from saa's new book program...

Ethics in American Archaeology, 2nd revised edition. Edited by Mark J. Lynott and Alison Wylie. This groundbreaking series of papers explores the myriad issues facing archaeologists as archaeological sites become more well known and the preservation of artifacts continues to command public interest. The Second Revised Edition expands the discussion that led to the development of the Principles of Archaeological Ethics. This innovative volume is an invaluable resource, especially in making ethics a standard part of formal archaeological training. 2000. 168 pages. ISBN: 0-932839-16-9. Regular Price: $12.95, SAA Member Discount Price: $9.95.


see inside back cover for ordering information
Welcome to The SAA Archaeological Record! SAA has launched this publication in the hope that it will provide an expanded level of information and service to SAA's membership. While many of the features you have come to enjoy from the SAA Bulletin are to be found in these pages, such as the columns and features on a variety of archaeological topics, you'll also note that we have expanded our coverage of governmental archaeology through Anne Vawser's new column, added more coverage of the large and complex world of consulting archaeology, and most obviously, have substantially changed the look and feel of the publication. Further changes will be made as the year progresses.

What you see before you is the joint effort of a number of talented and committed people, and I am pleased to have been a part of the launch of this impressive new publication. Special thanks go to the Board of Directors, which conceived the project; Tobi Brimsek, who has helped to provide the administrative and financial context for its publication; John Neikirk, manager, Publications, who has been charged with oversight of the technical details of the publication process; and importantly, Karen Doehner, my editorial assistant, who has done all of the heavy lifting that has made the transition from the Bulletin to The SAA Archaeological Record as smooth as possible.

We hope you enjoy The SAA Archaeological Record, and naturally, we are very interested in your comments and observations. Please let us know how you feel about it.

I am happy to announce that my successor has been identified, and I could not be more pleased with the choice. John Kantner of Georgia State University will become editor of The SAA Archaeological Record beginning with the September 2001 issue for a three-year term. John, a graduate of UC Santa Barbara, worked with me on the Bulletin and was primarily responsible for getting the Bulletin into its electronic form. He is very familiar with the publishing process, and although much of what he intends for The SAA Archaeological Record will be familiar to readers of the Bulletin, he will soon put his stamp on it. I am delighted that John has accepted the editorship and I am certain he will do an outstanding job with it.

CALL FOR VOLUNTEERS
You can help the 66th Annual Meeting in New Orleans run smoothly. We need enthusiastic volunteers to help out the SAA team April 18–22, 2001, in meeting support services and as session attendants. In return for 12 hours of your time, you will receive FREE meeting registration (refunds available to preregistered participants will be processed after the meeting), a COMPLIMENTARY copy of the 66th Annual Meeting Abstracts book, $5 stipend per shift, and SAA's sincere gratitude. This is a great opportunity to meet fellow archaeological enthusiasts and get involved in all aspects of our fun and exciting meeting. Act quickly as opportunities are limited. For details and a volunteer application, contact Andrew Caruso at SAA headquarters, 900 Second Street NE, Suite 12, Washington, DC 20002; telephone (202) 789-8200; fax (202) 789-0284.
S since I’m writing this column in the middle of the biggest political cliff-hanger in recent American history (the unofficial vote totals in Florida are about 537 votes apart at the moment), it is somewhat easier to make the argument that the political process matters very much and that the efforts of a small number of people can have an enormous impact!

The Government Affairs program is one of SAA’s major services to its members, but this program is less visible to the average member than publications or the annual meetings. I’ve been asked to provide a brief history of the Government Affairs program and its accomplishments and to touch on why these accomplishments matter to our members. As the incoming chair of the Government Affairs Committee, I would also like to say a few words about future directions of the program.

Overall government affairs policies are set by SAA’s elected Board of Directors, and major decisions about SAA positions on legislative or executive branch issues are made by the Board. Because government affairs issues tend to be fast moving and to require quick responses, however, most of the day-to-day decisions about SAA positions on government initiatives are made by the Executive Committee (the elected officers) with advice from the Government Affairs Committee (GAC), or for minor matters, by the GAC alone.

As with all SAA committees, the chair of the GAC is selected by the Board and the members are appointed by the president with the advice of the chair. The committee members are chosen to represent as wide a cross-section as possible of the SAA membership and a broad range of experience in governmental matters in order to provide the president and the Board with needed expertise and advice. Because it is impossible to cover the full range of needed expertise in a single committee, the GAC charter from the Board also provides for GAC advisors to be appointed by the president to assist the committee and the Board on specific issues.

Having said all this, however, I would be the first to proclaim that all of the heavy lifting in the Government Affairs program is done by one person, Donald Forsyth Craib, SAA’s manager, government affairs. Prior to 1994, SAA depended on the services of a part-time hired lobbyist to represent the Society’s interests on Capitol Hill. In September of that year, we brought the program in house and hired Craib, an attorney with more than 14 years of Capitol Hill experience.

The advantages of having a permanent, full-time lobbying presence in Washington, and especially one with Craib’s skill at making and developing contacts, have quickly become apparent. SAA is now recognized by key Congressional staff, and by staff in key Executive agencies such as Interior, as a major source of information and testimony on issues affecting the practice of archaeology and the preservation of the archaeological record. Over the years, the Society has moved from a position of offering input on existing initiatives to one in which we are asked to comment on or even assist in drafting legislation before it is introduced.

The GAC alone could never have established the contacts and partnerships for legislative and policy issues that we now have thanks to the Society’s manager, Government Affairs. Craib has built successful partnerships with archaeological and preservation organizations to address issues of shared concern and to provide us with a wider information-gathering network. SAA is now a leader among archaeological organizations in efforts to affect government policy, regulations, and legislation.

In addition, SAA has been fortunate in the last several years in having Society presidents who have shown strong interest in and a sometimes unexpected talent for government affairs. Anyone who thinks that archaeologists are just a bunch of ivory tower eggheads or solitary adventurers only at home in lost cities or forgotten jungles has never seen Bill Lipe, Vin Steponaitis, or Keith Kintigh working Capitol Hill or offering poised, articulate testimony in front of a congressional committee. Indeed, if the current SAA president gets his picture in the paper once more with the President or the Secretary of the Interior or some other big-time politico, he may have a political future of his own!

Thanks to the efforts of Donald Craib, with assistance from our
IN BRIEF

Tobi Brimsek

Tobi Brimsek is executive director of the Society for American Archaeology

NEED A POLITICAL FIX?

SAA’s Government Affairs program introduced a new member service one year ago in the form of a monthly email update/newsletter on Washington politics and archaeology. The update provides timely information on legislative and administrative issues pertaining to archaeology that are currently being debated in our nation’s capital. If you would like to join the hundreds of SAA members that are already taking advantage of this benefit, please send an email message to donald_craib@saa.org and ask to be signed up.

CHECK YOUR MAIL BOXES

On December 27, 2000, the preliminary program for the 66th Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology was mailed to over 9,000 interested archaeologists. While this winds its way through the third-class mail route of the postal service, take a shortcut and view the pdf file of the preliminary program posted on SAAweb.

ALSO IN YOUR MAIL BOX

As is now mandated by Board policy, ballots for the SAA annual election are mailed out first-class mail. Ballots were mailed right before the new year. All ballots must be postmarked by February 15, 2001. Please remember that in order for your vote to be counted, you must be a current member of the Society.

NEW ORLEANS 2001

Just a reminder that the 66th Annual Meeting will be hosted by co-headquarters hotels, the New Orleans Marriott and Le Meridien New Orleans (by press time, unfortunately the student and government blocks have filled, but there are plenty of special SAA rate rooms available). Reservations may be made by calling the New Orleans Marriott at 1 (800) 654-3990 or Le Meridien New Orleans at 1 (504) 525-6500. Complete hotel information and room reservation forms are available both on SAAweb and in the preliminary program.

IF YOU MAKE YOUR HOTEL RESERVATION BY 1/31/01

Your name will be entered into an SAA drawing for a terrific prize: a one-year membership in SAA! There will be two prizes awarded—one for an attendee registered at Le Meridien New Orleans and one for an attendee registered at the New Orleans Marriott. Make your room reservation today!

MORE MEETING MADNESS

Based on the number of submissions received and other key indicators, this likely will be SAA’s biggest annual meeting ever! To avoid long onsite registration lines, please consider advance registration before the March 19, 2001 deadline. In addition, please pay all balances due before the deadline, and you will move quickly through the advance registration lines!

ONLINE MEETING REGISTRATION AVAILABLE

To speed your advance registration process, if you are paying by credit card, consider using the new online registration option. You can register through SAAweb. There is a button on the front page of the web that will guide you to the online meeting registration form. Fast, simple, and easy! Why not complete registration from your own computer? Also for those prepaid presenters who would like add abstracts, an event, an excursion, a roundtable, etc., you can also use the online registration form for that purpose. The only requirement is that you will be using a credit card to pay. Check it out!

SUMMER STAFF TRANSITIONS

Over the summer, SAA welcomed three new program staff: John Neikirk, manager, Publications; Betty Fawley, manager, Membership and Marketing; and Andrew Caruso, coordinator, Administrative Services.

STAFF EXPANSION

As of January SAA’s staff will grow by a part-time position, Information Services Assistant. This is a 15-hour a week position focused on data retrieval, data maintenance, and web-page updates.

NOW AVAILABLE FROM SAA PUBLICATIONS

Topics in Cultural Resource Law edited by Donald Forsyth Craib. This collection of articles explores a wide range of legal issues as they pertain to control, protection, and regulation of cultural resources. ISBN 0-932839-21-5. Regular price: $24.95; SAA Member Discount price: $19.95.
SOME still see archaeology as a small group of scholars and adventurers unfettered by the concerns of the “real world” and envision the Treasurer keeping the Society’s financial records on the back of a worn, stained envelope tucked into the pocket of a tweed sport coat along with dirt and beer caps from the last field project. The dirt and the beer caps may be still there, but the financial records aren’t. Like it or not, archaeology in North America now involves thousands of people managing or using over a hundred million dollars annually and coordinating their jobs with a wide range of people from many sectors of society. There is no question that archaeology is a diverse enterprise requiring a more complicated organization with a larger budget. With this in mind, I want to comment on SAA’s budget.

First, the good news. With a strong economy, supportive membership, and the hard work of previous and current SAA officers and staff members, the Society’s finances are sound, in better shape than they have been in years. We are on target to meet the long-term reserve goals that will allow the Society to weather severe economic problems. And we have begun making numerous improvements to benefit all members and the archaeological community as a whole.

While other articles in this inaugural issue of The SAA Archaeological Record discuss some of the exciting changes at SAA, I want to highlight just one that may not be as obvious as others. The Board of Directors just authorized a major, multi-year program to upgrade our information management system. This won’t come cheaply: these upgrades will cost in the range of $150,000 and perhaps more. Every SAA member will be affected. In addition to making the business end of the Society better, access to the SAA web resources will be more efficient and will be expanded greatly. You will see, for example, easier meeting registration and dues renewal.

The upgrade has other important benefits. An improved system should reduce the need for increased administrative personnel in the future, a major expense for the Society. Perhaps most importantly, SAA’s voice to the wider community will be clearer and stronger.

The bad news? The Society is still overwhelmingly dependent on only two income sources, membership dues and annual meeting revenues. The first is flat. For the past few years, SAA’s membership has grown very slowly. The second—meetings—is variable. The forthcoming meeting in New Orleans will be exceptionally large, but other annual meetings probably will be smaller and, as a consequence, will have reduced revenue.

What can each of us do? Unfortunately, many archaeologists in North America fail to see that SAA works for the entire archaeological community. Nor do they recognize that a strong organization provides direct and indirect benefits to them as individuals, with scholarly and professional publications, continuing education opportunities, and an effective lobbying presence. Unless each of us who is making the effort to do our share to encourage our archaeological colleagues who are not SAA members to join, the financial situation will not change appreciably.

SAA isn’t about making money; it’s about supporting a large and diverse membership involved in all types of important work.
With the real turn of the millennium, it seems appropriate to reflect on the state of the Society for American Archaeology. The Society is strong and vital. It is intellectually alert, organizationally strong, and financially sound. What more is there to say? Actually, quite a lot.

With this issue, SAA launches *The SAA Archaeological Record*. At the same time, we are embarking on a major membership drive. These two events are, in fact, related as we hope that *The SAA Archaeological Record* will play an important role in inducing nonmembers to take a close look at SAA and convincing former members to reconsider joining SAA.

SAA now has more than 6,600 members and it appears that we will have a record-breaking Annual Meeting in New Orleans this April. One might wonder why SAA needs or wants to grow. The Board’s answer is a pragmatic one. With a larger membership, the Society will be able to better achieve its mission:

The mission of the Society for American Archaeology is to expand understanding and appreciation of humanity’s past as achieved through systematic investigation of the archaeological record. The society leads the archaeological community by promoting research, stewardship of archaeological resources, public and professional education, and the dissemination of knowledge. To serve the public interest, SAA seeks the widest possible engagement with all segments of society, including governments, educators, and indigenous peoples, in advancing knowledge and enhancing awareness of the past. Simply stated, with a larger membership SAA can more effectively serve the professional needs of archaeologists and advance the cause of archaeology more broadly.

As the Board discussed SAA’s plans for a membership drive, we tried to understand archaeologists’ perceptions of the Society. From both nonmembers and members one hears, with disheartening frequency, that the reasons one joins SAA are to receive *American Antiquity* and to be able to present a paper at the Annual Meeting, and conversely, the reasons that one fails to join are because one does not wish to get the journal or to attend the Annual Meeting. My plea to those holding this sentiment is to take another look at SAA and the range of benefits that accrue to the members and to the discipline from individual membership.

The first place to look, of course, is right here at this magazine. Like its predecessor, the SAA *Bulletin*, *The SAA Archaeological Record* provides content that can help make you a better informed and more effective professional. While you’re at it, take a close look at *American Antiquity* and *Latin American Antiquity*. When I hear a complaint that there are just too many articles about inscriptions on Maya stelae in *American Antiquity*, I have a sneaking suspicion that the individual missed the last couple of decades of the journal. If you look at SAA’s journals, I think you will see that there is current and highly relevant content for a great majority of our members. And by the way, *Latin American Antiquity* isn’t just for Latin Americanists. If you would ever consider applying theoretical developments, methods, or analytical strategies that derive from outside your research area, you will likely find much of value in *Latin American Antiquity*.

Contrary to popular belief, member dues do not primarily go toward paying for *American Antiquity*. In fact, through the institutional subscriptions alone, *American Antiquity* generates net revenue that supports other Society programs, notably those that are less for archaeologists and more for archaeology.

SAA makes a major investment in promoting the interests of archaeology in government affairs (discussed more fully by Lynne Sebastian in *Archaeopolitics*, p. 3). This is not a program that only comes to life when there is a major issue—SAA is engaged in government affairs on a daily basis. We have had substantial impacts on both national and international issues. Some of that impact is public; some is behind the scenes; and
FROM THE PRESIDENT

some we will never learn about. Because the long-standing government affairs program has established SAA’s credibility on Capitol Hill, the effects are, to a large extent, cumulative. It used to be that each time an archaeology issue came up, SAA would have to ask to be allowed to testify. Because of a great deal of hard work by Donald Craib, SAA’s full-time manager, Government Affairs, and by SAA members working on government affairs issues, we find that members of Congress and a range of agency officials are now coming to us for help. The United States Secretary of the Interior addressed the SAA Annual Meeting in Philadelphia last spring and has met several times with the Society’s leaders. Each year, SAA is there fighting for agency appropriations for cultural resource programs, we are there commenting on regulations and management plans, and we are there for oversight hearings and in the legislative arena.

This doesn’t just happen; it happens because all of SAA’s members, through their dues, support SAA’s Government Affairs program and because SAA members participate in the Society’s government affairs initiatives. If you’d like to track current government affairs issues and SAA’s participation in them, please sign up for SAA’s Government Affairs Update, a monthly electronic publication that is free to members (email: donald_craib@saa.org to be put on the distribution list).

