological research in poster sessions. Student posters will be evaluated as electronic submissions made directly to the Student Poster Award committee.

Who Is Eligible to Apply or Submit Nominations: All student members of SAA in good standing whose poster abstract has been accepted by the SAA for the upcoming annual meeting are eligible to participate. All co-authors must be students, and the first author must be a member of the SAA. All co-authors receive the award.

Nomination/Submission Materials Required: The poster abstract must be accepted by SAA for the upcoming annual meeting. A student must be the primary author of the poster. The poster must be submitted to the Poster Award Committee Chair as an electronic entry.

Nomination/Submission Deadline: March 1, 2014

Committee Chair Contact Information: Brett A. Houk, Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Social Work, Texas Tech University, Box 41012, Lubbock, TX 79409-1012, tel: 806-742-2400 (x234), e-mail: brett.houk@ttu.edu

Resident Scholar Fellowships Offered

Fellowships are awarded to scholars who have completed their research and who need time to complete books or doctoral dissertations on topics of anthropological interest.

- Tenure from Sept 1, 2014–May 31, 2015
- Includes stipend and low-cost housing

Deadline is November 1, 2013

Resident Scholar Program
School for Advanced Research
PO Box 2188, Santa Fe, NM 87504
(505) 954-7201 • e-mail: scholar@sarsf.org

scholar.sarweb.org

Artifact Casting

Northeast Archaeology Research Center, Inc.

Farmington • Maine • USA

The NE ARC casting lab produces highly detailed, museum quality artifact casts of a wide range of objects. Molds are made of silicone rubber and the casts are poured with dental plaster or plastic resin and then hand-painted or colored to match the actual object. We have successfully cast hundreds of objects including, for example, flaked and ground stone tools such as projectile points, adzes, axes and gouges; individual ceramic sherds and whole pots; and coins and other metal objects.

Call us or email today to learn more at:

207-860-4032
nearch@nearchaeology.com
www.nearchaeology.com

facebook
Pat’s characteristics as a mentor and teacher par excellence were to provide gentle support at every stage of a student’s career, as he mixed humor with encouragement for their projects. He actively published with students, stressed the value of simple sentences without jargon, and exhibited professionalism at all times. Pat insisted that his students needed a cross-cultural perspective to truly understand the ancient Maya. When not talking archaeology with colleagues and students, he would happily discuss the latest performances of operas in Tucson and Santa Fe or the Arizona Wildcat basketball team or his favorite Dunkin’ Donuts.

In 1965, Pat helped to organize and publish the results of the First Lowland Maya Ceramics Conference held in Guatemala City. Pat loved working in Guatemala and with Guatemalan colleagues whom he respected and who reciprocated their appreciation for Pat’s work and friendship. His final publication in 2007 (Culbert and Rands, *Latin American Antiquity* 18(2):181–190) was also a milestone: it reflected on the important changes in our analytical toolkit for Maya ceramics. Many of these advances were the result of Pat’s contributions, coming full circle some four decades later. Pat’s academic and personal legacy remains not only in his impressive body of research and publications, but also in the generations of scholars he has mentored and who revere him.

Pat married Barbara (Bobbi) Baker, whom he met at the University of Chicago in 1958. Bobbi’s own career as an opera and theater costumer and artist enriched Pat’s life immeasurably. He is survived by Bobbi, their four children, nine grandchildren, and three great-grandchildren. Pat died in Santa Fe on March 28, 2013, surrounded by his family and friends. *Que te vas bien*, Pat.

Laura J. Kosakowsky
School of Anthropology
University of Arizona

Norman Yoffee
Department of Near Eastern Studies
University of Michigan

Note: We thank Bobbi Culbert for her help with biographical details.
Paleoindian research has lost a significant benefactor. Over the past three decades, Paleoindian investigations have been advanced by the most generous private contributions of the late Joseph L. Cramer and his wife Ruth. They set up $1-million research funds at several institutions for the purpose of searching for evidence of the earliest Americans. Joe was a retired petroleum geologist and oil producer who wanted to ensure that the search for the First Americans was based heavily on a geologic approach, hence, his private support for geoarchaeology. Find strata of the right geologic age and test them—was his approach.

I first met Joe at the Hell Gap site in the early 1990s. He asked George Frison and me to join him in a private conversation in one of the camp trailers, during which he said, “I want to give another million dollars to an institution for searching for evidence of the earliest Americans, but you fellows are too old. I want your suggestion of a deserving young Paleoindian archaeologist,” or words to that effect. At the time, there was little knowledge of who this might be. The result was the Quest Fund at Southern Methodist University, which joined the Kokopelli Fund at Montana State University and the Sundance Fund at the University of Nevada. Other funds came later, including the Argonaut Archaeological Research Fund at the University of Arizona and significant support for the Center for the Study of the First Americans.

Despite George and me being “too old,” Joe did support, to a degree, the George C. Frison Institute at the University of Wyoming and my radiocarbon pretreatment laboratory at the University of Arizona for a few years. I know of no other individual who has done as much for Paleoindian geoarchaeology as Joe Cramer. His legacy will endure as his contributions are acknowledged in research reporting and by graduate student funding.

