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EDITOR’S CORNER

Jane Eva Baxter

I just love the cover of the magazine this month, and not just because it is such a beautiful photograph — and it is that. I love this cover because it conveys such an important message: that archaeology is a discipline for and about people in the present and not simply the study of old places and things. There’s nothing novel about this idea, I know, but it’s rarely an idea that we convey on the cover of archaeological magazines.

The many types of human connections in the present that are facilitated by archaeology characterize the contents of this issue as well. Two articles focus on training and teaching and how we seek to make archaeological and traditional forms of knowledge relevant in an ever-changing present. It should be noted that Nancy Gonlin and Christine Dixon are presenting a workshop on online teaching at the annual meetings in Honolulu; so if this article piques your interest, there is an opportunity to participate in ongoing discussions in the very near future. Leland Gilsen offers other travel destinations if you’d like to try your hand at a skills workshop alongside other students interested in technologies of the past.

While formal teaching offers one form of “archaeological relationship” in the present, Anderson and his coauthors promote a different type of engagement between archaeologists and the public as they present the content of a very popular forum from the 2012 Annual Meetings in Memphis. This was a standing room only event at the meetings, and people were talking about this forum for the duration of our time in Memphis. Rather than just a review of popular pseudoarchaeological claims and stories, the authors make a strong case for meeting members of the interested public “where they are at” as a way of reclaiming public perceptions of our discipline. Our final article addresses the very close relationships between professional and avocational archaeologists in our shared commitments to the study and preservation of the past. I am grateful to the Crabtree Award Committee for generating another excellent article on avocational archaeologists and the important contributions they make to archaeology. Last year, we got to learn about avocationals in Oregon, and this year in Tennessee, as the 2012 Crabtree Award Winner, John Dowd is recognized for his long commitment to archaeology.

This issue also features the second half of a two-part forum on Native Hawaiian Perspectives on Archaeology, guest edited by Kathleen Kawelu. These articles all point to the importance of engaged archaeologies in the present, and consider multiple perspectives and approaches in the study of the past. The relationships between people and places presented in these articles are one of continuity, and offer an important perspective for all archaeologists to consider, especially as we prepare to visit next month. I want to reiterate my thanks to Kathy for all of her hard work on this forum — it has been a genuine pleasure to work with her.

Finally, in last month’s column, I said goodbye to John Neikirk, who had served as the manager of publications for The SAA. This month I have the pleasure of introducing Eleanor Umali who has joined the SAA as the new manager of publications. While I will only have the chance to work with Eleanor on two issues of the magazine, I can assure you all she’s a very quick study and will be a real asset to all of our publications at the SAA. Welcome Eleanor!
It’s fitting that as I sat down to write this profile, I received the open call for volunteers for SAA committee service. It’s hard to believe (for me, at least!), but I’ve been a member of the SAA for almost 40 years, ever since I was urged to join the Society as an undergraduate student by my professor and mentor Bob Euler. For way too long, I was unaware that being an SAA member could involve more than paying my dues and getting *American Antiquity* in return. I did attend the Annual Meeting now and then, even giving an occasional paper, but I was definitely unengaged with the Society. If there were chances to volunteer, I was unaware of them—certainly there were no mass emails to members urging our participation.

I have spent my career in cultural resource management (CRM) in the western United States. Twenty-five years ago, my husband and I founded our own company: Alpine Archaeological Consultants, Inc.—an initially terrifying event that I would have never foreseen back in my college days. My involvement in volunteering at the national level began when I served on the Board of Directors for the American Cultural Resources Association (ACRA) in the 1990s. It was around that time that I started to notice that archaeologists, like myself, who were affiliated with CRM firms were being approached by the SAA to sponsor events at the Annual Meeting. Curiously, however, the list of Program Committee Members for that same meeting included only academic archaeologists. I brought this to the attention of Executive Director, Tobi Brimsek, commenting that CRM archaeologists had more to offer the Society than just our checkbooks. Not long thereafter, I was surprised to receive a phone call from Tobi, asking if I would like to serve on the Program Committee for the next Annual Meeting. I remember saying to her, “I guess the squeaky wheel gets the grease,” to which she replied, “No, I think it’s more along the lines of ‘Ask and you shall receive.’” Since that time, I’ve had the privilege and honor of being elected as the Society’s Treasurer, and I continue to volunteer as the Chair of the Investment and Finance Committee. I served a stint as a co-editor for the *SAA Archaeological Record* and have recently been appointed to serve as the Society’s liaison to the Register of Professional Archaeologists.

I suspect that most of us who volunteer have an initial concern about just what it is we might be getting ourselves into. For an organization like the SAA, with its organized committee structure, excellent staff, and clear mission and goals, volunteering doesn’t mean having to set up chairs or organize bake sales. Volunteering is a chance to give back to the profession—to share your skills and talents to further the Society’s mission and, once appointed or elected, actually do what you agreed to do. And what do I get in return? As SAA President Fred Limp said in a recent email, volunteering to be one of the 400 members who serve on one of the Society’s 40 committees is an important chance “to become more hands-on within SAA and to build your professional development and engagement with specific issues.” I couldn’t agree more. For me, it has been a chance to keep up to date on developments in our field at the national level. It has educated me about issues, policies, goals, and objectives. It has made me realize that SAA members are responsible for the health and well-being of the Society. It has vastly expanded my network of professional colleagues, many of whom have become friends. I have gained new perspectives and valuable contacts. I have valued colleagues whom I can call on to help me problem-solve, to put me in touch with other professionals who can help me with my research, and who can recommend talented archaeologists for employment.

---
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ARTICLE

ADDITIONAL TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES FOR STUDENTS IN ARCHAEOLOGY
AN INTRODUCTION TO SKILLS WORKSHOPS

Leland Gilsen

Leland Gilsen is a retired State Archaeologist from Oregon and a volunteer with Echoes-In-Time. He also has taught at Rabbitstick, Wintercount, and Buckeye events.

Bethany Morrison’s January 2012 article in The SAA Archaeological Record, illustrated how fieldwork changes students’ perspectives by reconnecting them with nature. There is another untapped source for educating students about the material culture recovered at archaeological sites. These are workshops, which feature the hands-on learning of certain types of skills that are variously called early living skills, primitive skills, aboriginal skills, indigenous skills, and/or traditional skills. Archaeologists participating in such skills workshops will gain new insights into Native American material culture, as well as firsthand experience in creating and using traditional technologies.

The workshops are given at events scattered across the country. Most are annual gatherings of instructors and students who work with each other on past human technology and culture. Many events last for a week, and may take place on private, state, federal or tribal lands. Most events charge a fee, which often includes morning and evening meals. Several of the larger workshops begin on Sunday when organizers and instructors arrive. Students usually arrive a day earlier to set up their camps and settle into the location. They are introduced to the instructors who describe the classes available during the week and the material costs for each project. These workshop events are expanding across the country. Demand is high. In some cases, the organizers must set limits on the size of the event.

The nature of the classes offered varies locally and regionally. The classes from Rabbitstick near Rexburg, Idaho will not be the same as Firefly near Asheville, North Carolina, for example. Local materials and cultural traditions are an important factor. The majority of the events features work with basic material culture items such as bows, arrows, atlatls, darts, and flint knapping (Figure 1). Almost all have classes relating to fire, sharp tools, fiber, vessels, and clothing (Figure 2). Water, food, shelter, and wilderness survival skills are usually covered. Quite a few events include local plant identification and animal tracking, as well as animal and plant processing. Some events may emphasize social/physical activities and belief systems. Some of the largest of these workshops have been in operation for a quarter century. Here are a few:

Backtracks (Idaho and Arizona)

Backtracks LLC operates the Rabbitstick (Rexburg, Idaho) and spin-off Winter Count (Mariposa, Arizona) events, and has been offering workshops for twenty-five years. The longevity of their program is a testament to the student demand for the workshops. Rabbitstick began in 1978, although it converted temporarily to Woodsmoke Primitive Skills Conferences for three years. Rabbitstick was revitalized in 1988 by Dave Wescott, focusing on primitive living skills. Forty-eight teachers showed up along with two paying students, and the event was designed as a weeklong symposium for sharing and teaching one another.

Dave Wescott, as an outgrowth of Rabbitstick, met with Steve Watts, Errett Callahan and John and Geri MacPherson in 1989 and started the Society of Primitive Technology (SPT) with a focus on experimental archaeology (http://www.primitive.org/). The resulting Bulletin of Primitive Technology promotes the practice and teaching of aboriginal skills fostering communication between teachers and practitioners and sets standards for authenticity, ethics, and quality in the replication and reproduction of material culture. Many of the instructors contribute to the Bulletin of Primitive Technology, spending hours developing and replicating ancient skills. Early bulletins were filled with hands-on articles on making replica or reproduction tools.

Rabbitstick has always been held on private land. Because of a demand by students in the southwest, Backtracks added Winter Count in Arizona in 1997. Winter Count was held on Forest Service land for two years and then moved to private land. Due
to increasing demand Backtracks added a third event in 2012 called Woodsmoke focusing on classic camping and a new movement called Bushcraft (http://www.backtracks.net).

Echoes-In-Time (Oregon)
As an outgrowth of Rabbitstick, Echoes-In-Time was started in 2001 to promote a similar format for workshops in Oregon. The first event took place on private land but moved to Willamette Mission State Park in 2006. Given that this organization has no formal staff, the number of participants has been kept low. The first event had 13 instructors and 37 students. This has grown to 26 instructors and 161 students. Sample Echoes-In-Time classes are available at: http://echoes-in-time.com/about.php.

Earthskills (Georgia)
Earthskills Rendezvous in Georgia was founded in 1985 to preserve and promote indigenous primitive skills. The original event was hosted at a campout at Unicoi State Park so that people could learn to make white oak baskets, forage for wild foods, start a fire by friction, and tan deer skins with brains and smoke (http://www.primitiveskills.org/) (Figure 3). Members of the Georgia Eastern Cherokee share their culture with the students.

There is enough demand that two events are held annually. The Rivercane Rendezvous is the spring event held in April. The name Rivercane Rendezvous honors the fact that rivercane was, arguably, the most beloved of all plants by the Southeastern tribes. The autumn event is held in October and is called the Falling Leaves Rendezvous. Generally, there are more than 20 classes offered on any given day. The diversity of subjects and skills can vary throughout the event. Core skills are offered everyday including fire making, flint knapping, and cordage/fiber arts. The teachers rotate through, and often teach different subjects on different days. Most of the teachers are willing to offer one-on-one instruction at any time.

Firefly (North Carolina)
Natalie Bogwalker founded Firefly in 2008, based on her positive experiences she had attending other workshops, including the Earthskills Rendezvous, Winter Count, and Echoes-In-Time. Firefly has a specific focus on creating a balance between ancient skills and practical skills for living with the land today (http://www.fireflygathering.org/). The event takes place on private land near Asheville, NC. The first year, Firefly had approximately 35 instructors, 30 students who worked to cover their fees (work trade), and about 200 paid students. These numbers have grown to 10 part-time staff, 80 work traders, and almost 100 instructors in less than five years. Workshops now feature one instructor for every four to five students. Class size varies between five and 50 students.

The Firefly Gathering is for people seeking to deepen and expand their connection with the natural world, which is an element of archaeological education that Bethany Morrison stressed in her recent article (Morrison 2012). The classes focus on self-sufficiency and wilderness skills taught by teachers from around the region and country. Firefly offers learning for adults and children, evening entertainment, and on-site camping.

Buckeye (California)
An example of the growing demand for workshops that focus on these types of learning experiences is the recent founding of the Buckeye event three years ago near San Francisco. The organizers have been forced to limit the number of students to 500 (http://buckeyegathering.net/joomla/) taught by 75 instructors.