For many years, SAA has sponsored important public education efforts, often in partnership with federal agencies. SAA’s half-time manager, Education of Outreach works with SAA’s Public Education Committee and pursues education and outreach initiatives for the Society. SAA maintains an archive of teacher resources (freely available on the Web) and is actively involved in developing new curriculum materials for K-12 education. SAA has been a key sponsor of three workshops providing training for Native American educators. Furthermore, SAA’s Executive Office in Washington D.C. replies to queries about archaeology from the press, school children, and adults. We provide career information, connect the press with relevant specialists, and distribute information on becoming involved in archaeology, and on research into public attitudes toward archaeology. With expanded membership, SAA would be able to expand some current programs and to undertake important new initiatives. In particular, the Board sees enhancement of both the Public Education and Media Relations programs as high priorities.

SAA’s activities directed within the profession also are increasing. We have established a new monograph series with a broad scope, ranging from new substantive monographs to reprints of classics, from readers to books on professional issues such as ethics or the law. SAA’s profile in professional development also is increasing with expanded course and workshop offerings at the Annual Meeting.

SAA’s committees devoted to professional issues (such as ethics, curation, law enforcement, and Native American relations) and to different professional constituencies (such as consulting, government and Latin American archaeologists) inform and influence the Society’s direction. SAA provides key support for increased professionalism in archaeology through its cosponsorship of the Register of Professional Archaeologists. SAA awards at the Annual Meeting help recognize extraordinary achievements by archaeologists.

SAA is committed to the use of available information technology to improve SAA’s delivery of member services and to address some of the critical problems facing the discipline, including access to the enormous corpus of primary literature that we generate, but that remains difficult to access or remains unpublished.

To SAA’s current members, I extend my sincere thanks for your support of the Society’s programs. I warmly invite those archaeologists who are not members to make a commitment to the profession by joining SAA. If your membership has lapsed, I urge you to consider the benefits of membership that you receive and that accrue to the discipline and to rejoin this year. With greater membership in SAA, the beneficiaries will be both archaeology and archaeologists.

Keith Kintigh
President
From October 27–29, 2000, the Board again met in the beautiful city of Montreal, Canada, and stayed at the headquarters hotel for the Society's Annual Meeting in 2004. The staff of the Delta Centre-Ville were accommodating and gracious and the city promises to be an exciting venue to anticipate. Just two weeks before, the Executive Committee met at the 2002 headquarters hotel in Denver, which also will be an excellent meeting site. As long as you have your long-term calendar out, plan to attend the Annual Meeting in 2003 in one of the mid-continent's best kept secrets: Milwaukee.

Speaking of meetings, the Board discussed trade-offs among the criteria used in Annual Meeting site selection. It is quite difficult to balance costs, logistics, and the attractiveness of the destination, as SAA does not fit into many venues and our meeting dates are often in peak or shoulder season. SAA will need to consider more expensive first-tier cities because second-tier cities can no longer fully meet our needs. The Board selected Salt Lake City, Utah for the 2005 Annual Meeting.

The Board discussed the Society's priorities for goals and programs over the next few years. We explored expansion of our efforts in government affairs, public education, media relations, meetings, and continuing professional education. There was also a broad discussion of information management including traditional publication and innovative means of disseminating professional reports. There is considerable optimism that SAA can improve services to the membership and the profession if the Society can grow in size.

In connection with this planning discussion, the Board discussed strategies for membership development so that the Society can better represent archaeology. Recently SAA membership has been relatively stable. The Board is concerned because growth is needed to support the additional member services that would be of great value to the profession. SAA has a very good membership retention although there is some drop-off in years following those with large annual meetings.

The Board set the goal of increasing the membership from the current 6,600 to 7,500 members by September 15, 2001.

The Board established a Task Force on Diversity charged with developing recommendations on how SAA can increase the diversity of both the profession and the Society. The Task Force will consist of a chair and five members and will develop an action plan for the Board to consider at its 2002 spring board meeting in Denver. Also in connection with future initiatives, the Board asked many of the recommendations of the Task Force on Renewing our National Archaeology Program to committees for follow-through. The complete Task Force report may be found on the SAA Website at [www.saa.org/Government/renew.html](http://www.saa.org/Government/renew.html). Some major issues concern the dissemination of information to the public, recognizing multiple interests, information management, and professional development.

With regard to the Secretary of Interior’s decision on the cultural affiliation of the Kennewick human remains, the Board discussed responses to SAA’s position paper on the decision (SAA Bulletin 2000, 18[5]:6) and further SAA actions. The Board is deeply concerned about the issues and supports the original compromise within NAGPRA that maintains a balance between Native American and scientific interests. The courts tend to look to scientific organizations for help in understanding the evaluation of scientific evidence in court. SAA will request standing as a friend of the court (amicus curiae) in the Kennewick case in order to provide information to the court on the definition of Native American and on the determination of cultural affiliation under NAGPRA.

The Board discussed the advantages and disadvantages of working with the Journal Storage Project (JSTOR), a nonprofit organization with more than 750 participating libraries. The Board approved entering into a Publication License Agreement with JSTOR to digitally archive American Antiquity starting
with volume 1. This archiving will cost the Society nothing. Access to archival issues of the journal will be available to members directly at a discount rate and through participating libraries. Staff requested that JSTOR consider both journals, but JSTOR declined to include *Latin American Antiquity* due to its youth but will reevaluate its inclusion in the future. The Board will investigate other electronic methods of archiving back issues of *Latin American Antiquity*.

As usual, the Board heard a report from the executive director, who discussed highlights of this productive and busy year. It is important to note that SAA continues to have significant impacts on federal legislation. The Board formally thanked the SAA Executive Office staff for their exceptional service over the last year and particularly for their extra efforts that helped to make the Annual Meeting so successful.

**ON CHANGE**

You may have noticed that SAA is changing, expanding, and moving to address the needs of its membership. A major change is the launch of this new magazine, *The SAA Archaeological Record*. Another major change poised for implementation over the next two years is the upgrade to all of SAA’s information systems. A future In Brief column will focus on the scope of that project and detail the new capabilities that SAA will gain as a result. It is both a necessary and major undertaking for the Society. One other major change that should be noted is the launch of the new book program. In your dues renewal form for 2001, you found the first SAA Catalog which offers a broad range of print and electronic publications as well as SAAgear. I hope that you took the opportunity to review the breadth and scope of the kinds of products that SAA is developing. Change is in the air!

**ON TOPICS**

The In Brief column is focused on administrative aspects of the Society and how they may impact you as a member. From time to time, the column departs from its regular format and provides a detailed look at a topic of general interest such as meeting site selection, meeting organization, etc. As mentioned, a column will be forthcoming on the information system conversion and implementation currently in its planning stages. If there is a topic that you would like to see addressed by the executive director, please contact her at tobi_brimsek@saa.org.

---

**NEW EDITOR ANNOUNCEMENT**

The Society for American Archaeology is pleased to announce that John Kantner will be the new editor for *The SAA Archaeological Record*, beginning April 20, 2001. His first issue will be September 2001. Please feel free to contact John directly at the following address:

Dr. John Kantner  
Department of Anthropology & Geography  
Georgia State University  
33 Gilmer St.  
Atlanta, GA 30303-3083  
Telephone (404) 651-1761 * Fax (404) 651-3235  
Email: kantner@gsu.edu
New Orleans is again proving to be a favorite location for SAA members. The 2001 SAA Annual Meeting in New Orleans will be the largest meeting in SAA history—drawing members from all over the world, presenting papers and posters on a wide range of topics. First, here are some statistics. There are a grand total of 236 sessions with 2,088 posters or papers. To place this size in perspective, the last biggest meeting was in Seattle, where about 1,800 presentations were made. Besides the formal presentations, 252 members will add flavor as discussants to the symposia and forums. There will be 136 paper symposia, 62 general sessions, 11 forums, 5 poster symposia, 20 general poster sessions, and 2 electronic symposia. These numbers do not convey the rich array of topics and approaches that will be seen this spring. We can only give you a taste of what is in store here, but whatever your theoretical, geographic, or methodological areas, there certainly will be something to draw your interest at these meetings!

Please make your plane and hotel reservations to arrive by Wednesday evening for the Opening Session. To kick off the program, the SAA Program Committee invited Michael Dietler to organize a session focusing on a theme appropriate to New Orleans. His session, “Consumption and Embodied Material Culture: The Archaeology of Drink, Food, and Commensal Politics,” will feature presentations by Michael Dietler, Brian Hayden, Ian Morris, Elizabeth Brumfiel, Jerry Moore, and Stephen Houston. This session addresses a cutting-edge topic in archaeology—and is a fitting beginning to a meeting set in New Orleans! We hope that many of you will attend what promises to be a stimulating and timely set of papers.

The remaining sessions are scheduled from Thursday morning through Sunday morning, including a full suite of papers on Thursday night. There will be a minimum of 20 concurrent sessions throughout the program—and sometimes even more. Some 250 posters will be displayed on Thursday and Friday mornings and afternoons. All paper and poster sessions and the roundtable luncheon will be held in the Marriott Hotel.

The diversity of session topics has been great fun to see and a challenge to organize. We had three primary goals to meet in organizing the program: (1) organize contributed papers and posters into cohesive general sessions; (2) make sure that individual organizers, presenters, and discussants were not scheduled to be in two different sessions at the same time; and (3) avoid scheduling sessions with similar themes at the same time.

Before we began organizing the general sessions, we developed a list of topics and then used these topics to sort contributed presentations and symposia. These topical categories provided a way to assign papers to general sessions and to avoid as many scheduling conflicts as possible. Some interesting and unexpected themes emerged for the general sessions, including “Copper Artifacts in Eastern North America,” “Hopewell Landscapes,” and “Archaeology and Ethnoarchaeology of Western Mexico.” Avoidance of nearly every individual conflict proved to be possible after several computer searches and subsequent readjustment to our original session time slots. But with 20 sessions with “Maya” in their titles alone, avoiding scheduling of similar sessions was much more difficult!

In fact, the Mesoamericanists win the prize for the most sessions from a single geographical area, with over 40 sessions on the archaeology of this region. Many of these will present the results of large, multiyear projects including sessions on Lamanai (organized by H. Ritscher and Elizabeth Graham), La Quemada (organized by Ben Nelson and E. Chris Wells), Tula (one session organized by Patricia Fournier and another by A. Mastache and R. Cobe), Piedras Negras (organized by Stephen Houston), Copan (organized by E. Wyllys Andrews V and William Fash), Yalahau (organized by J. Mathews and Scott Fedick), Aguateca (organized by Takeshi Inomata), Teotihuacan (organized by S. Sugiyama), Chac (organized by Michael Smyth), the Central Mixteca Alta (organized by A. Balkansky and L. Silver), and the Maya Mountains (organized by R. Hays and K. Pruefer).

Other Mesoamerican sessions that will be of great interest are
“The Late Postclassic to Spanish-Era Transition in Mesoamerica,” “Precolumbian Water Management: Ideology, Ritual and Power,” a two-part session on “Bridging Formative Mesoamerican Cultures,” and a session honoring the work of Richard E. W. Adams in the Maya area. With so many Mesoamerican sessions, one could clearly spend the entire time in New Orleans attending sessions on the archaeology of complex societies, urbanism, and the state. Urbanism also will be addressed in a comparative session comparing Old and New World trajectories as well as sessions on the Southeast Asia, the Andes, and the Bronze Age. Andeanists are well-represented at this meeting with a total of nine sessions.

As befits a meeting location along the Gulf Coast, coastal archaeology will be discussed in at least a half-dozen sessions, including “Archaeology of the Whole Gulf Coast, Southeastern U.S. – Mexico” and a two-part pan-Americas session. The other North American area most heavily represented is the Greater Southwest, including symposia on topics such as settlement ecology and landscapes, Pueblo IV period settlement histories, and migration.

The New Orleans meetings are a big draw for our international colleagues. Archaeologists from Mexico and other areas of Latin America submitted the most papers after U.S. submissions. Some notable sessions outside Mesoamerica with high international participation include “Mesolithic Peoples and Environments of the Russian High Arctic”; “Prehistoric Hunters and Herders in Istri a, Coratia: Pupicina Cave Project, 1995–2000”; “Investigating Social Change: Recent Work in Ireland”; “The Andean-Amazonian Connection: Diachronic Relationships”; “From the Sierra to the Sea: Recent Archaeological Investigations in Sonora, Mexico”; and a poster symposium on “Settlement Evolution and Site Formation Patterns Among the Sambaqui Moundbuilders from Southern Brazil.”

Social theory is hitting its stride at the annual meeting this year. Agency (2 sessions), identity (6 sessions), and ideology (3 sessions) are all prominent themes. Comparative sessions on empires, community and locality, and households will tackle social archaeology at multiple scales. Historical archaeologists will have a fine complement of sessions to attend including “Colonial Praxis.”

Warfare and violence continue to be hot topics, with no less than four symposia, including one sponsored by the Archeology Division of the AAA on “Multidisciplinary Approaches to Social Violence in the Prehispanic Southwest.” Many of our bioarchaeological colleagues are participating in these sessions, as well as in “Archaeology of Death: Perspectives at the Start of the New Millennium” and “Interacting with the Dead: Secondary Burial and Cultural Modification of Human Remains.”

Papers on the peopling of the Americas and Paleoindian archaeology are strongly represented in several general sessions and symposia. “Entering America: Northeast Asia and Beringia Before the Last Glacial Maximum” will set the stage for literally dozens of papers at this meeting.

Two twists on the archaeology is anthropology theme appear on the program this year. One is a forum on “Archaeology is Archaeology” and another is a symposium, sponsored by the SAA Student Affairs Committee, “Archaeology as Anthropology: Perspectives at the Start of the New Millennium.”

Textiles and other perishables will be the subject of a pair of complementary sessions: “Plants, Perishables, and Prehistory” and “Textiles and the Negotiation of Power.” Zooarchaeologists will join their ethnobotanist colleagues in “The Call of the Wild: Critiquing the Wild Resource/Domestic Staple Dichotomy.” Zooarchaeologists will be well represented at the meetings in several other sessions—especially in the Fryxell Symposium, which this year honors the work of Melinda Zeder on Friday afternoon.

Two electronic symposia are on the program this year: “Working with Indigenous People and Other Descendent Communities” and “Crossroads in Mediterranean Landscape Archaeology.” Electronic symposia were first offered last year and have much potential as an alternative format to the traditional paper session. Papers will be placed on the web by the organizers one month prior to the meetings, with links posted on SAAweb (www.saa.org). Papers will not be read at the meetings; instead, presenters will provide brief summaries, leaving the rest of the session for discussion. This format depends on the audience and other session participants reading the papers online prior to the meetings. We urge everyone to take a look at the electronic session papers. Besides finding these sessions of great interest, you may want to organize an electronic symposium at a future meeting.

Students should especially take note of the Friday Roundtable Luncheon. Not only is this lunch a great opportunity to meet leaders in the field, but the lunch is heavily subsidized by over 30 generous organizations. Thus, you can be fed intellectually and materially—without too much impact on your budget. The topics range from career issues to method and theory in archaeology. With 18 tables and 36 table co-hosts, there is something for everyone.

So, make your plans now for what promises to be an exciting meeting! Peruse the preliminary program and chart a course that will take you through sessions and posters in your areas of interest. Also be sure to include time for the exhibit hall, where in addition to seeing displays of the latest books and equipment, you can participate in the Native American Scholarship Committee’s silent auction. We look forward to seeing you all in New Orleans!
Late April is a delightful time to visit New Orleans, warm but not yet hot and muggy. If it rains one day, it’s likely to have cleared up the next, but in case it doesn’t bring a raincoat or umbrella. So it’s going to be a fine time to be outside in The Big Easy, and if you want a break from the Annual Meeting, you’ll find more to do than you have time to fit in. It might be a good idea to figure out in advance what you want to do and when. Here are some suggestions. A capsule history of the city appeared in my column in the November SAA Bulletin (2000, 18(5):10).

MUSEUMS Our city has one major art museum, the New Orleans Museum of Art, in City Park, a cab ride from downtown. On Jackson Square, in the center of the French Quarter, is the Louisiana State Museum, with the Cabildo and the Presbytère, and beside them stands St. Louis Cathedral. The elegant Hermann-Grima, Gallier, and Beauregard-Keyes houses are restored early to mid-nineteenth century homes in the heart of the Quarter. Also in the French Quarter are the Historic New Orleans Collection and the New Orleans Historic Voodoo Museum. A moderate walk beyond the French Quarter to Lee Circle will take one to the Confederate Museum, and a block away from it is the National D-Day Museum, which opened in June 2000.