C. Vance Haynes
Regents Professor Emeritus
COMPANY: UNIVERSITY AT BUFFALO, STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
POSITION: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR IN BIOLOGICAL ANTHROPOLOGY WITH SPECIALIZATION IN BIOARCHAEOLOGY
LOCATION: BUFFALO, NY
The Department of Anthropology invites applications for a position in Biological Anthropology with specialization in bioarchaeology at the Assistant Professor level (tenure-track) to begin Fall 2014.

We seek a bioarchaeologist who conducts research in human biological and evolutionary anthropology. He/She will primarily focus on the sub-discipline of Biological Anthropology, but also intersect with the sub-disciplines of Archaeology and Medical Anthropology and the Departments of Biological Sciences, Geology, or the Medical School. This candidate will be at the core of the Department’s new research cluster in environmental and climate change in relation to sustainability, health, culture, and society in the past and present.

Candidates must have a Ph.D. in hand; active laboratory and/or field research, preferably in Europe, teaching experience; publications in standard or refereed journals; and demonstrated ability to obtain research funds. Faculty are expected to teach consistently at the undergraduate and graduate levels, mentor graduate students, provide service to the Department, and/or University as a whole, and maintain an active research agenda.

Send a letter of application, curriculum vitae, copies of representative publications, and three letters of recommendation by October 15, 2013. Applications must be submitted through www ubjobs buffalo edu/applicants/central quickFind=56242

For inquiries, please contact Professor Sarunas Milisauskas, Chair Search Committee, Department of Anthropology, University at Buffalo, SUNY, 380 MFAC, Buffalo, NY 14261-0026 via email to: apy-facultysearch@buffalo.edu

University at Buffalo, SUNY, is an equal opportunity, affirmative action employer, and provides reasonable accommodation to the known disabilities of applicants and employees. Women and minorities are encouraged to apply.

COMPANY: BRYN MAWR COLLEGE
POSITION: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR IN NEW WORLD ARCHAEOLOGY
LOCATION: BRYN MAWR, PA
The Department of Anthropology at Bryn Mawr College invites applications for a full-time, beginning Assistant Professor position in New World archaeology to begin on August 1, 2014. Ph.D. in hand is required by the August 1, 2014 start date. We seek a broadly trained archaeologist with an active field research program in North America or Mesoamerica, and a research focus on hunter-gathers, agriculturally-based societies, or historical archaeology. Preferred topical areas of specialization include population growth and its consequences, development of trade and exchange, early colonial encounters, social differentiation and the rise of hierarchical societies, material culture, ethnohistory, or the politics of heritage, but other areas will be considered. We expect the successful candidate to be a teacher-scholar trained in the major subfields of anthropology and prepared to join a four-field department. The candidate should be well grounded in archaeological theory and method and able to incorporate students in field research. Teaching responsibilities will include a lower level introductory course and lab, archaeological methods and theory, senior capstone course, and elective courses in the successful candidate’s area and topical specialties. For full consideration, applicants should send by October 11, 2013, a curriculum vitae, cover letter outlining research and teaching interests and experience, and names and contact information for three referees. Send application materials in a single PDF file (electronic submissions only; subject line should read “Archaeology Search”) to: archaeology_search@bryn mawr.edu. Preliminary interviews will be held November 21-23, 2013 during the AAA meeting in Chicago.

Located in suburban Philadelphia, Bryn Mawr College is a highly selective liberal arts college for women who share an intense commitment to intellectual inquiry, an independent and purposeful vision of their lives, and a desire to make meaningful contributions to the world. Bryn Mawr comprises an undergraduate college with 1,300 students, as well as coeducational graduation programs in social work and in some humanities and sciences. The College promotes faculty excellence in both research and teaching, and has strong consortial relationships with Haverford College, Swarthmore College, and the University of Pennsylvania. Bryn Mawr College is an equal-opportunity employer; minority candidates and women are especially encouraged to apply.
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is pleased to announce

the 2013 Patty Jo Watson Distinguished Lecturer:

Robert L. Kelly
Professor of Anthropology, University of Wyoming
"The Abyss: An Archaeologist Looks to the Future"

and

the 2013 Gordon R. Willey Prize Recipients:
Charles R. Cobb and Chester B. DePratter
for "Multisited Research on Colonowares and the Paradox of Globalization"


Join us at the 2013 meeting in Chicago, November 20-24, to celebrate the achievements of our colleagues. See http://aaanet.org/meetings/index.cfm for more details on the meeting and program.
Preview SAA’s Newest Journal Today!

Advances in Archaeological Practice is a brand new, quarterly, peer-reviewed, digital journal addressing the techniques, methods, technology, and business of archaeology. The journal publishes original articles that present creative solutions to the challenges archaeologists face in the ways that they approach the archaeological record to learn about the past and manage archaeological resources.

Visit saa.org!

Preview the first two issues for free and learn how you can become a subscriber.
We Want You! Volunteers Needed for the Annual Meeting!

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

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

Training for the April 23-27 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 Josh Caro at SAA: 1111 14th Street NW, Suite 800, Washington, DC 20005, Phone +1 (202) 559-7382, Fax +1 (202) 789-0284, or e-mail josh_caro@saa.org.

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

See you in Austin!