Figure 1: Projectile point and source material. (Taken at Echoes-In-Winter, 2012 by the author.)

Figure 2: Coil pottery workshop. (Taken at Echoes In Time, 2012 by the author.)
Value to Students

This type of hands-on learning of traditional skills is very germane for students of archaeology, particularly of prehistoric North America. A hands-on project will affect views on trade and small-scale economies, will increase the appreciation of effort and value in raw materials and finished goods, and will help students place archaeologically recovered artifacts into dynamic social contexts.

Some of the best flintknappers in North America teach at these events (Figure 4). Sitting down with an experienced stone knapper to make a biface and/or stone tool is the best way to understand the lithic reduction process. Some events have exhibits on biface reduction or tool manufacture that illustrate the amount and type of debitage from the reduction process. The practical use of tools, reuse of tools, sharpening tools, and tool conversion leads to questions about typologies. Students will look closer at the artifacts recovered in archaeological contexts and broaden their contextual models for understanding lithic assemblages. Knapping classes also will give practical knowledge about the relative economic values of different lithic reduction methodologies (i.e., biface, core, bi-polar, etc).

Pecking and grinding a stone bowl or mortar gives an archaeologist a different perspective on artifacts recovered in the field. It is surprising how quickly one can peck a stone bowl. Archaeological assumptions about the labor involved may be incorrect due to a basic lack of understanding of technological production.

Having the opportunity to construct an atlatl and dart, and then using the weapon system will make finding a dart point in an archaeological context come alive. The students can gain a new appreciation for the atlatl hunting system. Making an atlatl and darts and then using the weapon system was personally instructive. I now have field experience on dart accuracy, range and hitting power. Discovering Errett Callahan’s experimental archaeology paper: “A Mammoth Undertaking” in the 1994 Bulletin of Primitive Technology, changed how I looked at the atlatl and dart. My concepts on the purpose and technology of fore shafts were modified by the published experiments and working with darts.

Recognizing useful plants broadens survey skills. Plants give clues to ancient gathering or camping locations. Knowing the uses of plants can broaden conclusions from pollen samples or organics recovered in archaeological contexts. When animals are processed in a workshop, skinning with a flake picked up from the knapping pit will change how students look at the humble flake. Archaeological students can gain an appreciation of utilized flakes and stone tools when they make and use them. A thumbnail scraper becomes a vital part of a toolkit once a student uses one. This simple tool might otherwise be overlooked during an archaeological surface survey. What the current students get out of workshops has been reported as life changing. The hands-on teaching method and opportunities for direct experience open up student perspectives on ancient lives. Archaeologists should encourage their students to attend workshop events. Professional archaeologists also will benefit from attending these events, or using their knowledge to teach their own workshop. Field schools could benefit if they contact instructors who can visit excavations and teach classes during field schools.
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ARCHAEOLOGY AT A DISTANCE
REWARDS AND CHALLENGES OF ONLINE ARCHAEOLOGY COURSES

Nancy Gonlin and Christine Dixon

Nancy Gonlin is on the faculty of Bellevue College and Christine Dixon is a Ph.D. student at the University of Colorado-Boulder and an instructor at Bellevue College.

There is an urgent need to address several issues surrounding distance education, not the least of which is the teaching of our subject matter in a totally different environment. When we first heard of online classes, as archaeologists we were skeptical for a variety of reasons. Some of the many questions that ran through our heads were: How could this venue possibly work or offer as good an education as on-campus classes? Who enrolls in online classes and why? What are the opportunities and challenges of teaching and learning online, and, in particular, what are the unique benefits and drawbacks to teaching and learning archaeology in this format? There still are known problems with online teaching, particularly in the regulation of academic honesty, but the increasing popularity of online course offerings throughout the world and across disciplines strongly suggests that this format of learning is fulfilling an essential and growing niche in academia. All types of institutions are offering online classes, from community colleges to large universities, to for-profit and private colleges. Recent announcements by top universities offering free online courses (massive open online courses or MOOCs) confirm that online courses are a reality and a part of the future of education in one’s own backyard and around the world.

To address these critical issues, we assembled a panel for the 2012 SAA meetings in Memphis. The Task Force on Professional Development Initiatives, chaired by Sarah Herr, sponsored the forum. We intentionally formed the panel with veteran and neophyte online instructors, which included both skeptics and proponents (which are not mutually exclusive categories). The following archaeologists participated in person (Figure 1): J. Heath Anderson (Wooster); Christine Dixon (U of Colorado-Boulder). Nancy Gonlin (Bellevue College); Shereen Lerner (Mesa Community College); Molly Morgan-Lohse (Northview Lake College); Sarah Sterling (Portland State U) and one of the original designers of the MATRIX website, Anne K. Pyburn (Indiana U). The M.A.T.R.I.X. (Making Archaeology Teaching Relevant in the XXI Century) project utilized experts to develop and make available 16 different archaeological courses that had materials including lectures, bibliography, assignments, discussion topics, exams, visual aids, and references (http://www.indiana.edu/~arch/saa/matrix/courses.html). While these offerings are not online courses, the modules do provide an example of successful online organization and useful archaeological content in an online format. Online participation by Carl Wendt (Cal State-Fullerton) and Dean Snow (Penn State U), another MATRIX veteran, supplemented the forum by providing electronic materials. Interactive participation from the attendees of the forum furthered knowledge for everyone in the room, with lively discussions of pros and cons and free exchange of ideas, which were much appreciated. This article builds on that discussion and highlights some of our findings. Teaching online remains a controversial issue throughout academia and one that our discipline would do well to address directly. Archaeologists use cutting edge technology to study history and prehistory; such technology can also be used for better dissemination of an understanding and appreciation of the past; in this case, through online courses.

Why Is Online Learning Important and Who Are We Teaching?

First, we need to be aware of the motivation and interest of our online students. Most students who enroll in an online archaeology course are not going to become archaeologists. Many online students are satisfying general education requirements, as noted by J. Heath Anderson and Shereen Lerner in our forum. Nancy Gonlin conducted a survey of Bellevue College’s online archaeology students, most of who reported that they were satisfying their degree requirements with an archaeology class. Lerner further noted that archaeology or anthropology majors typically take courses in their majors on-campus rather than online. Some of Gonlin’s online students said they had always been interested in archaeology, and this was a chance to take a course in the field of anthropology. The popularity of Hollywood films, for better or worse, has steadily increased interest in our field.

While online courses are touted as the great equalizer in educational opportunity, the reality is that many people around the
world do not have access to clean water, let alone an Internet connection, an electronic device to access it, and a steady supply of electricity. Even for those who can access the Internet, the necessary software or speed of connection may be an issue for taking online classes. These difficulties are compounded by the fact that the knowledge about various technologies for students and instructors alike may not be sufficient to do well in the online environment. Molly Morgan reported that at Northview Lake College, a new learning management system (LMS) provider offered classes for faculty to ease the transition from one system to another. Likewise, at Bellevue College, where Dixon and Gonlin teach, classes for transitioning from one LMS to another are available to faculty and students alike.

For those students who do have regular access to the Internet and the ability to use online technologies, distance learning provides them with a college classroom connection that might otherwise not be possible (Figure 2). Virtual classrooms are filled with people from around the globe who select this mode for a variety of reasons, including, but not limited to, accessing education while parenting children, working jobs, and/or serving in the military. In addition, the virtual classroom can aid certain students not served as well in a traditional classroom. Individuals with physical disabilities are sometimes faced with challenges in getting to campus, or students with learning disabilities are served by the extended time and repeatability of lectures as well as access to class materials. The online environment can be less linear in format than the campus classroom and can engage multiple senses simultaneously (as in the physical classroom), all of which can encourage a different approach to education that might have greater appeal to bright students who otherwise would not succeed in a traditional classroom. Thus, the virtual classroom does open higher education to many who might not be able to access it or succeed on campus. The diversity of students from around the world enriches all participants in the classroom, including both students and instructors.

As universities and colleges struggle to adapt to the growing popularity of online learning, it is imperative that we critically assess how archaeology might be adapted to an online environment and what adaptations to course content or presentation might help in the success of effectively teaching archaeology courses online. Upper and lower division archaeology courses are being taught online with varying degrees of success. As the number of online archaeology offerings grows at institutions across the United States and around the world, we are confronted with questions about the appropriateness and role of this environment for the training in archaeological methods and the dissemination of archaeological knowledge. This article focuses specifically on undergraduate online archaeology education, although a discussion of the merits and challenges with online higher education degrees is also needed, given that some schools are now offering advanced online degrees in archaeology (e.g., St. Cloud State University, University of Exeter, Prescott College, and University of Leicester).

Advantages to Teaching and Learning Archaeology at a Distance

Our purpose here is to engage a wider audience of archaeologists to consider the intent and impact of online archaeology courses. We can begin by sharing the progress that was made in last April’s forum. At the opening of the session, Anne Pyburn provided a powerful statement for consideration: “Online learning can be used to pedagogical advantage.” While there are different approaches, learning management systems, and various modes of presentation of materials, the benefits of online archaeology are clear: many teaching and learning strategies can be employed to better effect the online environment. An example of one of these strategies is the use of maps, as pointed out by Anderson. Online students already have access to the Internet in front of them, and effective, free tools afford unique learning opportunities in the areas of remote sensing and settlement pattern analysis. Sarah Sterling suggests the use of Google Earth™ (see Hochstetter et al. 2011 for an example). Furthermore, some museum websites provide detailed photographs and descriptions of artifacts or virtual museum tours. Sterling uses such hyperlinks to directly take students to the physical objects of discussion, providing visuals to accompany text.

Archaeology students can greatly benefit from increased time and focus on discussions of method, theory, and ethics. When students are required to post their considered evaluation of a topic, the online environment ideally becomes egalitarian. Granted that there will always be those who will try to control a discussion, the online environment, however, makes this domi-
nation more difficult and can lend a voice to those who may not participate in the traditional classroom. Many professors of online classrooms report the high caliber and quality of online discussions and noted that these discussions were more developed than those in the on-campus classroom.

The virtual environment also offers students the opportunity to engage with topics and case studies available in electronic format, especially because archaeological projects are making data, site reports, and various publications increasingly available on the Internet. Rather than passively presenting our students with summaries of excavations, by asking them to provide examples and references from their own Internet research, it allows them to become their own experts and to practice the application of critical thinking about archaeological materials in the matrix of Internet sources. This approach not only facilitates students pursuing their own interests in the vast realm of archaeology, it also requires them to assess the quality of Internet sources. By creating discussions and activities that require students to examine the relationship between data and interpretations, we are able to extend the boundaries of our classroom to the entire Internet. There are many other kinds of resources that greatly facilitate online learning. For example, Dixon designed an exercise that asks students to investigate a question about human behavior.

Online classes can be thought of as boundless learning since this mode frees education from the classroom, but the boundlessness can also refer to the expansion of learning into the world around us. In this way, we can challenge our online students to bring an archaeological perspective to their observations of their own environments, to critically think about television shows or news articles that directly reference the past, and to see how their own behaviors are shaped by and shape the material world around them. Furthermore, students can be challenged to draw parallels between human actions and their impact on the past and present. Many of the ideas generated for the online classes can improve on-campus classes, as the availability of technology in the classroom becomes more common throughout college campuses.