OTHER NEW ORLEANS ATTRACTIONS The Audubon Zoo, located Uptown between Audubon Park and the river, is a world-class facility. One can take the streetcar out St. Charles Avenue to the park and a shuttle from there to the zoo, or one can ride the John James Audubon Riverboat up the Mississippi River from the Canal Street dock. The spectacular Aquarium of the Americas is at the foot of Canal Street at the Mississippi River.

WALKING AND STREETCAR TOURS New Orleans is a truly fascinating city, with architecture including the Iberian style of the French Quarter, early nineteenth century southern mansions a bit up the river, an array of early and late Victorian styles all across Uptown New Orleans, and through it all the distinctive row houses called shotguns, which come in a dozen different flavors. Any of the old parts of town are pleasant to walk or drive through, but the French Quarter and the Garden District are the most interesting. The National Park Service leads an excellent 90-minute French Quarter walking tour at 10:30 daily, leaving from the Visitor Center of the Jean Lafitte National Historical Park at 419 Decatur ([504] 589-2636). Passes are free but limited, and you must pick up your own ticket by about 9 a.m. The Park Service also gives walking tours of the Garden District, a mile or so upriver from Canal Street on the St. Charles streetcar, where newly arrived American merchants and planters built antebellum mansions in the decades after the Louisiana Purchase. A fun trip is to take the old streetcar line up St. Charles Avenue, sometimes called the most beautiful street in America, from Canal Street out to Audubon Park and Tulane University.

RIVER, SWAMP, AND PLANTATION TOURS If you want to spend a few hours or most of a day, you’ll find tours to suit many tastes. Even the bus tours of the city draw rave reviews (from locals as well as tourists). Traditional Mississippi River paddle boats take cruises of varying lengths up and down the river from the Canal Street dock, giving you a different perspective of the city. For a short trip with a great view, take one of the free ferries across the river and back. A fun half-day tour will take you out of the city to one of the nearby swamps, where you board a swamp boat with a colorful captain for a trip that lasts from 90 minutes to three hours (two hours will be enough for most people). By April the alligators will be sunning, and you’ll see lots of them. Bird watchers will see migrating fowl. If you rent a car, you can combine a swamp tour with a visit to Jean Lafitte National Park (and its excellent museum), about an hour south of New Orleans, where boardwalks take you through a swamp and let you see coipu, introduced from lowland South America as nutria (Myocastor coypus), if you’re lucky. Tours of plantation houses along the Mississippi River between New Orleans and Baton Rouge will take from five hours to a full day, depending on how many plantations you visit, how far upriver they are, and how often you stop to enjoy the food. You can go with a bus tour or rent a car. The best-known
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plantations nearby are Oak Alley, with its quarter-mile alley of live oak trees (inside not as attractive as outside, so you might want to look at it as you drive to Laura, close by); Nottoway, the largest plantation home in the area; Destrehan, built in 1787, the oldest documented plantation home in the lower Mississippi Valley, San Francisco, the closest to New Orleans, built in the steamboat gothic style and beautifully restored; and Laura, owned by a Creole family for generations and named for a girl who grew up there, moved away, and wrote about her childhood there years later. If you visit only one, go to Laura; you’ll learn how the Creole family worked and lived.

MUSIC You can find all kinds of live music: Blues, Bluegrass, Cajun, Country, Dixieland, Funk, Gospel, Contemporary Jazz, Traditional Jazz, Latin Jazz, Rhythm and Blues, and Zydeco around the Quarter and not far away. Among the best known establishments are Preservation Hall, Pete Fountain’s, Tipitina’s, and Snug Harbor. For complete listings, try Gambit Weekly (www.bestofneworleans.com/mus/attheclubs.html).

RESTAURANTS New Orleans is a wonderful place to eat, as most of you know. In your registration packet you’ll receive a list of restaurants that will try to serve every palate and pocketbook, but I’ll suggest a few that are in or near the Quarter. Excellent restaurants include the Grill Room in the Windsor Court Hotel (the fanciest in town), Bayona, Antoine’s, Arnaud’s, Brennan’s, Emeril’s, Feelings, Galatoire’s, K-Paul’s Louisiana Kitchen, Marisol, Mr. B’s Bistro, and Palace Café. These have varied menus with traditional New Orleans, European/French, Cajun, and Creole cuisine. Most also have innovative dishes. For less expensive but great food try the Acme Oyster Bar, Central Grocery, Félix’s, Mother’s, Café Maspero’s, Ralph and Kaco’s Seafood, and the Taquería Corona.

HARRIS REPORT HELPS IN UNDERSTANDING PUBLIC PERCEPTIONS: PART I

H ow important do Americans think archaeology is in today’s society? We now have a better idea thanks to the Harris Interactive report Exploring Public Perceptions and Attitudes about Archaeology. A coalition of archaeological organizations led by SAA commissioned Harris Interactive to study the American public to understand their perceptions, knowledge, and attitudes about archaeology. Why should archaeologists be interested in this study? As archaeologists attempt to share their information and work with the public, understanding what Americans think about archaeology is important.

The report covers a range of topics including the public’s understanding of what archaeologist study. Ninety percent say the human past, 85 percent also say dinosaurs. Ninety percent of respondents believe students should learn about archaeology as part of their school curriculum. When it concerns protecting archaeological sites, 96 percent feel there should be protective laws. This information, and a lot more, can be found in the report.

Archaeologists should take full advantage of the data in the Harris report. It not only allows archaeologists to learn about the public’s understanding of archaeology, but it can help archaeologists find support for future undertakings. You can find a copy of the report on SAA’s web site at www.saa.org/Pubrel/publiced-poll.html. The report will also be highlighted at the SAA booth during the New Orleans annual meeting.

How important do you feel archaeology is in today’s society?

Figure 1. Level of interest clearly influences the importance Americans attribute to archaeology.
American archaeology has come a long way from its antiquarian beginnings and can now consider itself a full-fledged profession with well-codified and widely accepted technical and ethical standards of procedure and performance. The process that produced these standards and the corporate desire and will to abide by them was slow, sometimes painful, but ever cumulative. It is important not to confuse the beginnings of professionalism with the various landmarks of its subsequent development. It is, therefore, somewhat difficult to determine just when archaeology became a profession.

It was not when federal programs greatly increased archaeological activity after World War II, nor when that increased activity generated interest in standards by declaration, registration, and certification in the 1960s and 1970s. Nor was it when that handful of professional archaeologists banded together in 1935 to found the Society for American Archaeology to be the guardian of the standards. It was certainly not in the last quarter of the nineteenth century when John Wesley Powell (1834–1902) marshaled the resources of the federal government to lay the foundations for the anthropological discipline. Professional standards did not emerge from the successes of the famous Mound Survey, the largest archaeological effort of Powell’s period. The professionalization of archaeology was not one of the many accomplishments of Frederic Ward Putnam (1839–1915), although he helped to set the stage for it by creating the nation’s first academic program for training archaeologists at the Harvard Peabody Museum.

Two contemporary but entirely different men working in very different contexts were primarily responsible for setting the standards that made archaeology professional. Alfred Vincent Kidder (1885–1963) and William Snyder Webb (1882–1964) established...
those standards at a time when the number of individuals claiming to be archaeologists was very small and when no one was expressing a need for standards. Kidder and Webb, however, did see a need and during the two decades from 1915 to 1935 they developed the basic standards that are followed today.

American archaeology began its journey toward full professionalization when Kidder received his doctorate from Harvard University in 1914. He was Harvard's and the nation's sixth Ph.D. in archaeology, but the first to specialize in North American prehistory. His dissertation on the systematic study of prehistoric ceramics in the Southwest made a revolutionary substitution of potsherds for pots and monuments. He saved and studied all the artifacts, not just the most attractive ones. An experienced Southwestern field archaeologist, Kidder initiated in 1915 a long-term research program at the ruins of Pecos Pueblo in New Mexico. He emphasized careful, planned, systematic research involving stratigraphic excavation, detailed recording and description, comparative analysis, and interpretation that was evidence based. He established these standards at the very beginning of the Pecos project and inspired his young assistants to put them to the test. By the end of the project when he hosted Rockefeller students, he had standardized written procedures for them to follow.

Kidder's excavating and recording techniques quickly became the norms for Southwestern archaeology and beyond. Of course, others also contributed to the development of these pioneer professional standards, a fact that Kidder recognized when he wrote in a presentation copy of Introduction to the Study of Southwestern Archaeology: "To N. C. Nelson, who laid the foundations for modern archaeological work in the Southwest." It was through that book that the value of Kidder's approach was made more widely available. The regional conference that he convened at Pecos in 1927 further promoted systematic and analytical research. His subsequent leadership of the Maya Program of the Carnegie Institution of Washington provided additional avenues for the dissemination of his standards and values. A. V. Kidder was the first professional archaeologist because he defined the basic standards that characterize the archaeological profession today.

At the same time that the Pecos project was winding down, William Snyder Webb was applying his systematic training in physics and his World War I experience as an artillery officer to the excavation of prehistoric sites in his native Kentucky. He had begun to develop controlled methods of excavating and recording in the late 1920s. Fortunately for the future of archaeology in this country, Webb was recruited by the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) in 1933 when an archaeologist was needed to direct the massive program of excavation in sites threatened by TVA dam construction on the Tennessee River and its tributaries in Alabama, Mississippi, and Tennessee.

Webb was confronted with an almost insurmountable problem. He needed many competent field archaeologists to supervise extensive excavations in dozens of sites in four reservoirs in three states while dam construction was underway and under severe time constraints that would be considered impossible today. At the time there were only a few practicing archaeologists in the entire nation. Webb found individuals in universities throughout the country who had some systematic training in archaeology and what he called "allied sciences," that is, any field that taught its students to measure and think logically. He converted them all into successful field archaeologists by providing standard procedures, goals, and values to be applied to all the TVA excavations, standards that continue in use to this day. One of Webb's enduring legacies is the continuing use in many regions of the 5-ft square as a standard unit of excavation.

Webb's standards were comparable to Kidder's, with appropriate practical adjustments to the nature of sites and problems in the Southeast. It is interesting to note that two of Webb's key consultants had worked with Kidder. Neil Merton Judd (1897–1976) of the National Museum had been with Kidder in the field in the Four Corners region in pre-Pecos days. Carl Eugen Guthe (1893–1974) of the National Research Council had been Kidder's assistant at Pecos for several seasons. Many of the people Webb trained on sites in the Norris, Wheeler, Pickwick, and Guntersville basins continued in archaeology after World War II, and carried his systematic approach with them. Inasmuch as the labor force for the TVA work came from the federal relief rosters in the affected counties, Webb wryly observed that he may also have trained some of the future pot hunters of the Southeast. Others in the country were using federally sponsored relief programs to carry out archaeological research of professional quality, but because of the sheer magnitude of the TVA program and the promptness with which Webb published his findings, he was without question the standard-bearer.

Although Kidder and Webb first introduced professional standards to American archaeology, they were followed by others who contributed significantly to the process of professionalization, including Fay-Cooper Cole (1881–1961) at Chicago and Emil Walter Haury (1904–1992) at Arizona. Nevertheless, the enormous progress in meeting new professional challenges in technical and ethical problems since World War II would not have been possible if the basic standards had not been defined so clearly and so early by those pioneer professional archaeologists, Alfred Vincent Kidder and William Snyder Webb.
IT WAS THE BEST OF TIMES, AND IT WAS THE WORST OF TIMES

Charles R. McGimsey III

Certainly the past 50 years have been exciting and challenging years to be an archaeologist in the United States. During this period archaeology has endeavored, and indeed is still endeavoring, to transform itself from a loosely knit academic discipline with practitioners numbered in the low hundreds to a truly professional body numbering well into the thousands that is fully accountable to the public, and has done so while maintaining its scientific integrity.

During this period, archaeology has taken significant steps toward assuming its proper place as a responsible scientific discipline oriented toward providing the public with data about past human activity—data the public must have to properly make decisions with respect to the future. To fully achieve its goal, archaeology must protect an adequate portion of archaeology's basic resource base, recover such data as is necessary and appropriate, interpret that data, and present that data in a meaningful way to the public, all the while keeping in mind that the public should be encouraged to be actively and positively involved throughout the process. The following review is concerned primarily with those developments most directly affecting the first two aspects of this fourfold challenge.

Following World War II, archaeology, as before the war, was practiced by a small number of individuals who largely knew one another. Almost all were employed by the National Park Service (NPS) or Smithsonian Institution, at the federal level, a few state agencies, a number of institutions of higher education, a few museums, and the occasional foundation or private source of funding. These sources also provided most of the funds for field investigations. Sites or areas were selected for investigation on the basis of targets of opportunity or research interest shown by individual archaeologists and their fiscal patrons. The fiscal resources were so minimal and the gaps in our knowledge so huge that almost any area or problem selected for investigation could be justified. Full analysis and report preparation was not normally budgeted for at the time of field research but was sought later or simply assumed as a part of an institution's normal operations. Funds for publication were more often a pious hope than envisioned reality.

Curation of the resultant records and collections was local in the extreme. No attempt at management of the resource base was possible; there simply wasn't enough data available as yet. Fairly widespread knowledge of who was doing what, with resultant peer pressure and university-level performance guidelines, provided an adequate level of quality control. Some saw little reason to expect all of this to change. One major university actively discouraged new majors in archaeology on the grounds that the field already had more trained practitioners than could find employment.

However, the post–World War II world was changing rapidly and many of these changes were to have major direct and indirect effects on archaeology and its practice.

The greatest direct effect was the ready availability and increasing use of powerful earth moving machinery, not just by the government and large corporations, but by farmers, developers, and others. That, plus a rapidly expanding population that led to suburban development, created a direct and immediate threat to the core of archaeology's existence—its data base. Legal changes were gradually taking place as well. The Supreme Court accepted the public's welfare as well as its health and safety as a legitimate basis for legislation, thus smoothing the way for the preservation of historical and archaeological elements. Indeed, the national legislative base was being dramatically altered. At the same time, thanks in no small part to the GI Bill, the number of persons graduating with degrees in anthropology and archaeology increased manyfold, leading to the establishment of many new departments and, ultimately, the availability of many more individuals to carry out field research.

To their everlasting credit, archaeologists did not sit idly by but immediately began striving to cope with a world that was rapidly changing. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers had no more than announced its extensive postwar plans for dam construction in the Missouri River drainage than archaeologists, harking back to their pre-war Works Progress Administration (WPA) and Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) experience, established the Committee on the Recovery of Archaeo-
and the Archeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974, of 1966 (HPA) (drafted without archaeological involvement), the Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) and the Historic Preservation Act operational environment, particularly the National Environment. It found itself faced with a completely new legislative 1965 to 1985 caused archaeology to undergo a major transformation. Forces operating without and within the discipline from this critical mass of personnel and data was achieved none too soon. By the early 1970s, the numbers of archaeologists in public and private institutions reached a critical mass. This led to accelerated activity in all areas of archaeological research from data gathering and development of theory to greater awareness of and concern for archaeology’s “place” in society. Public archaeology became an area of increasing concern. The Archaeological Institute of America (AIA), long involved with the public, but for years primarily active in the Old World, became increasingly active in the New World. The Society for Historical Archaeology (SHA) was formed and became an effective voice. SAA transformed itself from a passive group that met once a year, published a journal, and was dependent for its administrative existence on the American Anthropological Association (AAA)—to an independent, fiscally responsible, wide-awake organization, increasingly interested in assuming a leadership role representing archaeology on the national scene. This critical mass of personnel and data was achieved none too soon. Forces operating without and within the discipline from 1965 to 1985 caused archaeology to undergo a major transformation. It found itself faced with a completely new legislative operational environment, particularly the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) and the Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (HPA) (drafted without archaeological involvement), and the Archeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974 (AHPA) (drafted with heavy archaeological involvement). The first two integrated archaeology into a national historic preservation, conservation, and management frame of reference for the first time, while AHPA, by authorizing every federal agency to expend program money to fund the investigation of archaeological resources threatened by that agency’s programs, vastly expanded and transformed archaeology's potential funding base. Archaeology was now funded by entities not inherently concerned with the recovery and interpretation of archaeological data itself, but rather with using archaeological data for the purpose of making management decisions directly affecting archaeology's resource base. Within just a few years, archaeology went from a funding base of $1–2 million per year to one of $100–200 million or more per year. This required employment of a greatly expanded number of archaeologists, many of whom had to learn to address new problems and work with an entirely new audience—managers. The traditional employment structure couldn’t handle this kind of archaeology. Archaeologists joined private research firms or went into business for themselves. University-based quality controls were now totally inadequate, and the discipline’s long-held, but often dormant, recognition of the need to establish a discipline-specific means of professional quality control now became urgent. Because of these changes in the funding base, a majority of archaeological practitioners now found themselves endeavoring to perform good archaeology (albeit not in areas of their choosing) in a context of national planning, with analysis, report preparation, and curation routinely addressed in the initial budgeting, and doing so within a tight time frame and on budget, all of which has redounded to the benefit of the discipline.