**Challenges to Teaching and Learning Archaeology at a Distance**

There also are clear challenges to adapting our on-campus archaeology courses to an online environment. On countless campuses around the country, professors pass around examples of artifacts or utilize teaching collections to aid in the understanding of classification, seriation, use-wear analyses, and other lines of evidence available in material culture. When teaching archaeology at a distance, it is not possible for students to hold an artifact that enables them to learn through the sense of touch—for example, the different fracture terminations on an obsidian core. The hands-on aspect of archaeology, so central to our field, is missing in an online classroom, yet there are ways to replicate or at least supplement this type of tactile learning. For example, having students do a material cultural survey of their environments can allow them to begin to understand the connections of material culture, interpretations, and multiple lines of evidence. For example, Dixon designed an exercise that asks students to investigate a question about human behavior.
through the material culture around them. Some students have attempted to study gender, class, or age through shoe type, purse style, or the contents of a supermarket shopping cart. Students select their own questions about human behavior and are required to justify their selection of material culture through which to approach their topic. Often, this exercise leads to significant discussions of research design and methodological soundness, such as sampling errors and appropriateness of the connection between data and interpretations. While the remote classroom prohibits students from holding artifacts (or their replicas), it allows students to engage in archaeological imagination and thinking in the world around them and to realize that artifacts are also modern. To supplement the inability to pass around artifacts, students can be encouraged to visit museums or any location that has material culture referencing the past (e.g., a high school with trophies and old school plaques and photos) to examine how we talk about the past in the present and how these narratives shape the world in which we live.

The online environment is not meant to be identical to the on-campus experience, whether one is discussing learning course content or other aspects of education. The roles of instructor and student change. In many aspects, the instructor becomes a facilitator and students must take greater responsibility for their own learning. Procrastinators beware! Students might not be able to raise their hands mid-lecture to ask questions, but this lack of first-hand instruction does not mean that our online classrooms are void of the dynamic interaction between student and teacher. In fact, some students and professors report that there is, in some cases, more student–professor interaction in this mode than in on-campus classes. Professors can choose to video chat, instant message, or email back and forth with individual students. Furthermore, the online forum allows time for more student questions and slightly-off-topic discussions than a traditional classroom setting, which is confined by the clock. A separate but related matter not discussed here, but one that needs thorough consideration, is an evaluation of WHO is teaching online courses. The ever-growing workforce of adjunct instructors often translates to less institutional support for them, a factor which may affect student success in online and on-campus courses alike. An additional concern is that some instructors are not necessarily experts in the field of study but are facilitators who can navigate the online educational world.

A critical issue highlighted by Sterling is the degree to which online students gain competency in a subject matter. Assessment of student learning can be challenging in an environment devoid of visual social cues. It may be more difficult to judge whether students “get” it, apart from grades. The overheads, PowerPoints, or Prezi presentations that one uses in the classroom must be adapted either for the online environment (by adding narration, for example) or replaced with other materials. Lerner uses a range of readings on topics to gauge whether students get the process and general order, and uses critical questions that focus on themes.

The reader may have already surmised that an additional challenge reported by all SAA forum participants is the amount of time one might spend preparing and teaching a well-run online course that accurately and engagingly presents archaeological content. Similar to the challenge faced by educators in on-campus classrooms, professors found themselves spending a significant amount of time preparing and posting to online classrooms. The expanded boundaries of online teaching can leave professors feeling on-call at all times, and the lack of time constraints presented in an on-campus classroom can leave faculty wanting to include much more information in an online environment (Paloff and Pratt 2011). However, the challenge of time investment is well known to professors, regardless of their teaching venues.

How Can We Succeed in Bridging the Gap between On-campus and Online Archaeology Courses?

For those who are looking to begin or improve teaching archaeology in an online format, we offer a few suggestions. First, utilize the fundamental anthropological principle of participant observation. Take an online course in any subject matter to gain experience in a new learning environment. Most professors currently teaching archaeology have taken classes only on-campus or in-the-field, and as educators, we are apt to draw from our own experiences as students to enhance our pedagogy. By taking an online course, members of faculty are better able to see the challenges and benefits of online learning and adjust courses appropriately. For example, Gonlin, who took a 1-week course, was surprised at the amount of community among all participants (faculty and students) that was established in such a short period of time.

Some of the challenges of teaching archaeology are relevant to both online and on-campus courses (Wilk and Schiffer 1982); however, we will focus on distance education here. Be organized, have clear expectations, and be available to students. Availability to students is especially necessary in distance education, and one of the major problems reported by students is feeling isolated and ignored by faculty. Simply promptly responding to messages and being attentive to student questions greatly facilitates the success of online learning and teaching, not to mention the reduction in complaints that may ascend the ladder of authority at one’s institution.

One area in which we have found great success in teaching archaeology online has been in utilizing activities. Without the strict time constraints of the classroom, we are given the opportunity to use activities that would otherwise not fit into the classroom schedule. For example, in an introductory archaeology
Concluding Remarks

The merits of using online courses to either augment face-to-face learning or replace it are still widely debated. Regardless of personal or official university positions on distance education in the college curriculum, the reality is that these courses are being offered and enrolled in at a growing rate across disciplines. It is therefore worthwhile to evaluate both the benefits and drawbacks, especially as these relate to presenting archaeological materials. This article is meant to begin discussion of online learning and teaching in archaeology. Continuing discourse about archaeology in this mode is vital to keep our discipline current in the evolving academic arena. Students of archaeology may become contract archaeologists, museum curators, or professors, but they also might choose career paths outside of our discipline. The education of majors and non-majors alike is imperative to advancing archaeological knowledge, cultural heritage protection, and an engaged public. As computers and mobile technologies become an ever increasing part of our lives, it is timely to examine how such technology might be used to foster student success, pedagogical success, and how to better connect with our students, both in virtual and on-campus classrooms.

During our sponsored SAA forum at the past annual meeting in Memphis, Lerner suggested that we offer our fellow archaeologists the chance to participate in a hands-on workshop on online courses. Lerner, Gonlin, and Dixon will be conducting a workshop in Hawaii this coming April at the next annual meeting, thanks to the sponsorship of the Public Education Committee of the SAAs. Furthermore, Gonlin and Dixon organized a 4-field poster session about online teaching for the upcoming American Anthropological Association conference this November in San Francisco. And, finally, Dixon has set up a blog so that we may continue the conversation and invite you to join in these discussions and share your own experiences and thoughts on the integration of online technologies into our virtual and on-campus classrooms (http://distancearchaeology.proboards.com).
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GONLIN & DIXON, continued on page 43
Most rock art studies have been conducted under the guise of archaeology, but accomplished by a number of people in different fields with different interests, orientations, experience, knowledge, abilities, resources, and agendas. Until the 1990s, the presentation of rock art sites was often limited to a decorative function within archaeological reports, as aptly noted in David Whitley and Lawrence Loendorf’s 1994 article *Off the Cover and Into the Book*. This work epitomized where rock art had been until that time and where it was going in the future, although the authors could not foresee the technological advancements that would benefit rock art studies in the next two decades. The introduction of absolute dating techniques for both pictographs and petroglyphs, advances in computer software and hardware, and improvements in photographic equipment all changed how rock art was recorded and analyzed, which in turn changed how much we could learn about past cultures and even individuals from these images. Pictographs and petroglyphs went from being interesting cultural remains with the annoying problem of attracting fringe interpreters to a major research focus for many people of varied disciplines.

Unlike sites such as lithic scatters or buried deposits, rock art is highly recognizable by most of the public (Figures 1–3). Because of this feature, it is often the target of vandalism, including site visitors spray painting, adding names and dates, and using sites as a target for high-power rifles. From the opposite perspective, descendant groups, such as Native Americans, usually classify pictographs and petroglyphs as sacred sites, which means that they are actively used in ceremonies and as places for offerings and meditation. This kind of attention means that archaeologists in management positions cannot let these sites take care of themselves. Rock art sites need active management plans that address not only how to gather information for research, but also how to protect the sites from vandalism while maintaining accessibility for people who do not consider them relics of the past, but rather important parts of their present. As diverse as these uses are, site recording is the first important step for successful management.

**Rock Art Recording**

Although the goal of most recordings is complete documentation of the site, this cannot occur through the efforts of any single discipline. Just as with other aspects of archaeology, the integration of specialists from several fields (which for rock art includes, but is not limited to, chemistry, geology, photography, computer science, and descendant groups familiar with traditional knowledge) results in a more complete picture of the past. However, there are still some rock art recorders and site managers who contend that once someone has been to a rock art site and conducted their kind of recording, the site does not have to receive any further field attention. This is unfortunate because continual upgrading of records to include new methods and research perspectives only enhances site conservation and provides a more complete database for property management.

If the recorder has limited time and resources for a recording project, priority needs to be given to photography. Photos are adequate for documenting basic site content and monitoring changes. With the development of commercial computer pro-
grams for photographic manipulation to enhance what is on the wall (see the side bar on DStretch) and programs to produce scale drawings from photographs, basic photography can result in some of the best results with the least investment of time and money. If the recorder has the resources for more in-depth recording, there are several advanced photography methods available, including photogrammetry and Gigapan technology, to produce larger and more accurate site photos that can interact with GPS data to place the site within natural and cultural landscapes.

Drawing figures has been standard practice for rock art recording for decades, and rock art site forms reflect the many ways of producing drawings (Figures 4 and 5). Freehand sketches are found in many early recordings, and although the quality is variable and sometimes questionable, for basic site location and contents, these are important. However, any formal documentation of a site requires scale drawings of the images. These can be accomplished in different ways, including use of a string grid (Figure 6), measuring the figures and drawing them to scale as one would any other archaeological artifact or feature, direct tracing of the images at the site, and tracing the images from scaled photographs.

Rock art recording traditionally has included tracing figures onto clear overlays. The method has its critics because of potential impact from direct contact with the rock surface. The continued use of this technique has resulted in heated debate among recorders. Although computer tracing of photographs simulates direct tracing (Figure 7), advocates argue that field tracing is necessary for accuracy and for understanding details that are only possible from the intensive close-up interaction that occurs during tracing. Field tracing is not rubbing, which is
a method in which a piece of paper, cloth, or other material placed on the rock surface is rubbed, usually with a hard pigment, so that the underlying uneven image, or engraving, appears on the material. Tracings are made with a soft pen (usually Sharpie), and although there is usually contact between the plastic and the rock, in some cases, the plastic is prevented from having direct contact with the wall. However, by 1998, tracing came under serious questioning because of spall damage from people touching panels, and a no touching campaign, which included plastic associated with tracing, was credited to conservation concerns and an attempt to preserve rock art. The no touching policy gained support because direct dating of rock art was developing, and it was discovered that human contact may contaminate images and preclude reliable dating in some cases. There is no consensus on the topic, and views are often polarized. Most recent publications take the stance that tracing is sometimes beneficial, but should be used with caution. However, most writers advocate that tracing should not be done as a recreational way of viewing rock art. Instead, it is a method of recording to be used only by trained people for a specific purpose, since it is destructive to fragile rock surfaces. Tracing advocates support their position by arguing that archaeological recording is destructive by nature (i.e., excavation) and that any impact resulting from tracing is minor compared with other archaeological information gathering techniques.

Artists bring a talent to rock art recording in their ability not just to copy the figures but also to place those figures in their environmental setting in a realistic rendition. Through some artistic portrayals of panels, we are able to see the figures as they occur on the wall in a 3D perspective. Today, 3D technology is replac-
ing the artist perspective since it can produce an accurate representation of the petroglyph on the rock that is not just a visual perspective, but also a physical model that can be displayed and studied in a controlled environment.

Rock Art Analysis

Art historians appear to find rock art best suited to their line of inquiry when it is part of what is referred to as “high-art styles,” such as that of the Maya or European cave artists. Archaeologists have often frowned on the art history approach because of questions regarding the application of the Western art concept to rock art, but they have borrowed analytical avenues, especially associated with style, from art historians when comparing figures among panels, sites, and regions. Linguists are interested in the idea that rock art represents an early means of communication. This kind of analysis is often argued against in archaeological circles because it attempts to determine the meaning of the depictions, which is felt to be beyond our reach, unlike the search for site function. Linguists have attempted to find whether rock art images represent words, ideas, sentences, paragraphs, or complete stories. This research direction is well founded in historical sources on the Northern Plains of North America, where biographic rock art was drawn to record an event. Here, James D. Keyser’s work developing a lexicon for interpreting biographic rock art has helped change the attitude of archaeologists toward the use of linguistics in rock art analysis. On the Northern Plains, linguists also have attempted to link rock art images to hand signs of the regional sign language widely used at the time of contact.