These changes were not achieved without considerable trauma, but archaeologists continued to assume a major role in determining their own future. In 1976 the NPS withdrew its support of CRAR and it ceased to function, but it was replaced, in a sense, by the Coordinating Council of National Archaeological Societies (CCONAS), designed to insure that archaeology spoke with one voice on Capitol Hill, and by the SAA Committee on Public Archaeology (COPA), which became the major rapid communication network among archaeologists. More recently the SAA Governmental Affairs Committee with its lobbyist has assumed these functions. The Denver Conference of 1974 provided a general, if worried, assessment of the developing situation, while the Airlie House sessions (1974) and subsequent report (1977) took a close look at six specific areas of particular concern (archaeology and the law, cultural resource management, guidelines for preparing and evaluating reports, communicating archaeology, archaeology and the Native Americans, and the certification and accreditation of archaeologists). Airlie House led directly to the founding in 1976 of the Society of Professional Archaeologists (SOPA), to be succeeded in 1999 by the even stronger and more comprehensive Register of Professional Archaeologists. Problems abounded during these transitions, and new ones
appeared daily. How did one interpret the 1 percent transfer of funds among federal agencies as provided for in Moss-Bennett? Did a site have to be “on” the National Register to be considered for testing and excavation? How best to utilize Memorandums of Agreement (MOAs) and PMOAs? How to bring the coal mining industry into line with the law? What to do about unqualified persons who were successfully bidding on contracts to do major and minor archaeological projects? Was too much or still not enough research being done under the new guidelines? It went on and on. Some major projects got caught up in this turmoil and suffered, but others, which began slightly later, came through quite well. These initial problems have been gradually worked out over time but, inevitably, others have arisen and the process is still ongoing. The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), in particular, is causing the discipline to rethink its entire modus operandi.

By 1985, archaeology’s basic philosophical focus had changed from that of being almost entirely a consumer of archaeological resources to being first a conservator and manager of those resources and then a consumer only when it has proved necessary and appropriate to do so. Funding for analysis and report preparation had become an accepted integral part of CRM research proposals. In addition, by the 1990s, funding agencies for the first time began to implement appropriate measures for the long-term curation of the archaeological collections for which they were responsible and to incorporate these costs into the initial budgeting. While traditionally funded archaeologists could still conduct research where they wished, it had become incumbent upon all archaeologists, however funded, to concentrate their efforts on resources that were under threat or had the clear potential of contributing to the solution of urgent significant research questions and, whenever possible, to include funding for full analysis, report preparation, and long-term curation as an integral part of every field research proposal. Adequate funding for publication remains a problem, but in the future, the computerized transfer of data may come to play a major role here.

Few disciplines have been called upon to handle such major growth, changes, and challenges within such a brief time span. Archaeology has responded responsibly and with a great measure of success, but further progress still must be made. In particular, there must be more and better state and regional planning documents with greater utilization of these so that archaeological data resulting from all sources of funding can become better integrated. Registration of qualified archaeological practitioners should become near universal. Professional management (from planning to publication), conservation, and maximum involvement of the public are our watchwords for future utilization of our archaeological heritage in the public interest.

SILENT AUCTION TO BENEFIT NATIVE AMERICAN SCHOLARSHIP FUND

Miranda Warburton and Johna Hutira

Miranda Warburton, director of the NAU branch office in Flagstaff, Arizona, is chair of NASC, and Johna Hutira is vice chair, NASC.

Be sure to visit the Native American Scholarships Committee (NASC) booth hidden away in the back of the SAA exhibit hall at the Annual Meeting in New Orleans to place your bids on some “great stuff” while contributing to a worthy cause. In three years the Silent Auctions have raised over $13,000, and we need your help to be even more successful this year!

The Native American Scholarships Fund was established to foster a new sense of shared purpose and positive interaction between the archaeological and Native American communities. The Fund has grown thanks to donations of book royalties, contributions from individuals and organizations, and the proceeds from the NASC silent auctions. In 1998, SAA was able to begin awarding an annual Arthur C. Parker Scholarship, which supports training in archaeological methods for Native peoples from the United States and Canada who are students or employees of tribal cultural preservation programs. The scholarship is named for SAA’s first president, who was of Seneca descent. With supplemental funds received from the National Science Foundation, we are now able support a total of four scholarships each year.

To contribute to the Native American Scholarship Fund, contact the Native American Scholarships Committee, c/o SAA, 900 Second St. NE, Suite 12, Washington, DC 20002-3557; tel: (202) 789-8200; email: info@saa.org. If you have items for the auction, just bring them to the meeting to drop off at the NASC booth (preferably on Thursday morning).

Please come by the booth to browse and chat. If you are not interested in participating in the auction, but would like to make a cash donation to the Scholarship Fund, we will have forms available at the Auction booth for that purpose. We appreciate all the contributions made by our SAA membership in support of Native American Scholarships.
How did archaeology become professionalized over the years?” asks your editor. In my experience, with lots of kicking and screaming on the part of some folks, that’s how it was done. Well, maybe not screaming but a few raised voices at SAA business meetings, and certainly by dragging a lot of reluctant archaeologists out of their offices, classrooms, and square holes into the real world. And by embarrassing the always-conservative SAA Executive Committee into taking some action about things going on in the world outside academic archaeology—illegal trafficking, real-live Native Americans, Congressional actions, and the thousands and thousands (literally) of amateurs, collectors, teachers, legislators, developers, and the rest of the “public” who were and are affecting archaeological sites.

Bob McGimsey has summarized the various actions—some internal, some external—in the past 50 years that he sees as getting “the profession” to the point it is today. But hasn’t archaeology always been a “profession”? It depends, of course, on how you define it—which I shall not attempt here. Individuals had careers in archaeology, and considered it their profession. But turning a “band of brethren” (see McGimsey 1974) into a true—whatever that is—profession is presumably what we are talking about here. Prior to World War II, an individual taught his students (and the operative word is his) in his own likeness, or he did his own research when, where, and how he liked. SAA and the Archaeological Institute of America (AIA), the two national archaeological organizations of the time, each published a journal and held an annual meeting. According to the published minutes of the SAA Executive Committee, they deliberated problems with publications, finances, setting future meetings, and creating awards. As McGimsey outlines, that began to change after the war, but it was from about 1965 to 1985 that so many changes occurred. Those were exciting, not to say heady times! That also happened to be the period in which I was in the thick of things, sticking my fingers into all sorts of pies (maybe even a few eyes). Perhaps a little detail at a personal level can explain the nature of a few of the activities, particularly through SAA, that had some influence on where we are today.

Joe Ben Wheat was president of SAA in 1966–1967, and during his short reign he created an ad hoc committee, the Committee on the Public Understanding of Archaeology. What prompted Joe Ben to create this committee with the cumbersome name is lost in the mists of time. It became known as COPA. There were six members: Carl Chapman (chair), Wilson W. (Bill) Crook Jr., Hester A. Davis, Edward B. Jelks, Jack R. Rudy, and Douglas Schwartz. The committee’s charge was “to explore the ways and means for improving the public understanding of archaeology and to search out ideas for needs and programs.” It made its first “interim report” at the 1967 SAA (American Antiquity 32[4]:586) and made the following recommendations (verbatim from the report):

1. To get readable articles into the hands of elementary school and high school teachers, for example, through The Weekly Reader.

2. To get short well-illustrated articles on archaeology that are on the public information level into the hands of conservation groups, resources and development commissions, and other state agencies that have magazines and newsletters as regular publications.

3. To encourage the showing of existing films and the production of new films and television programs for the public understanding of archaeology.

4. It was suggested that a primer be written to educate the archaeologist on “How to Handle the Publicity of Finds,” so that a better understanding of archaeological discoveries could be obtained by the public.

5. Finally, the committee is recommending to the Executive Committee that the Society submit a proposal to some appropriate foundation to support a pilot study to explore the ways and means of furthering the public understanding of archaeology.

A commendable list of ideas, some of which sound familiar, and some of which are still good ideas. During the next year, the committee prepared a proposal as it had recommended and Chapman took it around to some of the major funding agencies, both federal and private. The proposal was asking for funds to prepare and execute a survey to find out what people knew about archaeology and what ways might be appropriate to get information to them. All those Chapman talked to or communicated with thought it was a great idea and should be
done but “it doesn’t fit into our mission at the moment.” A great idea all right, but ahead of its time it seems.

In 1969, Chapman resigned and I was asked to be chair. In that same year, the committee, which had existed of six members, asked the SAA Executive Committee to appoint one person in each state as a member of the committee and provided a suggested list. This was done, but the Executive Committee added: “these representatives will also serve as liaison agents in relation to the utilization of the provisions of PL 89-665, the National Historic Preservation Act.” Ah, hal! Recognition that something was going on in the outside world. This is actually the second evidence that I found in the deliberations of SAA that the Executive Committee was looking outside its own financial and budgetary concerns, to a wider world. The first evidence is in 1967 when the secretary’s report says “The [Executive] Committee discussed, without specific action, the growing problem of commercial traffic in archaeological specimens. . . .”

At the same time SAA was giving this new charge to COPA (1968–1969), McGimsey and Chapman were drafting the first iteration of what became the Archaeological and Historical Preservation Act of 1974 (known at the time as the Moss-Bennett Bill). It took six years and many rewrites to get the bill passed, and during that effort, COPA served as the communicating mechanism to acquaint archaeologists with the need for the legislation and to teach them how to help get it passed. This activity was not public education in the sense Wheat had meant, and the bill was to amend the 1960 Reservoir Salvage Act rather than add something or blend with the National Historic Preservation Act. But the COPA “alerts,” which were sent to the committee member in each state, were spread by each member to other archaeologists. It was an amazingly successful grass roots educational effort that worked, for both archaeologists and Congress, but particularly in letting archaeologists know that they could change something that affected their livelihood and the resources at the same time.

Once the work on Moss-Bennett was done, COPA carried on under several chairs as a communication devise for other legislative and governmental activities, but the mid-1970s brought so many changes for both individual archaeologists and SAA that the exact sequence of events is difficult to trace. Although COPA members met annually at the SAA Annual Meeting, and always talked of wanting to do something about public education, the what and how was not resolved until SAA made some decisions of its own (see McGimsey’s article).

To make a very long story appropriate in length to this venue, SAA put its emphasis first into taking a leadership role in legislative affairs. This included withdrawing from participation in the meetings of the Coordinating Council of National Archaeological Societies (CCONAS), an informal gathering of the presidents of the six national archaeological organizations which existed at the time: SAA, AIA, the Society for Historical Archaeology (SHA), Society of Professional Archaeologists (SOPA), American Society for Conservation Archaeology (ASCA), and the Association for Field Archaeology (AFFA). The CCONAS would meet to discuss how the archaeological profession could speak with one voice when working with Congress and federal agencies. The SAA Executive Committee felt that it was SAA that should provide the leadership and, ultimately, through various chameleon changes, it has essentially reached that goal.

In doing this, SAA, created two committees to take the place of COPA—the Government Affairs Committee (GAC) to work with the Society’s legislative liaison, and the Public Education Committee (PEC), the latter being the most energetic of its “professionalizing” activities. The PEC has one of the largest budgets for a committee, but must find outside funds for projects that are directed to “the public.”

A less well-documented change has occurred in the professionalization of archaeology. It was 32 years ago that the first woman was elected president of SAA (H. Marie Worthington, 1968–1969). The position was only for one year (it changed to two years in the mid-1970s along with the many other changes) and was in some senses ceremonial at the time. There have been but three other women as president since then (Cynthia Iwinn-Williams, Dana Dincauze, and Pru Rice), despite the huge rise in the number of women who are now professional archaeologists. Women are effective chairs of important committees, and are elected to SAA Executive Committee with regularity now; the same is certainly true for SHA and AIA. (My earliest copy of American Antiquity is for 1941, and it shows Frederica De Laguna on the Executive Committee, but not another women for 21 years, 1962, when Betty Meggers was elected. Ten years later Cynthia Iwinn-Williams was on the Executive Committee, and at least one woman seems to have been elected each year since then.)

The one area, in my opinion, where there could still be some improvement in achieving professional status is in academic training. I believe that true professionalization means paying attention to the world around us. And I also believe that many of those archaeological programs producing M.A.s and Ph.D.s have not yet figured out how to give appropriate amounts of time to theory, techniques, field experience, ethics, writing clear, grammatically correct, and understandable English, preparing for a job outside of academia, and public relations. There is always something that can be improved, isn’t there?
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A revolution of sorts is occurring in the world of archaeological provenance studies, and the instrument of change is Inductively Coupled Plasma Mass Spectrometry (ICP-MS). Archaeologists have long used a range of scientific techniques to characterize the elemental composition of artifacts in order to reconstruct prehistoric patterns of trade and interaction. The archaeological literature is riddled with the acronyms for these techniques—Atomic Absorption Spectrometry (AAS), Inductively Coupled Plasma Emission Spectrometry (ICP-OES), Instrumental Neutron Activation Analysis (INAA), Proton Induced X-Ray Emission (PIXE), Particle Induced Gamma-Ray Emission (PIGME), X-Ray Fluorescence (XRF)—and collectively they have helped archaeologists reconstruct past lifeways through rigorous scientific testing. Compared to these techniques, ICP-MS is either faster, more sensitive, or has superior detection limits on many elements. More importantly, the multielement capabilities of the method have stimulated a great deal of interest in a variety of scientific disciplines, and these instruments are becoming widely available at universities and research institutes nationwide. Because of this, we predict that within five years ICP-MS will become the method of choice for archaeologists interested in the geochemical characterization of artifacts. Here, we present some background to the technique and report some of our latest studies using this methodology at the Archaeometry Laboratory at California State University, Long Beach (CSULB) and the Research Reactor Center at the University of Missouri-Columbia (MURR).

Inductively Coupled Plasma Mass Spectrometry

Inductively Coupled Plasma Mass Spectrometry (ICP-MS) is a relatively new technique for determining material provenance. Most commonly, quadrupole mass spectrometers are used, although more sensitive magnetic sector instruments are now becoming available. Due to the great precision of the method (2–3 percent), it is becoming increasingly popular for deriving compositional data on materials found in archaeological contexts (obsidian, ceramic, metal, glass) (Mallory-Greenough et al. 1998; Pingitore et al. 1997; Tykot 1998). Approximately 70 elements can be measured in an essentially simultaneous manner with the technique and detection limits for most elements in the sub-parts-per-billion (ppb) range. High-resolution magnetic-sector instruments have detection limits even lower than quadrupole instruments, and they also permit more precise measurement of isotope ratios. Equipped with multi-collectors, magnetic-sector instruments yield isotope ratio measurements as precise as TIMS (thermal ionization mass spectrometers). Isotope ratios are currently used in metals provenance, but the approach offers great potential for resolving provenance questions for other materials as well.

In conventional ICP-MS, an inductively coupled argon plasma is used to send charged isotope species to a quadrupole mass spectrometer that separates them by their mass/charge ratio. Liquid samples are generally introduced into the argon plasma using an autosampler attached to a peristaltic pump. Prior to entering the instrument, the liquid is forced through a nebulization system where it is mixed with argon gas to create an aerosol that is ignited through RF inductive coupling (Pollard and Heron 1996). The torch (~8000°C) atomizes and ionizes all elements with a conducive ionization potential and directs them toward the pole through a series of nickel or platinum cones. In the quadrupole, ions of different masses are separated using two sets of oppositely charged rods by altering the voltage so that only ions of a particular mass can pass through...
the device to the detector (Tykot and Young 1996). Rapid scanning of the voltage across the quadropole rod pairs allows the sequential transmission of elements of a particular mass/charge ratio through the entire mass range from Lithium to Uranium. This process is rapid (~30 seconds), but typically five minutes is needed for the analysis due to delays in sample aspiration and the need to flush the sample transfer lines after each sample.