Chemists and geologists have been important to rock art studies during the past two decades for their work in dating analysis. Their discoveries have revolutionized rock art chronology in the same way that radiocarbon dating did for excavated sites in the 1950s. This is one area where rock art researchers are not reluctant to bring specialists into their projects. Additionally, chemists and conservators have helped in preservation efforts through the development and evaluation of different compounds for use in cleaning and preserving rock art panels. Pigment analysis of pictographs has been aided by X-Ray Fluorescence (XRF) spectrometry studies (Figure 8). This non-invasive reading of the chemical components of the paint with a handheld field instrument aids in identifying source materials for the paints, and it can also authenticate pre-industrial age rock art by verifying that the ingredients in the paint do not include modern chemical mixtures.

Consultation with Native Americans and other descendant groups in rock art interpretation is on the rise, following trends towards a more inclusive archaeology in general. This association promotes better relationships between rock art researchers and groups that may be using sites, and acknowledges that rock art is
considered sacred by most modern people regardless of its past function. In some cases, this collaboration also results in rock art researchers learning about traditional beliefs surrounding a site and gaining information about understandings of descendant relationships. Unfortunately, published accounts of these interpretations rarely contextualize traditional knowledge with the background of the informant, which is essential for evaluating and integrating traditional knowledge into larger studies.

Filing Site Records

All rock art researchers, regardless of their discipline, need to be informed of the importance of and procedures for placing their information in the permanent archaeological records of the state or government agency responsible for them. Thirty years ago, researchers, regardless of their association, were more likely to place their information in a central repository. Today, with different institutions, museums, and even agencies retaining control of their information, it is more difficult to know the history of recording at any given site. A central location for sharing information enhances the quality of the site data by making it more complete.

However, shared information is of little use if it is not accurate, and within the past couple of decades there has been a trend in recording caves that has implications for rock art research if it is not circumvented. In an effort to keep caves secret not only from the public, but also from competing researchers, names of caves are changed so that publications or professional presentations do not reflect a cave’s actual location. This kind of protection appears good on the surface, but it has some unredeeming aspects, such as the potential for the duplication of records when sites are recorded multiple times, or the omission of important data in synthesis reports, which diminishes their usefulness. Distributional studies are not possible if basic information is not on file for every known site. Additionally, unless a site is placed under lock and key (which many caves are) keeping the name and location secret from others does not prevent people from finding the site or vandalizing it. Archaeologists must make rock art researchers from all disciplines aware of the systems already in place for archaeological site numbering, the filing of site information, and the curation of records. It is the responsibility of archaeologists to explain how these systems offer the best protection for sites.

IFRAO and Local, Regional, and National Rock Art Organizations

The popularity of rock art research is reflected in the number of local, regional, and national groups that have been formed in the past few decades that are dedicated to educating the public about petroglyph and pictograph research and about the people who created these images. Within the United States, there are a variety of rock art groups available to professional and amateur researchers. Examples of these groups include the American Rock Art Research Association, the Eastern States Rock Art Research Association, the Utah Rock Art Research Association, Bay Area Rock Art Research Association, Friends of Sierra Rock Art, San Diego Rock Art Association, Nevada Rock Art Foundation, Southern Nevada Rock Art Association, Friends of the Albuquerque Petroglyphs, Colorado Rock Art Association, and the Upper Midwest Rock Art Research Association. The Society for American Archaeology’s Rock Art Interest Group has one of the highest memberships of the interest groups offered by the Society. This desire for rock art researchers to gather and share problems and solutions has resulted in accelerated progress in all areas of knowledge and protection of this site type.

The number and diversity of these organizations was the impetus for formation of the International Federation of Rock Art Organizations (IFRAO). Rock art researchers from nine organizations met at the 1988 Australian Rock Art Congress to discuss...
common interests and international cooperation. Their immediate goal was to minimize discrepancies within rock art research between regions and countries, and the original IFRAO constitution was written with that in mind. Other rock art organizations around the world were asked to join, but each organization remains autonomous, with the federation initiating policies that represent the common interests of all. Today about 50 organizations are members, and IFRAO focuses on providing guidelines for global standards of rock art study, conservation, recording, and inventory. Intellectual and monetary support of rock art projects endorsed by IFRAO and educational programs for the public to maximize appreciation and protection of rock art resources are encouraged.

International Conference—Cross Pollination of Ideas

The IFRAO congress brings together experts from around the world, and the American Rock Art Research Association (www.arara.org) is hosting the 2013 meeting in Albuquerque, New Mexico, May 26–31. Scientists, researchers, educators, conservators, and all interested people are invited to attend. This conference in the heart of the American Southwest provides an atmosphere in which rock art continues to be a daily presence in the lives of those in the area, and the participants from around the world remind us that all our ancestors made rock art, regardless of our ethnic heritage.

The weekend event includes four days of presentations in seven concurrent sessions, with a day of field trips to nearby New Mexican rock art sites. Participants will have the opportunity to see some of the best Southwestern pictographs and petroglyphs and a chance to visit and learn about Pueblo culture both past and present. In addition to opportunities for attendees to meet and talk with rock art experts from around the world, there are events planned to expand their knowledge of the Southwestern United States.

To acquaint attendees and the local community with rock art in a global perspective, Dr. Jean Clottes of France will present the opening public lecture. He is a past IFRAO President and retired General Inspector for Archaeology and Scientific Advisor for Prehistoric Rock Art at the French Ministry of Culture. Clottes has traveled the world studying rock art and advising on site protection, but he is best known for his work with cave paintings. He was instrumental in the studies at both Chauvet and Cosquer and has written books on theoretical constructs for explaining the rock art in European caves. His presentation From Cave Art to IFRAO will tie together the history of rock art studies and benefits available to researchers from rock art organizations.

One of the biggest concerns of rock art researchers and interest groups is the balancing act of protecting sites while providing for public visitation. The public has a fascination with rock art that includes not only those that “love the sites to death” but also those that “vandalize the sites to death” upon seeing them. The presence of graffiti at rock art sites worldwide is something that many believe can be alleviated by educating people about their past, while others feel keeping site locations secret is the only solution. Others see preserving sites through recording and documentation as the only real protection available. These problems will not be solved by any one meeting or book, but continued collaboration of people from around the world and in-depth examinations of topics related to rock art in local, regional, national, and international organizations will bring new ideas to the table, aid progress in recording and preservation efforts, and find ways to balance the needs of researchers, descendant communities, and interested members of the public.
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Passionate and dedicated avocational archaeologists have been a mainstay of support for professional archaeology in Tennessee throughout the past five decades. This article seeks to examine the contributions of avocational members of the Southeastern Indian Antiquities Survey (SIAS), now known as the Middle Cumberland Archaeological Society (MCAS), to professional archaeology in Middle Tennessee. We also take this opportunity to acknowledge and highlight the significant role of SIAS/MCAS member John T. Dowd, recipient of the SAA’s 2012 Crabtree Award, for his encouragement, promotion, and sponsorship of activities and organizations that furthered the successful interaction of avocational and professional archaeologists across Tennessee. And finally, the authors highlight recent collaborative efforts to provide access to information about Tennessee archaeology.

The urban and suburban expansion of Nashville—Tennessee’s capital city—began in earnest in the early 1960s when there was no National Historic Preservation Act, no state archaeology laws, no state archaeologists, and no university archaeologists interested in local archaeology. The few professional archaeologists in Tennessee at that time were located on the opposing ends of the state at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville and Memphis State University. This situation left Middle Tennessee in the hands of collectors, pothunters, and bulldozers. In response to the increasingly frequent destruction of prehistoric Native American sites and cemeteries, several avocational archaeologists banded together in 1963 to create the Southeastern Indian Antiquities Survey (SIAS). That initial group of devoted avocationalists volunteered their time and energy to conduct salvage excavations at dozens of archaeological sites threatened by urban development, and also organized efforts to promote preservation and stewardship of the local archaeological record. From the beginning, the SIAS included members from “all walks of life: professional and amateur archaeologists, blue and white collar workers, housewives, students, and anyone else interested in history...
and prehistory” (Dowd and Smith 2008:1). In 1976, the SIAS changed its name to the Middle Cumberland Archaeological Society (MCAS) to reflect changing times. Whatever the name, this organization will celebrate its 50th anniversary in 2013.

The driving force behind the early SIAS was Bob Ferguson (1927–2001). Bob was a successful songwriter as well as an executive at Radio Corporation of America (RCA). He later became tribal historian of the Mississippi Choctaws. Bob was interested in promoting prehistory as ancestral to vibrant modern Native American traditions, so the SIAS was also closely involved in partnerships with southeastern tribes. This arrangement was perhaps unusual for an early avocational organization, with major projects including publication of the Choctaw Times (Chahta Aunumpa) newspaper, fundraising for a Native American cultural center in Nashville, and sponsoring several meetings of the United Southeastern Tribes (now United South and Eastern Tribes, Inc.).

John T. Dowd, recipient of the SAA’s 2012 Crabtree Award, joined the SIAS in 1968. John’s involvement in surface-collecting began in the early 1960s when he accompanied his father-in-law Lloyd McMahan in the fields of Coffee County, Tennessee. A few years later in 1967, while walking down a creek near his home, John noticed a scattering of potsherds and other artifacts that had been kicked out by a groundhog burrowing in a small rockshelter. Dowd, along with co-worker and SIAS member David Parrish, excavated the Mill Creek Overhang later that year. From that first project, John exhibited what would be a consistent concern for recordkeeping and publication of his discoveries. Soon after completing the Mill Creek Overhang excavation, he wrote to Charles Faulkner (Department of Anthropology, University of Tennessee) and A.K. Guthre (Frank H. McClung Museum, University of Tennessee) asking for help identifying potsherds from the rockshelter. This collaboration led to publication of the first of many articles along with his initial public presentation (Dowd 1969abc). These early efforts set the high standard by which all subsequent avocational archaeologists in Middle Tennessee have been judged. Other SIAS members exhibited a similar devotion to publication and distribution of results and data from their salvage operations (i.e. Ferguson 1972; SIAS 1972).

Preservation and Professionalization

Passage of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 prompted development of a bill in the Tennessee legislature in 1969 to create a “Tennessee Antiquities Act” and state division of archaeology. Both the SIAS and the statewide Tennessee Archaeological Society officially endorsed the bill, and their lobbying efforts were instrumental in gaining the necessary votes to pass the bill (Smith 2012). As a result, two of the six positions appointed (by the governor) to the newly created Tennessee Archaeological Advisory Council were reserved for avocational representatives, one from the Tennessee Archaeological Society and one from the SIAS. Avocational interests were well represented and contributed significantly to defining the mission and goals of the new state Division of Archaeology. A former president of the SIAS, Mack Prichard, was appointed as the first State Archaeologist in 1971. Over the next few years, many of the field responsibilities and investigations performed by the SIAS were assumed by the state Division of Archaeology. Given this change in SIAS roles, along with Bob Ferguson’s retirement and relocation to Mississippi in 1973, Dowd and fellow SIAS member H.C. “Buddy” Brehm (1918–1995) reorganized the SIAS as the Middle Cumberland Archaeological Society (Brehm 1976).

The increasing professionalization of Tennessee archaeology by the late 1960s provided challenges in defining appropriate roles for the avocational archaeologist. This development also widened a growing rift between polarized ends of the statewide Tennessee Archaeological Society (TAS) membership spectrum, with professional archaeologists on one side and avocational members with commercial interests in artifacts on the other. That schism eventually led to abandonment of the TAS in 1976 by a majority of Tennessee’s professional archaeologists and founding of the Tennessee Anthropological Association (Smith 2012). Without an institutional support base, the TAS struggled along until 1985 when it was quietly disbanded. The bitter feelings generated by the failure to define common ground resonated to this day. Both authors entered Tennessee archaeology at this auspicious moment—Smith as an anthropology graduate student at Vanderbilt University, and Moore as an archaeologist with the Tennessee Division of Archaeology. In the absence of a statewide archaeological organization, our attentions soon
turned to the Middle Cumberland Archaeological Society and its leadership for assistance with our research and preservation efforts.

One of the largest field projects ever conducted by MCAS members was initiated in 1980 at the Anderson site, widely recognized as one of the most significant Middle Archaic sites in the interior south (Figure 1). The Anderson site excavations set the stage for a long tradition of collaboration between MCAS members (avocational and professional) that continues to this day. The project has long served as a model of cooperation between avocational, graduate students from several universities, and professional archaeologists from many institutions. Eventually, Dowd brought all of this collaborative work together in a publication with contributions from multiple authors (Dowd 1989). MCAS member Buddy Brehm, a printer by trade, began publication of his “Mini History” series through the Mini-Histories Press at about the same time. Brehm would eventually publish and reprint over 30 volumes, including many hard-to-find antiquarian works, making them widely accessible to citizens of the state.

Rapid expansion of the greater Nashville metropolitan area during the 1980s and 1990s generated a continuous series of threats to major archaeological sites through private developments not subject to either state or federal archaeological statutes. Members of the MCAS have provided countless hours of volunteer labor on dozens of professional projects (both “emergency” salvage and more research-oriented projects) over the past four decades. An example was the 1993 private development of a subdivision just northeast of Nashville that promised to destroy about half of a major late prehistoric mound center known as the Rutherford-Kizer site. With permission from

When we began our professional careers in Tennessee archaeology in the mid-1980s, the most common answer to any of our questions about major archaeological sites in the mid-state region was something to this effect: “You should ask John Dowd. He probably knows more about that site than anybody else.” When “speed dial” became available, John’s home number was among the first entries on both our phones, and for almost 30 years now John (or wife Lynda) always answered. Therein lies the heart of why John Dowd received the Crabtree Award: his consistent, insistent, and passionate belief that we are only stewards of objects from, and knowledge about, past cultures. Such objects and knowledge must be shared to be meaningful. A few quotes from John’s letters of support underline some of his key qualities:

“The body of work that John has created over a half century is a model for professional and avocational archaeologists alike. He has presented and published his research efforts as a labor of commitment of the highest caliber and has set a benchmark of service that exceeds the label of avocational archaeologist. While John may work locally, he thinks and writes in a broader context that infuses his work with relevance for current research problems.”

“His sustained involvement in archaeology is quite simply inspirational.”

“John’s professionalism has been manifest in his concern that important collections and objects be preserved and accessible in a public institution. Consequently, we now house several important collections.”

“For nearly fifty years, he has worked to encourage cooperation between avocational and professional archaeologists across the state of Tennessee.”

“Over his entire career as an avocational archaeologist, John has actively promoted positive relationships between the professional and amateur communities.”

John T. Dowd has been an avocational archaeologist for almost half a century. His “resume” includes conducting a dozen major excavations projects of his own (all of which are published); volunteering on an uncountable number of professional projects; publishing more than thirty articles and monographs; and sharing his knowledge through a similarly uncountable number of
the developer, the authors approached the MCAS for assistance in salvaging as much information as possible from this largely uninvestigated site. During late summer and early fall of 1993, over 70 individuals volunteered thousands of hours to the project (Figure 2). This assistance continued through 1994 and 1995 laboratory processing of artifacts and soil samples. The Tennessee Historical Commission awarded a Certificate of Merit to the MCAS in 1994 during National Historic Preservation Week in recognition of their efforts at Rutherford-Kizer. More importantly, perhaps, is that the publicity and media coverage generated by the volunteer project eventually contributed to the developer redesigning his project. The redesigned project set aside four acres of the core archaeological site area, along with an associated cemetery, as greenspaces that were donated to the Native American Indian Association of Tennessee (Moore and Smith 2001).

Beginning in late 1994, another significant volunteer project was conducted under an Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) permit issued jointly to Smith and avocational MCAS member George Heinrich (Figure 3). This project engaged George and a number of MCAS volunteers for a decade, and resulted in recording information on 200+ shoreline archaeological sites (many previously unrecorded). The survey had to be performed during the dead of winter when reservoir pool levels were drawn down. MCAS President Roger Armés noted in the MCAS Newsletter: “in the winter of 1994–1995 when the water was down—or as some of the members have noted, the ice was floating low—volunteers recorded information on approximately 70 sites.” Heinrich was recognized in 1996 for his leadership of this unique project with a Tennessee Historical Commission Certificate of Merit during National Historic Preservation Week.

public and professional talks. In the preceding quotes, three consistent points are highlighted: professionalism, stewardship, and partnerships. John set a high standard for himself in all three areas from his first project in 1968. While working without any professional training in archaeology, he kept detailed records and photographs from the very beginning (he presented and published the results of his initial project within a year). In a footnote to his first publication, he noted, “All of the records and materials are at my home [address was included]... It is open for examination to any interested persons.” John has maintained that professionalism, and an “open door” policy, throughout his half-century of devotion to Tennessee archaeology.

The acknowledgements section of the senior author’s dissertation notes that “every archaeologist of the region owes a debt of gratitude to John Dowd for his insistence in ‘doing the archaeology right,’ and I wish to extend a very special thanks to him for sharing a lifetime of knowledge. Without his contributions, this dissertation would have been a much poorer product.” (Smith 1992). We could list dozens of report and presentation acknowledgements that cite consultation with John and the value of his contributions. On a related note, John has also never been shy (but always polite) about holding professional archaeologists accountable to produce accessible reports about their projects in a timely fashion. Given his lengthy publication record as “just an avocational,” those polite reminders and critiques are difficult to ignore.

John acknowledged that receiving the Crabtree Award was one of the highlights of his life. However, his contributions to Tennessee archaeology have been previously recognized by others as well. John received the first Outstanding Member Award from the Tennessee Archaeological Society in 1971, as well as the Lifetime Achievement Award for Avocational Archaeology from the Tennessee Council for Professional Archaeology in 1999.

All things considered, we suggest that John’s greatest lifetime contributions are not only his personal commitment to being an avocational archaeologist of the highest caliber, but also his devotion to supporting and promoting organizations that involve both avocationalists and professionals. John insists that all archaeology organizations in Tennessee should engage both groups. The authors agree that the successful avocational partnerships many professional archaeologists enjoy today would probably not be in place if not for the example set by John.

On a final note, we must acknowledge that John is also an accomplished artisan in a variety of mediums, including plaster artifact casts, woodcarvings (including the locally famous John Dowd Santa Claus), or replicas of copper plates. It is a rare MCAS meeting when John doesn’t have a recent creation to donate for the traditional door prize drawing.

As John retires from his five decades of avocational pursuits, we can fortunately see his legacy in the many avocationalists who have looked up to and learned from him and will follow in the large footsteps he established. Professionalism, stewardship, and partnerships—the hallmark of John Dowd, avocational archaeologist.
For public outreach and education, the number of school and civic club presentations on archaeology by MCAS members certainly number in the thousands. These include numerous programs on Native American crafts and heritage by long-time members of Native American descent Lib Roller, Marion Dunn, and James Miller. The MCAS and/or individual members have also donated money toward many projects when funding was short. For example, when Tennessee Archaeology Awareness Week was authorized (but unfunded) by the state legislature in 1995, the MCAS stepped up to donate matching funds for a Historic Preservation Fund grant to print and distribute Tennessee’s first Archaeology Week calendar of events and poster in 1996. That poster received First Prize in the 1997 SAA Archaeology Week Poster competition in Nashville (http://www.saa.org/publicFTP/public/archPosters/posterWinnerArchive_1997.html). Other contributions include underwriting publications such as *The Tennessee, Green, and Ohio Rivers Expeditions of Clarence Bloomfield Moore* (University of Alabama Press), the purchase of archaeological sites for preservation (Archaeological Conservancy, Tennessee Parks and Greenway Foundation), and sponsorship of professional meeting receptions.

We would be remiss not to mention the extraordinary contributions of avocational archaeologists in addition to MCAS members toward the Tennessee Paleoindian Projectile Points and Site Survey. John Broster and Mark Norton of the Tennessee Division of Archaeology initiated this survey in 1988, with most of the 4000+ projectile points documented during this survey discovered by interested avocationalists. Several of these individuals later donated significant portions of their collections to the state. The majority of significant Tennessee Paleoindian sites subsequently investigated and published in the archaeological literature were brought to professional attention by those avocational archaeologists.

Interest in creating a new statewide archaeological organization was renewed in 1991 by Charles McNutt of Memphis State University. McNutt initially proposed the creation of a Tennessee Council of Professional Archaeologists. However, input from Dowd and other avocationalists generated discussions that resulted in selection of a more inclusive name, thus mirroring the 1933–34 discussions about what to call the Society for American Archaeology (Poetschat et al. 2012:5). The proposed new organization was formally chartered in 1994 as the Tennessee Council for Professional Archaeology (TCPA). In 1998, the TCPA created an awards program to recognize significant contributions of avocationalists, students, and professionals. An avocational was defined as “someone who makes a special contribution to archaeology without deriving primary income as an archaeological practitioner.” MCAS members have frequently been among the recipients both for lifetime achievement and special recognitions, including John Dowd who received the 1999 TCPA Lifetime Achievement Award in Avocational Archaeology. At the first awards ceremony, during which two MCAS members were recognized, then TCPA President Nick Honerkamp of the University of Tennessee, Chattanooga noted the MCAS as “perhaps the finest avocational organization in the country.”
The Present and Beyond

Successful partnerships are built upon a foundation of mutual respect and a dedication to common goals and interests. As highlighted in the previous examples, many of our own professional projects have benefitted tremendously from the input and assistance of respected avocationals. We view this group as markedly distinct from those individuals whose primary interests in artifacts are commercial. Despite the absence of a statewide avocational society, other organizations in addition to the MCAS continue to make important contributions to professional archaeology, including the Jackson Archaeological Society, Old Stone Fort Archaeological Society, and Dickson Archaeological Society.

Over the past three decades, the authors have worked to sponsor and encourage opportunities for the interested public to get involved in Tennessee archaeology. The annual Current Research in Tennessee Archaeology meeting has brought together professional archaeologists, undergraduate and graduate students, avocational archaeologists, and the interested public to showcase recent discoveries and research (http://capone.mtsu.edu/kesmith/TNARCH/CRITA.html) (Figure 4). The electronic journal *Tennessee Archaeology* was launched in 2004 under the general sponsorship of the Tennessee Council for Professional Archaeology. Each issue of this fully peer-reviewed publication, edited by the authors, is available to view or download at no charge (http://capone.mtsu.edu/kesmith/TNARCH/tennesseearchaeology.html). Also, since 1996, the *Tennessee Archaeology Network* web pages have served as a central on-line place to promote and publicize the contributions and significance of archaeological research in the State of Tennessee.