In magnetic sector ICP-MS, ions from the plasma are sent into a curved flight tube, where they are separated according to their mass/charge ratio by changing the current supplied to an electromagnet. The ion beam is focused on a collector slit that can be tuned so that masses as close as 0.001 amu (atomic mass units) can be resolved from one another, thus eliminating many polyatomic interferences.

There are several advantages of ICP-MS when compared to other techniques for determining the provenance of archaeological materials. First, the ability to determine a larger number of elements and to measure isotope ratios enhances the potential for discriminating even geochemically similar sources. Second, once samples have been prepared the elemental analysis can be done extremely rapidly (~5 minutes per sample), thus considerably reducing the per sample cost relative to other techniques. Third, because of the small sample size requirements, especially when coupled with laser-ablation systems (discussed further below), ICP-MS is virtually nondestructive.

The ICP-MS laboratory at CSULB is currently equipped with a Perkin Elmer Elan 6100-DRC Inductively Coupled Plasma Mass Spectrometer (Figure 1). This instrument was purchased with funds from NSF MRI (#OCE-9977564) awarded to a group of 11 researchers in the College of Natural Sciences/Mathematics and the College of Liberal Arts. It has detection limits for most elements in the parts-per-billion range (ppb), but certain elements can be measured at the parts-per-trillion level. The addition of the Dynamic Reaction Cell (DRC) also increases the number of potential analytes by eliminating certain isobaric and polyatomic interferences. Faculty and students in our newly established archaeometry program are working with ceramics and stone tools from the American Southwest, the Channel Islands of California, Mesoamerica, and Oceania.

At MURR, a VG Axiom magnetic sector ICP-MS was recently installed in a laboratory within the reactor building, where it will be used in conjunction with INAA in archaeological provenance studies (Figure 2). The instrument was purchased with funds from NSF MRI (OIA-9977237). The purchase included a Merchantek 213-nanometer wavelength laser-ablation system, which can ablate spot sizes between 5 and 400 μm in size at a rate
In the three months since instrument installation was complete, we have analyzed black paints on Southwestern pottery, slips on Plumbate pottery from Mesoamerica, obsidian from Mesoamerica and North America, and glass trade beads from North America.

**Microwave Digestion ICP-MS**

In order to obtain compositional data via ICP-MS, solid samples must be solubilized using acid digestion or atomized using laser ablation technology. Complete dissolution of archaeological materials is necessary to obtain quantitatively meaningful results. At CSULB and MURR we solubilize ceramic, chert, and obsidian samples via microwave digestion (CEM, Mars 5, and Milestone Ethos Plus, respectively). Scientific microwaves allow for complete control of temperature and pressure of samples during digestion (Figure 3). Although microwave digestion technology is used in organic and inorganic chemistry routinely to process a variety of sample types (Kingston and Haswell 1997), to the best of our knowledge we are the first to successfully couple microwave digestion and ICP-MS (MD-ICP-MS) for determining matrix and rare earth elements in archaeological or geological samples (Kennett et al. n.d.).

Acid digestion is an inherently risky endeavor because of the highly caustic nature of strong acids, particularly hydrofluoric acid which is required to break down the silica in many archaeological materials. Powdered archaeological samples (~100mg) are reacted with hydrofluoric, nitric, and hydrochloric acids in closed Teflon containers. Microwave digestion systems provide the safest method for conducting closed vessel acid digestions and are a great advance over open vessel, hot plate acid digestions. Although the method is relatively new, it is increasingly clear that it will become a viable alternative to Instrument Neutron Activation Analysis (INAA) and other techniques currently used for bulk chemical characterization (Kennett et al. n.d.).

**Laser Ablation ICP-MS**

UV Laser Ablation coupled with ICP-MS (LA-ICP-MS) can be used to determine trace elements in a variety of archaeological materials, including ceramics, obsidian, chert, basalt, metal, and glass (Figure 4A). The instrument can be used for bulk analysis, micro-feature analysis, surface-mapping, and depth profiling of materials. There are several benefits of LA-ICP-MS compared to chemistry-based digestion methods (Gratuze 1999; Mallory-Greenough et al. 1999). These advantages include: (1) minimal sample preparation, (2) no sample contamination with reagents, (3) lower elemental detection limits (parts-per-billion range), (4) less destruction to archaeological samples, (5) microsampling and surface mapping of complex samples (i.e., ceramics), (6) fast data acquisition, (7) nonhazardous sample preparation, and (8) lower cost per sample.

One of the most attractive benefits of LA-ICP-MS to many archaeologists is the nondestructive nature of the technique compared with microwave digestion. We currently require between 100 and 200 mg of powdered sample to obtain accurate and reproducible results with microwave digestion. This often requires the partial destruction of...
an artifact, which therefore limits the materials that can be analyzed, particularly materials from museum collections. LA-ICP-MS leaves only a small scar on an artifact that is barely visible with the naked eye (Figure 4B). This makes the analysis of rare or precious artifacts a feasible proposition.

Beyond the nondestructive nature of the technique, other benefits of LA-ICP-MS include lower detection limits on most elements and enhanced isotopic ratioing. Despite the use of high purity reagents, the process of digesting archaeological materials inherently adds background noise to samples. Even with the cleanest reagents available (acids, water, etc.) significant background signals are observed when analyzing samples with ICP-MS. Variability in the background signal reduces detection limits, which can be problematic when elements are rare in a sample.

LA-ICP-MS holds great potential as a rapid and cost-effective technique for characterizing the geochemical composition of archaeological materials. The primary impediment to the widespread use of the method is the difficulty in obtaining quantitative results because the amount of material removed from an artifact cannot be determined accurately. Matrix matching between homogenous archaeological materials (obsidian and metals) and external standards has been used successfully to obtain quantitative results (Gratuze 1999), but this technique has limited utility for heterogeneous materials such as ceramics and chert. We are currently experimenting with different methods for obtaining quantitative results and have had some preliminary successes with adding internal standards to small powdered materials. Development of a quantitative LA-ICP-MS technique is certainly within reach and, once established, will further enhance the capabilities of ICP-MS.

Conclusion

As our questions about the past become more sophisticated, greater access to reliable scientific techniques will be needed to test competing hypotheses. The analytical capabilities of ICP-MS enhance our ability to determine
the provenance of archaeological materials. The lower cost and speed of this technique also allows for the large sample sizes necessary to reconstruct the spatial complexities and temporal variability of regional exchange networks. Due to the increasing popularity of ICP-MS in a variety of fields we predict that within the next five years most universities will have the instrumentation required to make accurate and precise geochemical measurements. These instruments acquire data rapidly and can be shared by multiple users working on diverse projects. Coupled with microwave digestion and laser ablation, this will make geochemical provenance studies via ICP-MS more accessible to the archaeological community.

Although the proliferation of ICP-MS instruments on university campuses offers great potential for archaeological provenance studies, much of this potential will be squandered if individual laboratories generate project-specific data that are incompatible with the data generated in other laboratories. Making optimum use of the potential of ICP-MS will require individual laboratories to adopt common sample preparation and standardization procedures. A set of quality-control standards and benchmark tests would enable laboratories to verify that their results are compatible with results generated elsewhere. Initial results of a collaborative study at MURR and CSULB (Kennett et al. n.d.) make us optimistic that data generated in different labs and even by different techniques can be calibrated against one another if careful quality control measures are adopted.
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Network Coordinators Needed  PEC chair-elect Beverly Chiarulli has put out a call for network coordinators in the following states: New York, Florida, Michigan, Illinois, Hawaii, New Mexico, Tennessee, and most of Canada. Coordinators act as volunteer liaisons between the PEC and organizers of public education activities at the state/provincial or local level. They provide information to the PEC about regional activities and assist the activity organizers by providing information about local and national resources. The main requirement is that the coordinator be a member of SAA and be willing to respond to inquiries about archaeology in your state. Bev notes that most coordinators do not receive a lot of calls and most are forwarded to them from the SAA office, but some level of institutional support is usually advisable. Contact Bev via email at bevc@grove.iup.edu for more information.

New Brochures Available  The SAA office recently announced two new brochures that discuss archaeology careers and how to become involved in archaeology. “The Path to Becoming an Archaeologist” focuses on making archaeology a career and “Experience Archaeology” explains how individuals can become responsibly involved in archaeology. Quantities of up to 100 brochures can be ordered from the SAA office at the following rates: 1–10, free; 11–50, free brochures + $5 shipping ($6 non-U.S. orders); 51–100, $0.25 per brochure over 50 + $5 shipping ($6 non-U.S. orders). State/provincial network coordinators should contact the Manager, Education and Outreach (public_edu@saa.org) for orders (fees and shipping and handling will not be charged). All other orders must be prepaid by check made payable to Society for American Archaeology (in U.S. funds drawn on a U.S. bank), or by MasterCard, Visa, or American Express.

PEC on the Web  Check out the new and improved Public Education page on the SAAweb and learn about the resources that are available to the public, educators, and archaeologists alike. The site has information on the PEC and its goals, guidelines for the evaluation of archaeology education materials, sample lessons for teaching archaeology in grades 3 through 12, a complete list of the PEC’s archaeology education coordinators in each state, and online access to the PEC’s e-newsletter, Archaeology & Public Education. A&P&E provides information on current archaeology related events across the U.S. as well as updates on PEC subcommittee activities. Most back issues of the newsletter (1993–1998) also are available for review online.

ARCHAEOPOLITICS

The work of the Government Affairs program is of value to all members of the profession, and indeed to everyone who cares about our ability to protect, learn from, and interpret the past. But...
Public education and outreach opportunities can present themselves in ways never imagined and the rewards can be vast for all participants. For Boy Scout Troop 21 of Mansfield, Pennsylvania, their lessons about archaeology began when their scoutmaster requested a tour of a local site.

Earning a merit badge in archaeology is a valuable educational endeavor that can be shared by Boy Scouts (and Girl Scouts), their families, the merit badge counselor, the scoutmaster, assistant scoutmasters, and an entire archaeological field team. While structured programs for the Boy Scouts of America (BSA) Merit Badge in Archaeology exist throughout the United States, our experience demonstrates that it is possible to offer such a program within the context of an ongoing data recovery project.

In May 2000, the scoutmaster for Mansfield’s Troop 21 stopped by the Phase III excavation of site 36Ti116 being conducted by the Louis Berger Group, Inc. (Berger). The field effort began in April and local interest in the project had started to grow. The scoutmaster wanted to know if his troop could have a tour of 36Ti116, as the troop leaders were interested in opportunities for the troop to pursue the archaeology merit badge. The interest and enthusiasm of Troop 21 led to Berger’s interest in learning more about the badge program.

The scoutmaster provided information about the merit badge program, and we reviewed the handbook for the archaeology merit badge (BSA 1997). We also sought information from colleagues who might have familiarity with such a program within the context of ongoing data recovery projects. One of our concerns was whether there would be too much disruption to the work at hand. Before proceeding further, we presented the proposed program to our client for permission. Public education and outreach was an important component of Berger’s proposed activities, but the details of the program had not been formalized. Gannett Fleming, Inc., and the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT), District 3-0 responded enthusiastically to the merit badge program.

We moved forward with a plan to provide Troop 21 with a valuable educational experience. We had a field crew of 23 at 36Ti116, so it was possible to implement a one-on-one educational program. The goal was to pair every scout with an archaeologist. We recognized that the key to success was individualized instruction, and the excellent field crew that had been assembled for this project was the vehicle to make this experience possible for Troop 21.

Guidance on similar programs was critical and Beverly Chiarulli (chair-elect of the PEC) was instrumental in providing assistance and direction. Chiarulli posted Berger’s query to the PEC’s discussion list, SAAPEC-L, and it was not long before offers of guidance, recommendations, and examples of similar programming were received from various PEC members across the nation.

While all the information gathered was of great value to the creation of the program (i.e., Farley 2000), it was the material developed by the University of Alaska (1998) that proved to be extremely useful. The packet provided by Becky Saleebey contained a series of forms that Berger used to track the accomplishments of each scout. These forms became invaluable to the overall organization of the program and acted as a visual benchmark of each scout’s progress. In addition, the one-on-one learning process ensured the program proceeded smoothly to evaluation of achievement and did not require the merit badge counselor’s presence at all times.

Troop 21 was informed that an archaeology merit badge program was approved and logistical preparations began. Issues of insurance and safety were addressed. A three-day field schedule was established during the week for the scouts. School was about to
close for the year and timing was crucial if we were to capture the attention of the scouts before they became too involved in their summer activities. Our program also included two girl scouts, and, because there is no formal merit badge program for the girls, we decided they would follow the requirements and participate along with Troop 21.

The three days on site were scheduled to run consecutively with daily hours of 9 a.m. to 2 p.m. This resulted in minimal disruption to the progress of the data recovery project and allowed Berger’s field crew to take care of business both before and after the scouts were on site each day. A tent was erected adjacent to the project area for lectures, demonstrations, lunch, and a retreat from the afternoon sun. We also established a “Boy Scout Block” outside the project area for additional hands-on experience in excavation techniques. The scout’s parents graciously prepared and served lunch each of the three days for both the scouts and the field crew.

Troop 21 could not afford the merit badge booklet, so the program accommodated this situation. Berger covered a wide range of information throughout the program. Libraries in the area were researched for their resources on archaeology that would be useful to the scouts in completing their merit badge assignments. A mini-library was created and presented to Troop 21 using donated textbooks and other archaeology-related books. Lectures were designed as 10-minute slide shows and organized around the themes of Introduction to Archaeology, Context, Dirt/Soil, Ceramics, Bones, Lithics, and Archaeology around the World. A flintknapping demonstration was scheduled, as were artifact exhibits and presentation panels highlighting archaeological projects around the United States. The lectures, demonstrations, and exhibits took place in the tent in the morning before heading out for fieldwork and in the afternoon before heading home. The Berger field crew was critical to the success of this endeavor. All had undergraduate degrees in anthropology/archaeology as well as lengthy field experiences; the scouts were fortunate to have such a seasoned and knowledgeable team.

After three days of lectures, training, individualized instruction, and firsthand experience, the scouts were well on their way toward completing their merit badge requirements. Over the next five months, Berger continued to meet with the scouts during their regularly scheduled troop meetings to allow them to present the results of their research and to meet the remaining requirements. For the exhibit portion of the merit badge requirement, the scouts worked in teams of three to create posters that addressed two central questions. Why is it important to study archaeological sites? What will we learn from the archaeological excavations at 36Ti116? The completed posters, along with newspaper articles on the project that appeared throughout Pennsylvania, were presented in an exhibit highlighting the project and what we can learn from archaeology. In late September, the scouts hosted the exhibit at Mansfield’s annual Fabulous 1890s celebration held to commemorate the first football game ever played under lights. After the September exhibit opening, it was moved to the lobby of a local bank.

The fieldwork for the data recovery project officially closed on December 1, 2000, but the scouts of Troop 21 continue to work on their merit badge requirements. To date, about 30 percent of the scouts have successfully completed the requirements. We are also pleased to report that working with the scouts did not deter the data recovery effort. The archaeological components across 36Ti116 that were successfully delineated and sampled included an early Owasco household consisting of a subrectangular structure, interior hearths and pit features, and external activity areas; a specialized early Owasco activity area believed to have been used for constructing and firing ceramic vessels; an extensive series of late Middle Archaic hearths and activity areas surrounding the hearths; and a Middle Archaic bifurcate tradition occupation. Throughout this project, the Berger team members shared their interest in and knowledge of archaeology with 22 terrific scouts. PennDOT’s encouragement and support enables Berger to continue this education effort so that each scout has ample opportunity to complete the merit badge requirements. Not all of them will, but we are confident that the experiences they had working with us in the field will not soon be forgotten.

We are also pleased to report that in November 2000, PennDOT District 3-0 was awarded the 2000 American Cultural Resources Association Government Award for its commitment to public outreach and education through this merit badge project.
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On the occasion of the first issue of the Society's new magazine—The SAA Archaeological Record—I would like to take this opportunity to update the membership on the current activities of the Student Affairs Committee (SAC), as well as reintroduce the committee to those members who may not know us. As presented in our official 1999 Statement and Goals, the SAC is committed to three goals that include: (1) To promote and develop opportunities for student professional development within the Society for American Archaeology, (2) To promote and develop opportunities for student professionalism in archaeology, and (3) To act as a conduit between the SAA and its student members, including the dissemination of relevant information, and collecting and addressing feedback from student members. As such, our initiatives and activities are wide and varied, and I am excited about our plans for the future.

On Wednesday, April 5, 2000, the SAC met in Philadelphia. At that meeting a variety of topics involving students within the SAA were discussed. The committee also made plans for its initiatives and activities for the upcoming year. As a committee (and as students), we are excited about our plans for the transition to the new millennium. The Philadelphia meeting also marked the transition of the committee’s chairship from Jane Baxter to myself. Jane has been a very active member of the committee over the years and was instrumental in establishing the newly formed SAA Student Paper Award (www.saa.org/aboutsaa/committees/o-sacstuaw.html). While we’re sorry to see Jane leave the committee, we wish her the best in her future endeavors and are grateful for her exemplary service to the Society’s student members.

In the past, the SAC has been a regular contributor to the SAA Bulletin. Within our contributions, we have attempted to provide useful information on a variety of topics of interest to students, including selecting field and graduate schools, attending the annual meetings, presenting papers or posters, developing teaching skills, obtaining funding, and internships (contents of SAA Bulletins can be viewed at www.anth.ucsb.edu/SAABulletin/). In future issues of The SAA Archaeological Record, you will continue to see the regular SAC column. Upcoming topics for 2001 include issues involving students and CRM, and job hunting. If you have any topics you would like to see us cover, or if you have an idea for a column of your own, please let us know.

Also, please do not forget to start planning to attend this year’s meetings in New Orleans. The SAC has been busy preparing for two student-oriented workshops as well as our fourth annual sponsored symposium. Our workshops revolve around the issues of student “publishing” and “funding” and our symposium topic is “Archaeology as Anthropology.” Each of these events promise to be as successful as previous ones we have sponsored. Finally, I would like to remind students of an excellent way to defray the costs of attending the Annual Meetings—volunteering to help out the staff in New Orleans. In exchange for 12 hours of help, the Society will provide you with complimentary meeting registration and abstracts as well as a small stipend for expenses. Volunteering is an excellent way to get involved in the meetings and make the acquaintance of other archaeologists.

Please do not hesitate to contact me (email: rakita@unm.edu) or the other members of the committee if you have any concerns, queries or ideas. Our web pages can be found at www.saa.org/aboutsaa/committees/o-dstu.html. Also, please encourage your friends and colleagues to become members of the SAA; or if they already are, to be as active in the society as possible. Again, the committee is excited about the future. We appreciate your help and support as we move toward our goals for the new millennium.

Now available on the Web!

eHRAF Collection of Archaeology
Full-text database on archaeological traditions
Subject-indexed for quick retrieval of information
Great tool for teaching and research!

Free 30 days trial available!
Visit Human Relations Area Files (HRAF) at www.yale.edu/hraf

Please address inquiries to: Christiane.Cunnar@yale.edu; 1-800-520-HRAF
To an archaeologist, journalists are scary creatures, but I suggest that journalists and anthropologists are very much alike. In many ways they view the world in the same way.

First, anthropologists and journalists focus on people. Anthropologists study human biology, culture, politics, socioeconomic, material remains, and artifacts. Journalists write about politics, economics, medicine, religion, the social condition, technology, and government. Slightly different words with the same meanings. Both record facts about aspects of human life, analyze these facts, and sometimes express opinions about human life. Good anthropologists and good journalists are after the same thing: understanding people, their lives, and cultures.

The second most important similarity is that they both view the world as observers. Journalistic objectivity is the goal. Journalists should never become involved with their stories. Report the news—don't make it—is a journalist's life. Anthropologists have this same value of objectivity. Influencing the subjects will not get valid survey results. Participating in the culture makes it difficult to be objective. Going into an excavation with expected outcomes leads to misdirected conclusions and lost data. Both anthropologists and journalists are voyeurs, recording what they see and what goes on around them without participating.

Nonparticipation in both professions is often breached. Journalists have been called on the carpet for creating amalgam subjects, becoming too involved with their subject, or paying for information. Anthropologists have become so involved in their study they are no longer objective or allow their research to follow a course that benefits a cause or theory. On a very basic level, journalists and anthropologists obtain information in similar ways. Both use the interview as a tool. Journalists study interview technique and note taking. They are taught to record exact quotations and facts, and at the same time to capture the subject, the surroundings, and the emotions of the person or the event. Not very different from what an anthropologist is taught in ethnology and survey courses. Not all that different from the interaction of an excavator and an excavation. In fact, the interview may be where some of the conflict between journalists and anthropologists arises. Both are used to being the questioner, not the questioned. Both tend to sidestep as soon as their informant asks a question. Both are familiar with the procedure and know all the techniques, and this can make for strained, unsuccessful interviews and less-than-good results in newspapers and magazines.

In another way, anthropologists and journalists share a certain camaraderie. They both have peculiar images in the popular culture. Anthropologists have, of course, Indiana Jones, that icon of archaeology, and the more recent Tia Carrera in Relic Hunter. We know that archaeologists do not operate like Indy and that the plots in Relic Hunter are absurd, but to the general public they are the image of the anthropologist/archaeologist. That is if they do not think we dig up dinosaur bones. Journalists have a similar problem. The image is one of tattered respectability, adventure, intrigue, power. There are Clark Kent, Lois Lane, and Perry White, the Front Page, and the justly cancelled Deadline depicting an alcoholic, unlikeable columnist who eschewed computers and broke the law regularly.

Yes, anthropologists and journalists may travel for their jobs. They may meet interesting, important people, see amazing places opened only to a few and sometimes, rarely, change some aspect of the world we live in. But more often, the work is less exciting. For the most part, anthropologists and journalists spend their time in front of computers, looking at databases, talking to people, and slowly, carefully putting together the story. To add to this misunderstanding, as professions go, anthropology and journalism are near if not at the bottom of the pay scale. Neither journalists nor anthropologists go into it to get rich. There are easier ways to make a living, but perhaps not ones that are more fun. For the outcome of both professionals' work is the story of our lives, whether printed in newspapers and magazines or in monographs and journal articles.
THE REGISTER

NEWS FROM THE REGISTER OF PROFESSIONAL ARCHAEOLOGISTS

Donald Hardesty

Donald Hardesty is president of the Register.

This inaugural issue of The SAA Archaeological Record includes the first advertisement for the Register of Professional Archaeologists (see adjacent page). The ad launches a major recruitment drive.

WHAT IS THE VALUE OF BEING AN RPA?

Recruiting almost always demands trying to answer the question of “why?” In this case, the questions are why should I become a Registered Professional Archaeologist (RPA)? What does it do for me? What does it do for the profession? Here are some answers to consider.

(1) The Register enhances the legal value of being a professional archaeologist. Archaeologists testifying as expert witnesses in land claim cases, for example, can have their credibility challenged by attorneys. Registration provides credentials that can be of enormous value in the legal arena.

(2) The Register enhances the social, economic, and political value of being a professional archaeologist because it promotes recognition by other professions. It comes as a surprise to many archaeologists that the public at large and the legal system often do not recognize archaeologists to be professionals in the same sense as architects, accountants, engineers, or medical practitioners. The Register helps to develop an image of archaeology as a profession and RPAs as professionals.

(3) The Register is a community of colleagues who have accepted the Code of Conduct and Standards of Research Performance for the benefit of the profession and cultural resources. It is an integrative link that helps to develop common values among all professional archaeologists.


(5) The Register administers grievance procedures to protect both the public and the profession by a thorough and impartial investigation should it be alleged that a Registered Professional Archaeologist has failed to comply with the Code and Standards. Professional peers conduct the grievance process, which recognizes archaeologists’ common responsibility to the profession, the public, and the resources.

(6) The last several presidents of SAA and the Society of Historical Archaeology (SHA) are listed on the Register, and the current president of the Archaeological Institute of America (AIA) is an RPA as well. These leaders within our profession recognize the value of endorsing and adhering to the Register’s Code and Standards.

(7) The value of being a Registered Professional Archaeologist lies in accountability. By taking this step the RPA is saying to the world that I am a professional, I will adhere to the standards and code, and I willingly subject myself to the grievance process for any breaches of misconduct. In the absence of a requirement that all archaeologists be registered and take continuing education credits, an archaeologist can take no more meaningful step toward recognition by his/her peers, the regulatory community, clients, and the lay public as a professional than to become registered voluntarily.

(8) There is a growing trend for states to require principal investigators of archaeological research projects to be listed on the Register or its equivalent.

(9) The Register works with sponsoring or affiliated scholarly organizations (e.g., SAA, SHA, and AIA) to mutually promote the Code and Standards.

(10) The Register promotes a public image that enhances the difference between professional archaeologists and treasure hunters (e.g., commercial salvagers).

(11) The Register promotes lifelong education for professional archaeologists.

(12) The Register promotes closes ties between the academy and archaeologists working in the private sector, government, and museums.
GOVERNMENT ARCHAEOLOGY—OR SHOULD WE SAY “PUBLIC ARCHAEOLOGY”?

Anne M. Wolley Vawser

Ann Vawser is an archeologist at the Midwest Archeological Center, National Park Service, in Lincoln, Nebraska.

Just what constitutes government archaeology? How is it different from academic archaeology? How are they the same? When I was recently invited to edit a new column for The SAA Archaeological Record with the general subject of government archaeology, I had to think about these things a little bit myself. What I decided is that government archaeology is probably more accurately described as public archaeology, and the main difference between it and academic archaeology is that if you work for the government, you have to learn to spell archaeology without the extra “a.” At least the U.S. government sees it as extra.

I decided to use this first column to generate some discussion about the topic, and I hope to use the column space in the future to highlight projects that represent the diversity of programs and the kinds of archaeology being done within the realm of government archaeology. I also thought I might try to come up with a snappier title for the column, but I eventually decided it was best to let the title stand. I realize the term “government archaeology” generally conjures thoughts of such exciting topics as Section 106 compliance, negative finding reports, and mounds of paperwork and red tape. While I won’t deny that these things are indeed a part of what goes in the offices of many government archaeologists, few would stay if that was all there was to it.

If we think about it, government archaeology is really archaeology mandated by the public, so it is really public archaeology. The federal government, most state governments, and even many county or local governments, have laws that are designed to preserve and protect archaeological resources for the benefit of the public. These laws come into effect any time public lands or public funds are involved. So why do I believe there isn’t much difference between this and academic archaeology? Primarily because much of government archaeology takes place in academic institutions.

At the local and county level, few agencies have their own archaeologist on staff, and even state and federal agencies often do not have sufficient staff or equipment to carry out major archaeological projects. These agencies look to archaeological departments at colleges and universities to complete projects through either cooperative agreements or work with the contract arms of many university archaeology programs. And while these projects must be designed to meet the required legal mandates of the government agency, it does not necessarily mean they are dull or that they are insignificant in their contribution to the archaeological knowledge of North America. Government archaeological projects are designed to answer important research questions about the archaeological record and report on the results of investigations.

Government archaeologists are also just as passionate about archaeology as are those in the academic arena. While their names may not appear as often on the bylines of articles in major journals or books, they work tirelessly to complete their work and report it for the benefit of other archaeologists and the public. The massive amount of “gray literature” is a testament to their reporting efforts, and recent programs designed to increase the involvement of the public in government archaeology attests to their commitment to make it a truly public archaeology. Government agencies have designed some wonderful programs to include volunteers in archaeological projects and also to produce public consumption oriented reports about their projects and resources.

One of the great struggles of government archaeology is the multitude of other factors at issue that are often in conflict with archaeological preservation. While archaeologists may agree that a resource is important and significant, its preservation may have to be weighed against other issues like health and safety, public enjoyment, or resource extraction. And the timetables in government archaeological projects are not always in tune with research needs. While academic oriented projects may proceed at a more leisurely pace guided by research interests, government projects may need to be completed in relation to other associated projects or planning...
Listing on the Register helps to market new professionals in archaeology by enhancing their professional image and credentials.

For these reasons and more, all archaeologists have a responsibility to promote professionalism. The question is not just “what can the Register do for us?” or “what are the benefits of registration?” but “what can we do to promote the profession and its standards?” Being an RPA is a personal commitment to enhancing the standards, status, and dignity of the field.

Attention Students! As part of its recruitment drive, the Register hopes to reach graduate students in archaeology who are about to complete or have recently completed an M.A. or Ph.D. degree to apply for registration. If they do so within six months of graduation, the Register will waive its application fee. Apply now! Pass the word!

Field School Certification Panels: The Register has organized panel discussion of field school certification at the 2001 annual meetings of AIA, SHA, and SAA.

GOVERNMENT ARCHAEOLOGY

Many archaeologists working in government will tell you that the frustrating thing about being a government archaeologist is that you find yourself having to fight every day to preserve the archaeological resources. Those same archaeologists will tell you that the rewarding thing about being a government archaeologist is that you find yourself fighting every day to preserve archaeological resources.

I hope you will look for this column in the next issue of The SAA Archaeological Record, and take the time to read about some of the great projects and issues currently taking place in government archaeology.

ARCHAEOPOLITICS

this work is especially important to the large proportion of our membership who work in cultural resource management, whether in the private sector or in government agencies. Federal laws, regulations, and budgets, as well as agency guidance and policies, directly affect the environment in which we work, the resources under our jurisdiction, and our very livelihoods. It is a fact of government that those who make the effort to be heard can influence the process to a degree that is far out of proportion to their numbers. Given its visibility and the highly professional quality of its presence, SAA’s Government Affairs program provides SAA’s membership with an opportunity to influence government decision making at the highest levels.

Effective as it has become, there are many ways that we can make SAA’s Government Affairs program even better. In my role as incoming GAC chair I have been discussing some ideas for the future with Donald Craib. Both of us feel that our Government Affairs program has been too reactive. We’ve done a fine job in that reactive mode, no doubt about it, but we want to encourage the SAA Board to develop a proactive component. We will be asking the Board to establish a legislative agenda and a set of public policy goals that are important to our members and to charge the GAC with developing a plan for achieving those goals. Goals already under discussion include securing appointment of an archaeologist to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and a program to nominate archaeologists to the Bureau of Land Management Resource Advisory Committees in the western states.

As we move into the next administration and the next Congress, the Government Affairs program will be working on ways to increase our interaction with the membership. We want your ideas about SAA’s legislative agenda, we want to keep you informed about the issues that we are working on, and we want you to alert us about legislative or policy matters that you think are important to our membership. The Government Affairs page on SAAweb provides summaries of the issues on which we have taken action and of the positions that the Society has taken. The Website also includes information about how to subscribe to Government Affairs Update, an email publication for those who wish to receive regular updates on the activities of the Government Affairs program.

Government Affairs is your program, paid for by your dues. If you have ideas or suggestions about how the program can better serve you, please feel free to contact Donald Craib (donald_craib@saa.org) or me (isebastian@sricrm.com) at any time.
Detailed information about specific radiocarbon measurements is essential for one of the fundamental concerns of archaeology—chronological control. There is always a great deal of understanding to be gained from the critical evaluation of any existing date in light of new information. Many of us have regarded as essential the ability to check date lists for details of lab techniques, pretreatment procedures, sample materials, and other information not always provided when a particular date was published or cited in a scholarly article. Some of this information is indispensable for the application of new calibration techniques, which are essential for chronological accuracy.

In 1995, editor Austin Long announced in Radiocarbon the debut of a new online journal, Radiocarbon Date Lists (RDL), established for the purpose of publishing the lists of radiocarbon dates submitted by laboratories. RDL had an ISSN and was planned as a peer-reviewed publication. However, by 1997 the new “online journal” had been scrapped, partly due to lack of subscription support and partly due to the dearth of submissions (Long 1995). This was not for a lack of material or even a lack of interest in the use of radiocarbon databases. The number of radiocarbon dates, especially those from AMS labs, have increased dramatically in the past five years. Geographic Information Systems (GIS) analysis has also opened a wide range of possibilities for the use of geographically coded radiocarbon data. What models does the Web offer some specific solutions for open access to growing, interactive radiocarbon date lists and databases?