As the two opening quotes suggest, many “amateurs” recognize the responsibility that comes with exploring the archaeological record. From our perspective, one of the responsibilities of the professional archaeologist is to provide opportunities for those who are willing to learn. Our understanding of Tennessee prehistory would be much poorer indeed without the assistance of the MCAS and other avocational groups. In sum, avocational and professional partnerships are alive and well in Tennessee.
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**Figure 4**: Group gathering for the 2011 Current Research in Tennessee Archaeology meeting. John Dowd and Travis Binion in foreground.
SPEAKING UP AND SPEAKING OUT
COLLECTIVE EFFORTS IN THE FIGHT TO RECLAIM THE PUBLIC PERCEPTION OF ARCHAEOLOGY
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Have you ever been stopped in traffic to answer questions about Noah’s Ark? One summer day in 2006, our co-author Jeb Card was driving along Veteran’s Memorial Boulevard in Metairie, Louisiana. If you’ve never seen it, Veteran’s is a divided six-lane high-traffic “miracle mile,” full of strip malls and box stores. While idling at a red light, a motorist rolled down her window, calling out, “Did you hear about the new Noah’s Ark discovery?” Jeb confessed that he had not. Realizing why she had asked, he assured her that he would look into it (Ravilious 2006). Why had she asked? Because Jeb was driving Tulane University’s official Center for Archaeology truck, which had both “Center for Archaeology” and “Tulane University” stenciled on the outside of the doors.

All three of the authors of the current paper have had multiple variations on this experience, and we suspect most SAA members can relate. We have been asked about Atlantis, the Pyramids, how the Mayas and Aztecs of South America (yes, we know) built their sewer systems, about the six-fingered aliens who gave the Maya a base-twelve number system (yes, again, we know), crystal skulls, and many, many other topics. Over the years, we have become increasingly interested in the attitudes of the people who ask these questions and how professional archaeologists should respond to these somewhat unorthodox claims. In our experience, the majority of people who ask these questions are not idle time wasters, nor are they typically out to proclaim a strongly held personal belief, but rather quite the opposite. These questions are often asked in an excited and happy manner. (The mocking questions usually involve Indiana Jones, or one’s state of employment.) The motive here is typically one of real, often pent-up, curiosity. That motorist in Louisiana had it, and we’ve seen it time and again from airplane passengers, college students, dinner party guests, bar patrons, taxi drivers, and even colleagues in universities and museums. With an archaeologist present, they finally have someone whom they can ask about the archaeology special that aired on cable television last month. And they want to get the question out before the traffic light turns green!

Archaeology and Pseudoarchaeology in the Public Eye
Throughout its history, archaeology has attracted both colorful characters and equally colorful theories about the human past. Early archaeologists are often better remembered for their quirks and charms than for the rigor of their research, but as the discipline has matured, our methodologies have improved along with the strength of our theoretical constructs. We still have many rousing debates regarding intricate interpretations of economy, sociopolitical organization, and occasionally ritual practices, but as a discipline, archaeologists today agree upon more subjects than they disagree. The products of archaeological study, however, are not consumed by archaeologists alone, and our internal agreements do not always transfer to the general public.

Archaeology has shown steady popularity in virtually all outlets of our modern media culture (Brittain and Clack 2007a; García-Raso 2011; Holtoff 2007). Perhaps the most prominent example is the Indiana Jones film franchise, but we cannot overlook the influence of all sorts of “inauthentic archaeologies” (Lovata 2007), including the influence of the variety of made-for-TV documentaries, blogs, video games, theme parks, and more. This popularity has led to widespread familiarity, albeit often a cursory familiarity, with stereotyped fantasies and visions of ancient cultures and the ruins that they have left behind. Hand-in-hand with this vague familiarity are the many claims (ranging from fanciful to fraudulent) that continue to be developed, recycled, and promoted by authors who sidestep mainstream archaeological methodologies and reasoning. This genre of archaeology has been given a variety of names by academic archaeologists, including pseudoarchaeology (Fagan 2006), dubious archaeology (Feder 2010), cult archaeology (Harrold et al. 1995), fantastic archaeology (Williams 1991), alternative/lunatic archaeology (Daniel 1979), along with other, less publishable, terms. Regardless of what we call these approaches, or what we think about them, in the eyes of the public, pseudoarchaeological claims compete directly with mainstream archaeological interpretations. And we’re fighting an uphill battle.
Many professional archaeologists have long held that the best response to pseudoscience is no response at all. The underlying assumption seems to be that it is preferable to ignore wild claims spouted about the human past than to offer them the legitimacy of an official response. There is a legitimate point here; debate can create the appearance of a genuine controversy, framing the professional as one of two sides of the story. Never mind how frustrating such an actual debate with an entrenched proponent of these claims can be, leading to the likelihood that no amount of persuasive argument or logical discourse will result in changed minds on either side. The very act of a debate can be the entire goal of the alternative proponent; hence the popularity of the phrase “teach the controversy” in Creationist/Intelligent Design circles (Meyer 2002). So we can understand refusal of direct public debates (Plait 2004). Another concern would be deepening any perceived connection between such topics and the profession of anthropology (Peterson 1991).

We would, however, remind you of Jeb’s traffic light conversation. Most members of the casually interested proponent are not diehard proponents of pseudoarchaeological theories, but rather they are just that: the casually interested public. This has been shown to be the case in numerous surveys conducted by one of our co-authors among university students (Feder 2011). Most respondents express fascination with the topics, but very few are true believers in ancient astronauts, Atlantis, and the like. In an era where people have come to expect instant answers to casual questions, and when an authoritative-looking blog can be produced in a matter of minutes to be indexed in Google within days, if not hours, we can be certain that if archaeologists do not answer the public’s questions about the human past, someone else will. All the evidence you could ever want of this can be found on YouTube, cable television, or, if you are an analog sort of person, in the books and magazines found at your local bookshop. If you have never familiarized yourself with these sources, we would strongly suggest that you should. Many of their creators are far more earnest and sincere than this allegedly ridiculous subject matter might lead you to believe, and the raw energy they bring to their subject of choice is often an advantage in attracting the attention of consumers.

Speaking Up and Speaking Out

We hold that it should be an explicit priority of all archaeologists to speak up publically regarding both the logical, factual problems presented by pseudoarchaeological claims and the way that they deeply impact contemporary social and political ideologies. To raise professional awareness of this issue, we organized a symposium on the question of how archaeologists should respond to pseudoarchaeology for the 2012 Society for American Archaeology annual meeting in Memphis. The papers presented in this symposium fell into two broad categories: trying to understand how people come to be interested in, believe in, and practice these ideas; and examples of how to react to such interests and beliefs when they are presented to us.

In pursuit of insights into such beliefs, Tera Pruitt (2012; see also 2009 and 2011) presented her work on the practices of “performing science” (utilizing symbols of science in public ways, rather than completing serious plans of scientific research) at the foot of supposed pyramids in Bosnia. Some of the rationale of why the “pyramids,” denounced as natural geological formations by archaeologists and geologists familiar with the region, have gained widespread acceptance will sound very familiar to historians of archaeology: local and national pride (in Bosnia’s case, in the wake of a devastating war), as well as economic benefit from tourism. Evan Parker (2012) provided valuable information on the nature of reality television in America, situating recent controversial shows (not just pseudoscience-oriented, but also those highlighting amateur recovery and sale of artifacts) in the ecology of “object” shows that combine American interests in capitalism and individualism with a populist bent. Christopher Begley (2012) laid out a fascinating case regarding the “Ciudad Blanca” of Honduras. While this is traditionally treated either as a fabulous legend or as pseudoarchaeology, Begley argued instead that demonstrable indigenous knowledge of Honduras’ past has been garbled by Westerners and turned into pseudoarchaeological myth to fit Western narratives, in this case a fabulous lost city. This phenomenon of “de-indigenizing” and appropriative mangling to create a Western legend is extremely common in pseudoscience, including the creation of ancient aliens (even as far as the Theosophists that lie at the root of much of modern Western occultism, including UFOs and aliens) (Colavito 2005), the “2012 Maya Apocalypse” (Aveni 2009:15–26), and even Bigfoot (Daegling 2005).

The other papers in the symposium detailed entanglements (or lack thereof) of scholars in pseudoarchaeological claims. Markus Eberl (2012) discussed methods of analyzing artifacts for signs of forgery and what this reveals about the larger practice of science. Robert H. Tykot (2012) discussed his techniques for addressing pseudoarchaeological claims in the classroom. Ken Feder, Sonja Atalay, Terry Barnhart, Deborah Bolnick, and Bradley Lepper (2012) provided a cautionary tale of the perils of uncritically cooperating with media production companies, based on their experiences with a television documentary that unbeknownst to them was promoting pseudoscientific ideas. Beyond terrifying the audience, these archaeologists provided sound practical advice for archaeologists working with the media, a topic that has been addressed to some degree (Brittain and Clack 2007b; Hale 2006; Taylor 2007), but for the reasons mentioned above, clearly needs to be emphasized more. It should be noted that the relationship between archaeology and the media is not the same everywhere, as can be seen by com-
1. Understanding why pseudoarchaeological beliefs originate and persist should be a part of our job as professional archaeologists. The mixing of cultural myth and mysticism with archaeological materials is a significant part of the human experience found around the world (Hansen et al. 2008; Jordan 2006; Magnoni et al. 2008; Rieti 1991:284; Semple 1998). Ignoring this behavior means ignoring an important element of human culture and its ongoing relationship to its own material products (Lovata 2007:9–24). We suggest thinking of these kinds of beliefs as an additional component to a site or regional sequence, something that we must understand and manage as a cultural resource, even if it is not relevant to our research questions or project goals. Just as we would not discard all lithic materials even though we may prefer working with pottery sherds, or dig through colonial architecture without the concern we show for Preclassic strata, we cannot discard the contemporary popular relationship with the material past simply because we find it a nuisance.

2. While we must be engaged with the social significance of our own research, we must also be responsible about how we present the human past. People outside of the professional archaeological community clearly have a variety of interests in the past, and many of them will turn to archaeologists to help them understand or manage these interests. Due to the specifically destructive nature of archaeological work, we are not only obliged to publish the results of our studies, but we must work with other stakeholders affiliated with our studies. This interaction should be undertaken both within our normal professional venues and outside of them. (Even low-rated television shows are seen by millions of people. How many people have read your book?). However, we must be cautious. The perils of working with popular media have already been mentioned, but we must further be aware of how our actions may be partly responsible for the myths and mysticism that plague archaeology (Card 2012), as well as how our research on the ancient past can have drastic political consequences in the modern world (Chakrabarti 2012). And we must realize that maintaining a dividing line between a strictly scientific archaeology and pseudoarchaeology may not be straightforward or even necessarily appropriate in all circumstances (Schadla-Hall 2004; see Holtorf 2005 for a similar perspective, though we must note that we strongly disagree with Holtorf’s views on archaeology’s responsibilities regarding pseudoarchaeology. See also Fagan and Feder 2006). This is all a bit of a balancing act.

3. By promoting our field, we promote the human past. If we adopt the first two themes to our research, we will have a better understanding of how people engage with their past, and we will be taking steps to contribute our professional skills and knowledge to this engagement. Given long-term problems with reconciling various ideas of science with public interests (Toumey 1996:11–44) and our current era of both conflict over science and government austerity, these seem like useful goals. If addressing claims of alien pyramids and sunken cities is necessary for moving public interest away from these topics to more important and pressing concerns of humanity’s heritage and continuing legacy, so be it.

Where Do We Go from Here?

The question naturally arises, where do we go from here? We greatly enjoyed the session in Memphis, as well as the rest of the conference (seriously Jeff, that was a good paper!), but a
gathering of likeminded academics at an institutionalized conference of professional archaeologists hardly qualifies as public outreach. We did not come to the SAA’s annual meeting looking for a pat on the back from a membership that widely agrees with us about the logical fallacies abundant in pseudoarchaeology, but rather in an effort to awaken an understanding of the very real problems that pseudoarchaeology presents for the human past and present.