The idea of a centrally organized, digital database of radiocarbon dates was the brainchild of Renee Kra (1988). Unfortunately, the project was shelved for lack of funding as well as logistical problems. David Sewell, a former assistant editor at Radiocarbon who created the initial format for Radiocarbon Date Lists, notes, “If only the computer age had begun a couple of decades earlier, there would probably be a nearly complete Internet database of radiocarbon dates in a standard format. Unfortunately, by the time Renee Kra and others began to seek staff and funding to do such a thing (mid 1980s), there were thousands of records in obsolete media (punch cards, tape, etc.) and in many different formats, and the subsequent exponential growth of date production with AMS dating made it seem less possible or even desirable to record every single 14C date in a single database.” Is there a Web solution to this problem?

Canadian Archaeological Radiocarbon Database

One inspiring example of a successful online radiocarbon database is the Canadian Archaeological Radiocarbon Database (CARD) www.canadianarchaeology.com/radiocarbon/card/card.htm, a “live” database of radiocarbon dates from Canada that has been compiled by Richard Morlan of the Canadian Museum of Civilization. It is available on the Web courtesy of the Canadian Archaeological Association www.canadianarchaeology.com/. CARD was born as a result of Morlan’s participation in an initial workshop convened by Renee Kra for planning the International Radiocarbon Database. It is a bilingual (English/French) compilation of radiocarbon measurements for archaeological and vertebrate palaeontological sites. At present, there are over 7,000 radiocarbon dates from Canada. Morlan notes that “These dates represent a substantial financial investment, but their potential for developing the chronology of archaeology and palaeontology remains under-utilized and in some respects misused. The dates are widely scattered in published and unpublished sources, and many have not been reported at all. Furthermore, the dates are not all created equal, as they represent the results of analytical methods and techniques that have evolved over a 50-year period.”
A search form permits searches based on site name, lab number, or ranges of dates. Individual data sheets are available for each date, with comments on the material dates, its provenience, and its associations. Data can be searched by Borden block (a designation reflecting latitude and longitude in blocks of 10–20 minutes), Borden number, site name, province, National Topographic System (NTS) map sheet number, laboratory number, material dated, and cultural affiliation. Searches can also be conducted for a range of dates or any combination of the above-mentioned fields. The location search field includes county names, major drainages, and the islands of the Arctic Archipelago. Associated taxa field contains the scientific names of mammals associated with the dates. Clicking on a “Search” button retrieves the data, which is presented as a table listing province or territory, Borden number, site name, laboratory number, and normalized age. Hyperlinks to any entry produce the full record for a given entry. Easy navigation buttons make the interface quick and easy to use, and any page can be printed. Naturally, a principal advantage of the online format is that it is constantly correctable and updateable. Morlan’s email address appears at the bottom of each screen, and users are encouraged to send corrections, comments, and additions by email.

One of the principal uses of the CARD database is the Mapping Ancient History project found at the Geological Survey of Canada’s GeoServ website. Mapping Ancient History is a Geographic Information Systems (GIS) presentation that creates maps of dated sites depicting the deglaciation and landscape evolution of North America across the past 18 millennia. A Web interface permits one to view maps of site distribution in Canada in 1,000-year increments from 18,000–1000 B.P. (Some of these maps appeared in the March/February 2000 issue of Discovering Archaeology, online at www.discoveringarchaeology.com.) Morlan is planning to update CARD with data from Alaska by the end of the year. He writes, “I have been working on extending the coverage southward well into the United States. The international border has certain influences on our disciplines, but it is irrelevant to our questions about ancient history. Hopefully we can compile a continental database in the long run. I will welcome data and comments from anyone who is interested in this project.” His email address is Richard.Morlan@civilisations.ca.

Other Online Examples

Having scanned the Web with various search engines, I have identified only a few other examples of active online radiocarbon databases.

**ANDES:** Radiocarbon Database for Bolivia, Ecuador, and Peru, has been assembled by Mariusz S. Ziolkowski, Mieczyslaw F. Pazdur, Andrzej Krzanowski, and Adam Michczynski of the Archaeological Institute, Warsaw University’s website. Some 2,800 dates are presented as uncalibrated results. They can be viewed online in three different tabular forms: (1) by uncorrected age B.P., (2) by country (Bolivia, Ecuador, and Peru), and (3) by laboratory. Each entry provides site name, date B.P., with error range, and laboratory reference number.

In the U.K., the Archaeology Data Service, University of York (ADS) is home to two large radiocarbon databases: the Council for British Archaeology (CBA)’s Archaeological Site Index to Radiocarbon Dates from Great Britain and Ireland and a database of radiocarbon dates from an Arts and Humanities Research Board (AHRB) funded study, “Spatial and Chronological Patterns in the Neolithisation of Europe” (see below). The former is based on a large data set initially compiled by Cherry Lael for CBA and subsequently augmented to (as of late November 2000) some 6,382 records. It is comprehensive until 1982, with some later additions in 1991. Although it is missing the large number of “conventional” and AMS dates that have been obtained during the last decade, it is currently the prime publicly available reference source on radiocarbon dates for British and Irish sites. It can be queried using a total of 11 different fields. Access to both of these databases is available via the ArchSearch interface, the online catalogue of the ADS (follow the links “Special Collections” and “Dating”).

The New Zealand Radiocarbon Database, assembled by Tom Higham and Bruce McFadgen, of the Department of Conservation, University of Waikato, and the Institute of Geological and Nuclear Sciences Ltd. of New Zealand, is another example of a useful national resource. It contains radiocarbon determinations and associated information for almost 3,000 dates obtained by seven laboratories from archaeological sites in New Zealand over the past 40 years. It permits form-based searches using fields of lab number, material dated, site name, site number, and conservancy.

Two modest examples of U.S. state-level databases are those for Delaware and Tennessee. The Delaware Radiocarbon Database, compiled by Kelvin Ramsey for the Delaware Geological...
Survey, presents a table of 267 dates. The Tennessee Radiocarbon Date Online Database [www.mtsu.edu/~kesmith/TNARCHNET/TNC14.html], which remains in the development stages, is designed to provide a centralized database of resource information on radiocarbon dates from sites in Tennessee. It currently includes approximately 800 dates but is not yet fully accessible. Obviously, there is a great deal that remains to be done in the development of these types of resources.

Specific Research Projects

Two current research projects that are likely to result in significant, publicly accessible radiocarbon databases merit special mention:

Spatial and Chronological Patterns in the Neolithisation of Europe is the result of a major study to evaluate the “neolithic” population expansion across Europe after 7000 B.C. under the direction of Stephen Shennan and James Steele. The aim of this project has been to compile a digital database of radiocarbon dates for the later Mesolithic and early Neolithic of Europe (ca. 9000–5000 B.P.), a time frame covering the range from the later Mesolithic in southeast Europe to the earlier Neolithic in northern and northwest Europe. It includes information about date contexts, the material dated, and economic and cultural associations. The information is now being analyzed using GIS techniques. The database is available to online users via an ArchSearch interface [ads.ahds.ac.uk/catalogue/]. It can be queried online using a total of 22 different information fields, which include data on material dated and associations with specific floral, faunal, and human remains.

Absolute Chronology for Early Civilisations in Austria and Central Europe using 14C Dating with Accelerator Mass Spectrometry [www.nhm-wien.ac.at/NHM/Prehist/Stadler/14C_Project/] is a project that has generated the world’s largest radiocarbon database. It currently contains documentation of about 30,000 radiocarbon dates pertaining to some 500 different cultures. Although it is not yet online, this project is intended to have an interactive component, which would allow for other researchers to contribute missing data and utilize portions of the database.

Future Directions

In his 1997 editorial reporting the discontinuation of Radiocarbon Date Lists, Austin Long expressed his opinion that “establishing a comprehensive, single-site 14C database is not feasible.” One possible solution he suggests is to provide Web site lists for individual laboratories that previously provided online, searchable 14C databases “whose directors wish to make available details of their techniques and personnel.” However, to date only a few commercial laboratories have taken the initiative to do this, and none appear to be publishing the kind of information that routinely accompanied Radiocarbon-style date lists in the past. Even fewer have taken the initiative to publish their date lists online. [One exception is the Oxford Radiocarbon Accelerator Unit [users.ox.ac.uk/%7Eorau/dl_index.html] which simply reprints data from date lists published in Archaeometry (1985–2000, Vols. 26–42) indexed by site and date number.] Given the rapidly growing corpus of both “conventional” and AMS dates, it is imperative that digital resources be developed to fill the void left by the regular publication of date lists. Although Radiocarbon resumed publication of a handful of date lists in 1997, these are not representative of the volume of data that is currently being generated. Date lists, in whatever format, are essential for the responsible, critical, scientific evaluation of some of the foundations of ongoing archaeological inferences about chronology. The Web now offers us a number of new options for accessing this data. Let us hope that radiocarbon laboratories, funding agencies, and creative archaeological professionals will realize how important it has become to devote energy and resources to new solutions for accessing the burgeoning basis for proving the antiquity of the past.

Author’s Note: The journal Radiocarbon [www.radiocarbon.org] has begun online publication this year, with the first two numbers of Volume 42 (2000) available to subscribers via [www.CatchWord.com]. For those who don’t follow this journal on a regular basis, Vol. 42(1) is a special issue dedicated to editor emeritus Renee Kra and includes a special section of review articles on radiocarbon dating in archaeology by Austin Long, R. E. Taylor, Ofer Bar-Yosef, and others. A recommended Web site on general radiocarbon dating is Radiocarbon Web-Info [www.c14dating.com/], assembled by Tom Higham of the Radiocarbon Laboratory, University of Waikato, New Zealand.
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A new Illinois archaeological bibliography is available online. This bibliography contains references to substantive publications that have been generated by archaeological investigations funded through the Illinois Department of Transportation Cultural Resources Program since 1960. The bibliography of more than 600 citations contains references to in-house reports, journal articles, books and monographs, and book chapters. During the first four decades of the program in Illinois (through the year 2000) 75 journal articles, 83 books and monographs, and 75 book chapters have reached print. Also, some 15 doctoral dissertations and over a dozen master's theses have been completed that were based on Illinois DOT sponsored research. One of the major goals of the Illinois program, particularly over the past 20 years, has been the publication and wide dissemination of the results of our efforts in the investigation and preservation of the state's archaeological resources. The bibliography contains citations to research on prehistoric as well as historic sites, including major excavation programs in the Mississippi and Illinois river valleys. The bibliography can be accessed at the Illinois Transportation Archaeological Research Program homepage through the Department of Anthropology at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign: www.anthro.uiuc.edu/itarp/research.html.

A new aid to managing archaeological collections is available at www.cr.nps.gov/aad/collections/. This is an online technical assistance and distance learning effort that covers a wide range of issues and activities involved in caring for archaeological collections. It focuses on the objects, records, reports, and digital data in the field, lab, office, and repository. This “one-stop shopping” effort is designed to help archaeological professionals and students learn more about preserving and managing archeological collections over the long term. It consists of 10 sections, such as “Relevant Laws, Regulations, Policies, and Ethics,” “Today’s Key Issues,” “Curation Prior to the Field,” and “Access and Use of Collections.” Each section has an extensive bibliography, a page of links to related Web sites, and a review quiz. There is also a large glossary of key terms that is linked throughout the site. This Web site is the product of the Archeology and Ethnography Program of the National Park Service. It benefited enormously from extensive review by many colleagues who generously gave their time and expertise. It will be updated as colleagues provide additional, pertinent information for posting.

The Midwest Archeological Center (MWAC), National Park Service and the Anthropology Program at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln are pleased to announce the availability of one to two internships to support graduate work in anthropology (preferably archaeology) at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Fellowship support includes tuition, fees, and books as well as a GS-5 part-time internship position (current pay level, about $11/hour) assisting field, laboratory, and office operations of the NPS MWAC in Lincoln, Nebraska. The archaeological staff at MWAC has expertise for much of the midcontinental United States, a vast expanse between the Rocky Mountains and the Appalachian Mountains. Center personnel investigate, interpret, and advise on the management of a wide variety of cultural resources in these locales, including:

- Examination of military forts and battlefields on the Indian frontier of the 1800s
- Rock art (petroglyph and pictograph) studies—recording and interpretation
- Historical research and archaeological investigation of 1700s and 1800s fur trade posts and routes
- Preservation and study of locations important in the overland exploration of the West, migration, and pioneer settlement
- Prehistoric Native American burial mounds and ceremonial centers
- Pipestone and chert quarries, prehistoric and historic copper mining sites
- Logging camps, dams, and railways of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries
- Presidential homes

The University of Nebraska-Lincoln and the National Park Service are equal opportunity employers; minority and women candidates are especially urged to apply. The fellowship period will begin with admission to the graduate program in anthropology, typically in the fall semester. It is renewable for a period of up to three years, as long as the student demonstrates progress in completing his/her graduate work. To apply, submit a letter to the Graduate Chair, Anthropology Program, Department of Anthropology and Geography, 126 Bessey Hall, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, NE 68588-0368 requesting this consideration. The application deadline is March 1, 2001. For additional information, contact Ray Hames at the address above, or tel: (402) 472-6240; Web: www.unl.edu/anthro/.
POSITIONS OPEN

Position: Assistant Project Managers and Project Managers
Location: New Orleans, Louisiana

R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates, Inc. announces immediate openings for assistant project managers and project managers at its New Orleans, Louisiana office. Applicants must possess a M.A. in anthropology, have completed an archaeological field school, and served in a similar capacity for at least one year. Computer skills, artifact analysis, experience with report writing, and Section 106 training is highly desirable. These are full-time, salaried, professional positions that come with a full benefits package. Salaries are highly competitive and commensurate with educational and professional experience. Please send a résumé to Gert Biondo, R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates, Inc., 5824 Plauche Street, New Orleans, LA 70123; email: gbiondo@rcco.gov.com. Equal Opportunity Employer.

Position: Assistant Professor
Location: Los Angeles, California

The Department of Anthropology, University of California, Los Angeles, invites applications for a tenure-track position at the assistant professor level for an archaeologist who is engaged in an active program of theoretically based research in the Old World, with a focus on the transition to complex societies or on developed complex societies. Demonstrated excellence in teaching and publications are required. As a four-field department, we seek a scholar capable of articulating effectively with other anthropologists and with the Cotsen Institute of Archaeology, whose faculty includes archaeologists in other departments. Ph.D. must be completed by time of appointment. Appointment begins July 1, 2001. Consideration of applications will begin on January 15, 2001 and will continue until this position is filled. Send cover letter, names of three references, and curriculum vita to Archaeology Search, c/o Joan Silk, Chair, Department of Anthropology, Box 951553, UCLA, Los Angeles CA 90095-1553. UCLA is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer. Proof of U.S. citizenship or eligibility for U.S. employment will be required prior to employment.

Position: Director, Office of Archaeological Services (OAS)
Location: Tuscaloosa, Alabama

The University of Alabama seeks a director for the Office of Archaeological Services (OAS). The successful candidate will be an experienced researcher with at least five years administrative experience in contracted research, historic rehabilitation grants, historic preservation programming, and/or cultural resources administration. Ph.D. in anthropology or archaeology is required, regional, and topical specialties open. Must be able to manage an office (40-50 persons) that includes professional researchers, support personnel, and students. OAS collaborates closely with the UA Anthropology Department and provides training opportunities for students on all levels. Position may include a joint affiliation with the Department. OAS is part of the Alabama Museum of Natural History and the Director reports to the Museum Director. It occupies a 12,000 square foot research/administration facility and the Erskine-Ramsay Archaeological Repository, the largest archaeological curation facility in the state, located at Moundville Archaeological Park. It conducts approximately 150 CRM projects annually (ca. $1.5 million) in applied and basic research in archaeology and architectural history. OAS manages Alabama's official archaeological site file, the National Archaeological Data Base bibliography for Alabama, and the Museum's Human Osteology Laboratory. Visit www.ua.edu/academic/museums/oas/index.html or www.ua.edu/academic/museums/. An External Review Panel is currently developing recommendations for long-range direction of OAS and the new director will help formulate these directions and programs. Send letter of interest, vita (include SSN), and names/addresses of three references to OAS Director Search, c/o Employment Services, University of Alabama, P.O. Box 870364, Tuscaloosa, AL 35487-0364. The Committee will begin application review January 20, 2001. The application deadline is February 10, 2001. The University of Alabama is an equal opportunity affirmative action employer.