Both the complexities and the importance of these problems are well encapsulated by two quotes that Tera Pruitt (2012) presented during the course of our session from local Bosnians living in the shadow of the alleged discovery of Bosnia’s very own ancient pyramid. The first comes from a waiter rushing to serve crowd-tables in a local restaurant benefiting from the pyramid-tourism boom, “Please God, let them find a pyramid.” The second quote comes from a resident of the town, pleading, “If they don’t find the pyramid, we’re going to make it during the night. But we’re not even thinking about that. There are pyramids, and there will be pyramids.” In this case, economic concerns clearly triumph over any semblance of objective interest in the past, and we might add that they triumph for very good reasons.

The problem represented by the hijacking of the human past by pseudoarchaeology is not a problem that can be simply fixed by a campaign of “debunking.” It is a problem that requires social engagement with the present and the past, and it is a problem in which all professional archaeologists have a stake. We recognize that between conferences, field projects, publications, teaching responsibilities, and the like, not everyone can devote the time to become an engaged expert on the latest popular claims of alleged evidence of ancient alien contact. We would, however, like to draw a parallel. To be both good archaeologists and good teachers, we are expected to maintain a familiarity with subjects that fall outside of our specialties. In short, while a majority of SAA members are not experts in the cultures of the Indus Valley (no offense to specialists in South Asian archaeology), we would expect that anyone of us should be able to compose a solid lecture on Harappan civilization when the subject arises in our World Prehistory course. We would suggest that if you can spend a class discussing the Harappans, you should be able to spend a class discussing pseudoarchaeology.

This is not only important for archaeology as a sub-discipline of anthropology, but is also an important contribution to the anthropology of recent and present cultural beliefs. As noted in our session by Begley, Pruitt, and Eberl, we cannot understand claims or beliefs, nor can we respond to them, if we ignore the cultural contexts of these claims and beliefs. From an anthropological perspective, it is just as important to understand the cultural contexts, significance, and meaning of ancient cities occupied by the gods, of pyramids older, larger, and more sophisticated than those found anywhere else in the world, and of lost (and found) Maya manuscripts, as it might be to address the historicity of these claims. The importance of esoteric claims in understanding historical and present societies, including how they reflect topics such as religion, government, and science, is a growing movement in various cultural fields (see for example Barkun 2003; Bennett 1999; Cook 2004; Denzler 2001; McEland 2006). Archaeology can and should contribute in a similar fashion.

**Strategies for the Future**

In order to make substantive progress in swaying public opinion regarding the differences between archaeology and pseudoarchaeology, professional archaeologists need to reassess their opinion of pseudoarchaeology. We can no longer afford to simply sideline such theories as irrelevant or insignificant. It is imperative that we actively speak out against these theories in our classrooms, to public audiences, and especially to the media. While many of us may wish to believe that pseudoarchaeological beliefs, and in turn pseudoscientific and paranormal beliefs, are minor influences in modern society, research has shown precisely the opposite. For example, Feder (1995, 2006) has shown through a series of surveys the continuous popularity of pseudoarchaeological beliefs among college student populations. Likewise, Thomas Gray (1995) found that even after taking a course on science and pseudoscience, college students continue to hold high levels of belief in paranormal subjects. On a broader scale, the recent work Paranormal America by Christopher D. Bader, F. Carson Mencken, and Joseph O. Baker (2010) documented that two-thirds of Americans hold at least one paranormal belief. In short, the denial of modern climate science and evolutionary theory are only the publicly acceptable tip of the iceberg.
We propose that two main strategies be employed in our efforts to speak out against pseudoarchaeology. The first can be called “confrontational-reactive,” which is a fancy way of saying that archaeologists should respond on a case by case basis—often when prompted—to the particular claims made in a documentary, newspaper article, or classroom question. In other words, as the result of a student question, a particularly egregious local newspaper piece, or an awful cable show, we write a letter to the editor, call the cable station, or respond in class, but only in direct response and limited to the particular claim being made at the time (see for example Feder et al. 2011). While we hold that this type of response is absolutely essential, it in part represents a never-ending game of intellectual “whack-a-mole.” Our readers are undoubtedly familiar with the carnival game in which animated, stuffed moles randomly pop out of simulated mole holes and you are supposed to whack them into submission. Of course, as soon as you whack one back into the ground, another one randomly pops up, and the one that you have already whacked is just as likely to pop back up as not. Imagine if you will, the particularly pervasive nature of a mole going by the name of Atlantis. Or, if Atlantis doesn’t bother you, how about Hebrew Moundbuilders in Ohio? Or the true Celtic colonists of North America? Or, Aryan migrations? We do not question the necessity of whacking moles when they appear, but it should be apparent by now that mole whacking is not a sufficient response on its own.

The second strategy is the more difficult one to employ. Archaeology, and by proxy the human past, is in need of a proactive strategy of promotion and explanation. In this approach, we recognize that there is a vast reservoir of fascination about the human past on the part of the public, a great interest in hearing our stories about the veritable past, the past revealed through archaeological research. We can satisfy this documented interest—and do a better job than the producers of pseudoarchaeology. Examples of the proactive approach can be seen in the work of Ohio Historical Society archaeologist Brad Lepper, in his popular book on Ohio archaeology (Lepper 2005), his regular column in the Columbus Dispatch, as well as his blog on the Ohio Historical Society website. Most of Lepper’s pieces are proactive, sharing the discoveries of genuine archaeology, exemplifying how the “mysteries” of the past are addressed through archaeological research. From time to time, Lepper is also confrontational-reactive, responding to specific, popular, and current claims that fall outside of mainstream science, but here his readers can view those responses in the broader context of how archaeological research in general can answer questions about human antiquity.

We would further point out the excellent research carried out by Jane MacLaren Walsh (2008) in researching the alleged Crystal Skulls of Mesoamerica. While the Crystal Skulls have plagued Mesoamericanists for decades (Garvin 1973), they were skyrocketed to international fame as mysterious archaeological objects by the fourth film of the Indiana Jones trilogy. Rather than simply dismissing the skulls, Walsh set out to understand where they had come from. Close examination of tool marks and historical records revealed a fascinating and, more importantly, true story of dreams, lies, art, and fraud, ranging from European workshops to Mexican markets to Belizean jungles.

In conclusion, the determinism of speaking to the public represented by Lepper’s work, and the ability to look beyond simple dismissal of dubious objects found in Walsh’s work, represent an archaeological activism that we would like to see the entire profession embrace. If you have doubts that this campaign is necessary, please take a tour of the archaeology section of your local bookstore, or check out the variety of documentaries being aired regularly on cable television. The general public has a demonstrable interest in the ancient past, and professional archaeologists are clearly not meeting that interest. This is perhaps in part due to the academy’s longstanding practice of villifying anyone who dares to write a popular book, but we think the problem is more deeply seated in our own self-interests. It is easier to dismiss a pseudoarchaeological claim and redirect the interested party to our latest lithic use-wear analysis than it is to talk frankly about the magic and mystery that the human past presents. Most of us were attracted to this discipline as a result of these indefinable qualities rather than the drudgery of lab work, and we should be encouraging the public to be interested in this all too human element of our own past.
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The legacy of Kamehameha Schools (KS) is rooted in its lands and resources. As the largest private landowner in the state of Hawai‘i, the Schools stewards 363,000 acres of agricultural, conservation, and commercial land across five Hawaiian Islands.

Hawaiians of old understood their relationship to the land and knew that healthy ‘āina (land and resources) would provide everything needed for a sustainable and healthy lifestyle. Today, the Land Assets Division of Kamehameha Schools seeks to use its vast acreage to achieve a balanced relationship of thriving lands and thriving communities. The role of land steward is one of kuleana (responsibility), but is better described as kaumāna (burden).

The wahi kūpuna (ancestral places) found on Kamehameha’s lands are tangible and direct links to the Schools’ founder, Princess Bernice Pauahi Bishop, as well as to our ancestors (Figure 1). They are repositories of ancestral knowledge and mana (spiritual power). As a Hawaiian institution and landowner, KS approaches its kuleana to maintain these cultural resources in perpetuity from a unique Maoli (Hawaiian or Indigenous) perspective.

Background of Kamehameha Schools
Kamehameha Schools was founded in 1887 by the will of Princess Bernice Pauahi Bishop, great-granddaughter and last royal descendant of Kamehameha the Great. During her lifetime, Pauahi had witnessed the physical and social decline of her people, and so she bequeathed her estate to found a school for Hawaiians, with the hope that education could reverse their fate.

One hundred twenty-five years later, KS serves more than 47,000 learners each year at its preschools and campuses, as well as through college financial aid and the support of community-focused programs. Since its founding, KS has become a symbol of educational excellence for Hawaiians, graduating more than 24,000 industrious, young men and women.

The cost of its educational mission is almost entirely supported by the Schools’ $9.2 billion endowment. Income from its residential, commercial, and resort leases, as well as diverse financial investments, fund the Schools’ educational operations. In 2000, under the order of a court master, KS developed a 15-year Strategic Plan that would transform it from a passive landowner to an active land steward.

Strategic Shift
Historically, KS had been a passive landowner that leased its agricultural lands to large sugar and pineapple plantations and cattle ranches. A shift in Kamehameha’s land management strategies has provided increased opportunities for place-based education, community consultation, professional development internships, and rediscovery of native ecosystems, traditional agricultural sites, and ancestral places.

Kamehameha’s lands have become settings where education and stewardship mingle and thrive. The Schools’ lands are now seen as cultural landscapes and native ecosystems, and the honor and value of these lands is measured by educational, environmental, economic, community, and cultural opportunities. Kamehameha’s lands also provide a source of cultural well-being and spiritual reawakening. These lands continue to provide Hawaiians—young and old—opportunities to reconnect with the places where their kūpuna (ancestors) once lived.

Wahi Kūpuna Program
Wahi kūpuna are tangible and intangible features that link Hawaiians today to our kūpuna (ancestors) of yesterday. Kamehameha’s Wahi Kūpuna Program focuses on the care and stewardship of ancestral Hawaiian places. To date, the
program has completed ethnohistorical studies for 80 percent of KS lands. Information from these studies allows KS to make informed management decisions. These studies include gathering historical documentation of the lands from archival resources and include oral history interviews with long-time knowledgeable residents of these lands.

In the past 10 years, Kamehameha has also completed more than 60 archaeological and historical documentation projects, including archaeological inventory surveys, mitigation work, mapping documentation, subsurface testing, and the development of cultural resources management plans. Educational collaborators use the lands as outdoor classrooms, and relationships with local communities ensure that these places are not neglected or, conversely, treated as museum-like pieces.

Paepae o He‘eia is a wonderful example of a community organization extending Kamehameha’s ability to serve as a land steward. The nonprofit organization is working to restore a loko i’a, or traditional fishpond, found on KS land on the island of O‘ahu. The group is using and teaching traditional Hawaiian aquaculture methods to reestablish the pond as a sustainable food source (Figure 2). The 88-acre, 800-year-old walled fishpond was built on a fringing reef. Young fish enter the pond to feed and grow, while adult fish are contained.

Restoration work at the He‘eia fishpond has involved removing mangrove and invasive plants that damage the pond’s rock walls. Wall sections have been repaired and restacked using the traditional Hawaiian method of dry stacking. Coral has been used to fill in and cement the stacked rocks utilizing the traditional method of construction.

The restoration of the loko i’a goes beyond the physical walls of the pond. Traditional knowledge of tides, moons, currents, salinity, and other scientific measures are being taught as a means to ensure success of the pond and its ability to be a food source. Previous research on water quality, diurnal nutrient cycles, and sediment depth has also been conducted at the pond.
Kamehameha’s kuleana in cultural resource management extends to the professional development of future land stewards. Over the past three years, the Wahi Kūpuna Program has supported the development of an internship program that has created numerous opportunities for emerging professionals. The program focuses on encouraging young Hawaiian students to consider archaeology as a career—thus bridging the gap between the archaeological community and the local Hawaiian community. The internship program provides training in the scientific techniques of cultural resource management and provides an indigenous perspective to this line of work.