Position: Assistant Professor
Location: Chapel Hill, North Carolina

The Department of Anthropology at UNC-Chapel Hill seeks a sociocultural anthropologist or historical archaeologist specializing in history and collective memory. Candidate will have affiliation with and partial teaching commitment to the Curriculum in International and Area Studies. Interests might include the historical anthropology or historical archaeology of colonialism, global capitalism, slavery, or diasporas; the politics
surrounding public representations of the past; the place of heritage in nationalist and ethnic movements; the cultural politics of memorializing and forgetting; the recovery of the pasts of marginalized groups; the formation of social identities; or the shaping of memory through material culture. Ph.D. is required by start date (July 1, 2001 earliest). The position is tenure-track and will be filled at the assistant professor level. Send cover letter stating teaching and research interests, curriculum vita, and names of four references no later than February 19, 2001 to Search Committee, Department of Anthropology, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3115. Women and minorities are encouraged to apply. The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer.

Position: Assistant Professor
Location: College Station, Texas

The Nautical Archaeology Program of the Department of Anthropology, Texas A&M University, seeks an archaeologist for a tenure-track position at the level of assistant professor to begin in September 2001. The principal area of specialization sought is in Medieval and post-Medieval seafaring and nautical archaeology. A secondary area of specialization is the development of shipbuilding and seafaring technology. Candidates should be able to conduct undergraduate lecture courses and graduate seminars, supervise graduate research projects, and should be prepared to conduct fieldwork involving Texas A&M University graduate students. Candidates with developed research programs are especially encouraged to apply. Ph.D. is required. Please send an introductory letter, curriculum vita, and the names and addresses of at least three and no more than five references to Kevin J. Crisman, Chairman of Faculty Search Committee, Nautical Archaeology Program, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas 77843-4352. FAX: (409) 845-6399, tel: (409) 845-6696; email: kcrisman@tamu.edu. Applications will not be considered until all materials are received. The closing date for applications is February 1, 2001. Texas A&M University is an equal opportunity employer. Women and minorities are encouraged to apply.

Position: Professorship in Greek Studies
Location: St. Louis, Missouri

The University of Missouri-St. Louis is pleased to announce a search to fill the Hellenic Government-Karakas Family Foundation Professorship in Greek Studies. The scholar will be expected to play a leadership role in developing a program of Greek Studies at the University of Missouri-St. Louis. The professor will be expected to take an interdisciplinary approach and exhibit, in his or her scholarship, both intellectual rigor and accessibility to a wide audience. The departmental home of the successful candidate is open. Working closely with the Center for International Studies at the University and with the Greek-American community, the professor will develop outreach programs in Greek community; the professor will develop outreach programs in Greek Studies. The professor will also collaborate with holders of other international professorships and Center programs to develop a comprehensive international program. Qualifications: Candidates must have a distinguished record of publication, teaching, and service. Experience working with community audiences is desired. Rank and Salary: Preference will be given to applicants who are tenurable at the full professor level. Salary will be commensurate with the qualifications of the candidate; endowment funds will be used to support the research and outreach functions of the professor. Application: The appointment will be made for fall 2001. Review of materials will begin on January 31, 2001. Nominations and applications will be accepted until the position is filled. Applicants should include a letter describing how their background and experience prepares them for this important and innovative position. Applications should also include a curriculum vita and names, addresses, and telephone numbers of four references. Candidates will be notified before references are contacted. Please address application materials to Endowed Professorship in Greek Studies Search Committee Joel Glassman, Committee Chair, Center for International Studies, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, MO 63121-4499. Applications may also be submitted electronically to the following email address: jglassman@umsl.edu or by fax: (314) 516-6757. For further information call: (314) 516-5753. The University of Missouri-St. Louis is an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer committed to excellence through diversity.

Position: Curator: Environmental Archaeology
Location: Gainesville, Florida

The Florida Museum of Natural History, Department of Natural History, invites applications for a 12-month, tenure-track, curatorial position in Environmental Archaeology anticipated to begin July 1, 2001—see: wwwisprod.ufl.edu/jvl_fac/dr-fl_mus_nat_h_-_natural_history.html. A Ph.D. and collection experience are required. Primary responsibilities lie in curating the Environmental Archaeology collections (archaeological animal and plant remains, comparative specimens, and soils) and conducting research in zooarchaeology. The strength in these collections is vertebrates and mollusks from the southeastern U.S., circum-Caribbean and western South America—see: wwwfmnh.ufl.edu/anthro/envarch/. Send letter of application, a curriculum vita, copies of two major publications, and names of three references including their addresses, email, and telephone numbers to Environmental Archaeology Search Committee, Florida Museum of Natural History P.O. Box 117800, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611-7800. The
POSITIONS OPEN

Deadline for applications is February 15, 2001.

Position: Postdoctoral Fellowship Location: Waltham, Massachusetts

Brandeis University, the Departments of Near Eastern and Judaic Studies, and Anthropology invite applications for a two-year interdisciplinary postdoctoral fellowship funded by the Mellon Foundation in the field of Near Eastern Archaeology, starting in September 2001. The fellow will pursue an active research program and teach two courses a year. The applicant’s scholarly work in Near Eastern Archaeology should exemplify the multidisciplinary nature of this fellowship program, and complementing the current course offerings in both departments, such as Archaeology of Egypt and Canaan in Ancient Times, Engendering Archaeology: Exploring Women’s and Men’s Lives in the Past, Meaning and Material Culture, The Archaeology of the Ancient Near East, The Archaeology of Ancient Israel, and The Archaeology of Ancient Mesopotamia. Applicants should provide: (1) a curriculum vita; (2) a 1,000-word research proposal including a select bibliography; (3) proposals for two courses, including a two-paragraph description (which may include details about pedagogical method and an account of the relationship, if any, of the course to the research proposal) and a preliminary reading list; (4) a list of three referees (addresses, email, phone, and fax numbers); and (5) evidence of teaching ability. Send to Mellon Fellowship Selection Committee, c/o Marc Brettler, Brandeis University, Department of Near Eastern and Judaic Studies, MS 054, Waltham, MA 02454-9110. The deadline is February 1, 2001. Brandeis University is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer.

Position: Director Location: Beloit, Wisconsin

Beloit College invites applications for the position of director of the Logan Museum of Anthropology. The Logan Museum plays a central and historic role in the College’s educational mission. It was established in 1894 and houses over 250,000 archaeological and ethnographic specimens. The Museum plays a vital role as a teaching resource in anthropology and related disciplines. Although the College recognizes the central role of exhibition, public education, and specialized research in the Logan Museum, the successful candidate will appreciate that Beloit College is a teaching institution and that the primary role of the collections is for undergraduate teaching and research. The central focus for the director is to ensure that the Museum Collections serve the educational mission of the College. The director oversees the daily operations of the museum and works closely with faculty and staff in the development of public programs and exhibitions, collection and acquisition policies, and resource management. The director will teach one course in his/her specialty each year in the anthropology department and one course each year in Beloit’s Museum Studies Program. The director supervises a small professional staff and reports to the vice president for Academic Affairs. We seek an individual who has a commitment to the teaching and scholarly potential of museums in a liberal arts setting, and who has expertise and experience in museum administration, familiarity with anthropology collections, and a willingness to take an energetic, hands-on approach to building a program of excellence. An M.A. degree in anthropology is required, a Ph.D. preferred. Beloit College is a highly selective liberal arts college of approximately 1,200 students and 89 full-time faculty, located in the Wisconsin/Illinois state-line area, 85 miles from Chicago and 55 miles from Madison, Wisconsin. Please submit a letter of interest, curriculum vita, and the names of at least three references to David Burrows, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Beloit College, 700 College St., Beloit, WI 53511. Review of applications will begin immediately and continue until the position is filled. The College is committed to cultural and ethnic diversity and urges all interested individuals to apply. AA/EO Employer.

Position: Assistant Professor Location: Lawrence, Kansas

The Department of Anthropology at the University of Kansas announces a full-time, tenure-track position in Old World prehistory at the assistant professor level with a starting date in either August 2001 or January 2002. A Ph.D. in anthropology, field-based research, demonstrated teaching experience, and specialization in the Paleolithic and/or Neolithic periods are required. Research in Africa, Europe, or the Middle East is preferred. Responsibilities include teaching two courses per semester, developing an active research program abroad, and service in the department and university. Application materials consisting of only: (1) a letter outlining proposed contributions to our program, (2) a current curriculum vita, and (3) a teaching portfolio, must be submitted by January 20, 2001. Review of applications will begin immediately and continue until the position is filled. The University of Kansas is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer.

POSITIONS OPEN, continued on page 44
CALENDAR

2001-2002

FEBRUARY 24-25
The annual meeting of the Midwest Conference on Andean and Amazonian Archaeology and Ethnohistory will be held at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan. For details, contact Jeffrey R. Parsons, Museum of Anthropology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109; email: jpar@umich.edu.

MARCH 8-17
The 25th Annual Maya Meetings at Texas will be held at the University of Texas at Austin. The theme of this year's conference is “The Coming of Kings: Writing and Rulership in Late Preclassic to Early Classic Southern Mesoamerica.” The 10-day event will provide lectures, workshops, and research seminars for beginners and advanced scholars on indigenous American culture, including Maya hieroglyphic writing, Mixtec codices, and other topics of interest. For information, write P.O. Box 3500, Austin, TX, 78764-3500; tel: (512) 471-6292; email: mayameet@ccwf.cc.utexas.edu.

MARCH 22-25
The 2e Festival du Film Archéologique de Nyon held in Nyon, Switzerland and presented under the auspices of the Musée Romain de Nyon is a selective and didactic biennial event featuring recent productions. Programming is framed by introductory talks and question-and-answer sessions led by area specialists. After the festival, parts of the program tour local schools. Screenings will be held at l’Usine a Gaz, 1 Rue Cesar Soulie. Contact Christophe Gourmand, Director. Musée Romain de Nyon, Rue Maupertuis, 1260 Nyon, Switzerland; tel: + (41-22) 363-82-82; fax: + (41-22) 363-82-86; email: christophe.gourmand@oracle.com.

MARCH 23-25
The 2001 American Association of Physical Anthropologists (AAPA) meeting will be held at the Westin at Crown Center, in Kansas City, Missouri. For program information, see the AAPA Web site at physanth.org or contact the program chair, Phillip Walker, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106; tel: (805) 685-8424; fax: (805) 685-8424; email: walker@sscf.ucsb.edu. For information on local arrangements, contact cochairs David Frayer, tel: (785) 864-2633; email: frayer@ukans.edu; or Sandra Gray (as of January 2001), Department of Anthropology, 622 Fraser Hall, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS 66045-2110; tel: (785) 864-2646; fax: (785) 864-5224; email: sgray@kuhub.cc.ukans.edu.

MARCH 31
Award winners from 3rd AGON International Meeting of Archaeological Film of the Mediterranean Area, a biennial festival held in Athens, Greece, will be shown as part of a special event at the Athens Music Megaron. A highlight of the program will be the presentation of $20 million awards to winning proposals in two international competitions: one for a 30-minute documentary on the role of the Aegean throughout history, and the other for a 15-minute film on the Olympic ideal. For further information, contact festival secretary Maria Palatou at AGON c/o Archaioxia ke Technes, (Archaeology and Arts). 10 Karitsi Square, 102 37 Athens, Greece; tel: + (30-1) 33-12-990; tel/fax: + (30-1) 33-12-991; email: mpalatou@arxaiologia.gr.
APRIL 4–7
The 6e Festival du Film d’Archéologie d’Amiens is a biennial festival of recent films on archaeology organized by themes. Selective and pedagogical, parts of the program tour regional schools and cultural centers following the festival. This edition will feature films about ancient civilizations of Latin America (Maya, Aztec, and Inca) and Chinese archaeology, along with a recurring section known as “Archaeology in the News.” Contact Tahar Ben Redjeb, Director, Centre Interdisciplinaire de Recherches Archéologiques de la Somme (CIRAS), 5 Rue Henri Daussy, 80044 Amiens, France; tel: + (33-3) 22-97-33-44; fax: + (33-3) 22-97-33-56; email: ciras@wanadoo.fr.

APRIL 18–22
The 66th Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology will be held at the New Orleans Marriott and Le Meridien New Orleans. For more information, contact SAA Headquarters, 900 Second St. N.E. #12, Washington, DC 20002; tel: (202) 789-8200; fax: (202)789-0284; or email: meetings@saa.org; Web: www.saa.org.

MAY 9–13
The Canadian Archaeological Association 2001 Annual Meeting will be held at the Banff Centre in Banff National Park, Alberta, Canada. For information on the CAA or the meetings, contact Lesley Nicholls, Conference Coordinator, Department of Archaeology, University of Calgary, Calgary, AB Canada T2N 1N4; tel: 403-220-7131; email: nicholls@ucalgary.ca.

JULY 29–AUGUST 3
The Sociedad Mexicana de Antropología will hold its XXVI Mesa

AUGUST 26–30
The 10th Archaeological Chemistry Symposium will be held as part of the American Chemical Society Meeting in Chicago. Papers in all areas of chemistry applied to the study of archaeological materials and chemistry employed to answer archaeological problems will be presented. Abstracts may be submitted by April 27, 2001, through the ACS Electronic submission system, acs.com- fex.com/oasys.htm. If you do not have computer access for submission, contact the symposium organizer by April 15, 2001. Registration information will be available in a June 2001 issue of Chemical and Engineering News and at www.acs.org/meetings. For information, contact Kathryn A. Jakes, 1787 Neil Ave., Columbus, OH 43210-1295, tel: (614) 292-5518, email: jakes.1@osu.edu.

OCTOBER 1–6
The 12a Rassegna Internazionale del Cinema Archeologico of Rovereto, Italy has tentatively announced “The Orient and Africa” as the main theme of its next annual festival of recent production about all aspects of archaeology and associated subjects. Submissions falling within established guidelines will be considered for the 5th Paolo Orsi Prize. The approximate entry deadline is April 30, 2001. For information, contact Dario Di Blasi, Director or Claudia Beretta, International Press. Museo Civico, Largo S. Caterina 43, 38068 Rovereto (TN), Italy; tel: + (39-464) 439-055; fax: + (39-464) 439-487; email: museo@museocivico.rovereto.tn.it; Website: www.museocivico.rovereto.tn.it.
**SAA book ordering and shipping information**
(see inside front cover for available titles)

* All orders must be prepaid; order by phone, fax, or mail.
* All sales are final (excluding book jobber/bookstore orders).
* Expedited service is available for an additional $25.00 fee plus the cost of shipping. An expedited order may be shipped overnight or 2nd day. Contact SAA to determine exact shipping costs. All expedited orders received after 2:30 pm (EST) will be processed the following business day.
* For orders within the United States: $5 for the first item and $1 for each additional item. Outside the United States: $10 for the first item and $3 for each additional item.
* Shipment is by United Parcel Service (UPS) Ground Delivery Service or Priority Mail, depending on recipient’s address.
* Standard order fulfillment is approximately 10 working days.

**Order Form**

Please send the following items:

- ☐ Expedite my order
- ☐ Overnight
- ☐ 2nd Day
- ☐ Contact SAA for exact shipping amount.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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Subtotal: __________

Washington, D.C. shipment add 5.75% sales tax: __________

Expedited Service Fee (if applicable): __________

Shipping and handling (see above): __________

Total: __________

**NAME**
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**CITY STATE/PROVINCE COUNTRY ZIP/POSTAL CODE**
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A SAMPLING ... CONTINUING EDUCATION OFFERED IN CONJUNCTION WITH SAA’S 66TH ANNUAL MEETING IN NEW ORLEANS

Wednesday, April 18, 2001
9:00 am-1:00 pm
The Business of Cultural Resource Management
Jointly sponsored by SAA and the American Cultural Resources Association

Wednesday, April 18, 2001
9:00 am-5:00 pm
GIS
Presented for SAA by the Office of Continuing and Extended Education of the University of Maryland

Wednesday, April 18, 2001
2:00 pm-5:00 pm
Writing and Managing Federal Contracts
Presented for SAA by the Office of Continuing and Extended Education of the University of Maryland

Friday, April 20, 2001
8:00 am-12 noon
Archaeological Damage Assessment Workshop

To see the vast array of sessions and topics offered by SAA at the annual meeting, view the preliminary program at www.saa.org/meetings/prelim_prog.pdf. If you would like to have a preliminary program mailed to you, contact us at meetings@saa.org or (202) 789-8200.