Community Consultation Process

In Kaka‘ako on the island of O‘ahu, KS is embarking on a master-planned redevelopment of 29 city acres. The transformation of Kaka‘ako from a modest fishing village to the urban cityscape it is today has left behind a complicated subsurface history.

As implementation of the Kaka‘ako redevelopment plan began, Kamehameha embarked on a rigorous approach that involved early planning and research. With this information, KS was able to have meaningful and respectful consultation with lineal and cultural descendants, the State Historic Preservation Division, the O‘ahu Island Burial Council, and other Hawaiian organizations.

This consultation relates to the treatment of any cultural resources, including potential burials, which may exist in the subsurface deposits found within the master plan area. Dialogue with cultural stakeholders of the area also provides KS with guidance on monitoring and surveying methodology (Figure 3). The planning and consultation process has included an ethnohistoric study of Kaka‘ako, historical map geo-referencing, site visits, and ongoing updates with cultural and lineal descendants, ground penetrating radar studies, and coring.

These are a few of the many examples in which KS has taken a proactive effort toward cultural resource stewardship. A guiding principle of Kamehameha Schools’ Wahi Kūpuna Program can be summed up in a Hawaiian ʻōlelo noʻau (proverb): I Hawai‘i no nā Hawaii‘i I ka ʻāina, translated as Hawaii‘i makes us Hawaiian. Our vibrant culture is a product of our ancestral home, and our well-being relies on healthy, intact cultural landscapes and interactions with our wahi kūpuna.
ongoing tensions between archaeologists and Native Hawaiian communities have existed for decades. This conflict often revolves around issues such as improper treatment of iwi kāpuna (human remains), unethical archaeological work, lack of community involvement, and unclear, questionable, or differing agendas (Cachola-Abad and Ayau 1999). However, over the past few years, there has been a growing transformation of more Native Hawaiians becoming cultural resource managers, strengthening relationships with archaeologists, and reshaping the entire field of cultural resource management (CRM). This movement has taken a bottom-up approach, focusing on mentoring and training a new generation of Hawaiian cultural resource managers who have a strong cultural foundation, coupled with the scientific competence to be well-rounded archaeologists.

The effort to involve more Native Hawaiians in CRM is not new. In 1999, Native Hawaiian archaeologist, Dr. Kehaulani Cachola-Abad, and Native Hawaiian attorney, Halealoha Ayau, presented a paper to the Society for Hawaiian Archaeology calling for a partnership between Native Hawaiians and archaeologists. They emphasized that Native Hawaiians are not inherently opposed to the practice of archaeology; rather, archaeology can be viewed as a useful tool that allows Hawaiians to learn more about Hawai‘i’s past as well as a means to help preserve and perpetuate Hawaiian culture (Cachola-Abad and Ayau 1999).

Dr. Kawika Tengan, a Native Hawaiian anthropologist, has made a substantial effort at the University of Hawai‘i–Mānoa to engage more Native Hawaiians in the historically colonizing discipline of anthropology. His Indigenous Anthropology courses help redefine the typical roles of anthropologists as outsiders examining other cultures to a more indigenous role that supports insiders looking for insights from within their culture and communities. In addition, he has effectively used his position at the university to help decolonize the discipline by involving Native Hawaiians as active agents and producers of anthropological discourse rather than its objects (Tengan 2001).

Most recently, Dr. Kekuewa Kikilo‘i’s dissertation research on the northwest Hawaiian Islands of Nihoa and Mokumanamana exemplifies how cutting-edge archaeology and Hawaiian ethnohistory can be used hand-in-hand to help reconstruct the traditional history of these significant island communities. Kikilo‘i’s groundbreaking research focuses on the overlap between humans and their environment and explores topics such as island colonization, social organization and cultural change, subsistence strategies, and resource sustainability through both cultural and scientific perspectives.

To expand on these positive efforts, my kuleana, or responsibility, in supporting this movement has been to develop, coordinate, and manage a CRM internship program for Native Hawaiian undergraduate college students. The basis of this internship program stems from the critical need to increase the number of Native Hawaiians in CRM. This group remains sorely underrepresented in this field for a number of reasons, including the long history of misunderstanding and conflict between archaeologists and Native Hawaiian communities, the lack of culturally sensitive approaches in CRM, the absence of professional and educational mentorship programs, the dearth of available and affordable field and technical training opportunities, and the limited recognition of CRM as a viable career path.

Increased involvement of Native Hawaiians in this field can effectively reshape the way archaeology is conducted and perceived in Hawai‘i. CRM work carried out by and for the benefit of the Hawaiian community serves to help ensure the appropriate protection and preservation of traditional Hawaiian cultural sites and practices. As more Native Hawaiians become involved in CRM, this field can become a tool for the continued perpetuation of the Hawaiian culture.
Native Hawaiian Perspectives on Archaeology

Native Hawaiians can use history to reclaim wahi pana (storied places/landscapes) and reestablish traditional customary practices. Participation of Native Hawaiians in CRM also helps to shift the perceptions communities have of the field and helps them to better understand that CRM can be used as an effective mechanism to benefit and truly assist Native Hawaiian initiatives.

Consequently, it becomes extremely important to develop a critical mass of local individuals trained to participate in and eventually reform the practice of CRM in Hawai‘i. Native Hawaiian cultural resource practitioners can bridge traditional knowledge with scientific insights to help forge a culturally appropriate and scientifically grounded process to effectively ma¯lama (care for) Hawai‘i’s cultural and historic sites. Thus, the primary goal of the internship program is to increase the number of Native Hawaiians in CRM through scientific and cultural mentoring, professional development, education, and applied field experiences. To attain this goal, four objectives were identified:

1) Provide CRM technical training and job skills in the laboratory and field, enabling interns to become professionally competitive.

2) Offer interns the necessary mentors, resources, and training to succeed in their academic journeys.

3) Provide interns with the opportunity to network with cultural resource professionals and cultural practitioners to expose them to a variety of perspectives and career options.

4) Create a learning environment bridging the worldviews of science and culture, and encourage the interns to respect, appreciate, and utilize their cultural values, beliefs, and practices while conducting archaeological research.

These objectives are accomplished by guiding and supporting the interns to learn, grow, and succeed as trained professionals in archaeological, academic, community, and cultural settings. Appropriate growth and progress of the intern’s archaeological skills is accomplished through applying hands-on archaeological techniques in both the field and laboratory. Practical training in archaeological field and lab techniques is essential if interns are to become competitive and secure employment in the CRM field.

Interns are provided the opportunity to network and collaborate with different CRM practitioners to help foster their professional development and growth. By doing so, interns are exposed to different working styles and witness a variety of career paths within the profession. Interns are also introduced to cultural resource managers working at multiple agencies and at various levels of management, including grassroots/community groups, academic institutions, state agencies, federal offices, private archaeology firms, and museums. Networking opportunities showcase the variety of approaches used to manage Hawai‘i’s cultural resources and provide an opportunity for interns to identify potential future employment opportunities.

Figure 1: The 2011 cohort of Native Hawaiian CRM interns.

Figure 2: Plane table mapping training.
The rigorous academic aspects of the program include requiring interns to complete a research report focusing on their specific internship projects. Grappling with the challenging process of formulating and writing a scientific research report has proven to be an extremely beneficial academic exercise that requires the interns to conceptualize their thoughts and ideas, develop and ask appropriate research questions, understand and use accepted archaeological methodology, identify and present clear and substantiated research findings, and to reflect, examine, and process their overall internship experience.

Community development is accomplished through meaningful collaboration with the local community and cultural practitioners. Because the program involves working at significant cultural sites, efforts are made to inform the local community about our projects, answer any questions or concerns, and identify and understand the unique cultural perspectives of the kama‘aina (native residents). In addition, after fieldwork has been completed, a presentation or hō‘ike is organized, where interns have an opportunity to give back by sharing their research findings and experiences with their families and the larger community. This dissemination of knowledge is critical as it strengthens relationships with communities and empowers them with information they can use to better steward the lands they come from and care for.

Cultural appreciation, understanding, and growth are achieved by exposing the interns to the cultural aspects of being a Native Hawaiian cultural resource manager. While technical training and research remain essential components of the internship program, the cultural history, traditions, protocols, and practices associated with our waahi pana and kūpuna (ancestors, elders) are the primary foundation of the program by connecting Hawaiian students to this type of work in very meaningful and personal ways. Providing the interns with a safe and nurturing environment where they can further develop and their ancestral wisdom to understand Hawai‘i’s cultural resources and landscapes is the key to the programs success and is what makes it unique from typical archaeology field schools (Figure 3).

So far, the CRM internship program has provided a means to encourage, empower, and support Native Hawaiians to learn about, appreciate, and eventually work as trained, qualified, and professional cultural researchers and resource managers on our own lands. After three years of successful operation, the CRM internship program has helped develop twelve new Native Hawaiian cultural resource managers—all equipped with the requisite confidence, tools, and cultural foundation to make a significant and positive impact on the CRM field in Hawai‘i. Hopefully, this initial effort will continue to develop and expand in providing Native Hawaiians with the opportunity to obtain the necessary training, support, and resources to properly research, document, and maintain the rich culture, history, traditions, and resources of Hawai‘i.
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Figure 3: Conducting cultural protocols before field work begins.
The SAA Archaeological Record • March 2013

**AN ‘ĀINA-BASED APPROACH TO CULTURAL HERITAGE MANAGEMENT**

Malia Kapuaonalani Evans

Malia Evans is a community advocate and a recent graduate of the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa Applied Anthropology Masters Program

There is value in preserving history, whether it is embodied in tangible constructed landscapes, geographical features, objects, and ecological zones or expressed through the intangible elements of oral narratives, indigenous knowledge, and social practice. Decisions on whether these resources should be protected, preserved, or conserved rests with the community that values and deems them significant. Community driven, grassroots efforts by engaged citizens were a catalyst for early historic preservation efforts in the United States and have been the most successful of the preservation movements in modernity (Lea 2003).

In Hawai‘i, Native Hawaiians, individually and collectively, are engaging in pro-active, grassroots approaches to cultural heritage management. These descendant communities are reclaiming their history, re-establishing links between oral traditions and place, and managing cultural landscapes within a locally appropriate framework.

**What Is an ‘Āina-Based Approach?**

The Hawaiian word ‘āina literally means the land, the earth (Pukui and Elbert 1986). The Hawaiian cosmological epic of Wākea (Sky Father) and Papa (Earth Mother) recounts the origins of the islands of Hawai‘i and the ancestral link between the land and the people. This intimate and kin-based relationship is the foundation for Native Hawaiian well-being and recognizes the culturally defined rights and stewardship obligations inherent in this relationship.

The term ‘āina-based is comparable to the term grassroots yet incorporates the mindset that the land and natural environment are not separate from cultural heritage but co-exist as equal components in a holistic, locally managed system. This blending of contemporary and traditional management wisdom finds its roots in a uniquely Hawaiian system of management known as the ahupua‘a system.

An ahupua‘a is a division of land that usually extends from the uplands into the sea and contains the resources needed to sustain life. In traditional times, active conservation was practiced and a balance between protecting natural and cultural resources and keeping pace with the needs of the population maintained. Paramount chief Mā‘ilikūkahi of the Mo‘i‘kea lineage initiated this unique system of resource and social management on O‘ahu during the fourteenth century (Beckwith 1976; Fornander 1969). The system continues to provide a foundation for contemporary, local management of natural and cultural resources in Hawai‘i.

**An ‘Āina-Based Approach in the Ahupua‘a of Waikāne**

The ahupua‘a of Waikāne extends from the crest of the 700-meter Ko‘olaupoko Mountain Range into the tranquil waters of Kāne‘ohe Bay on the windward side of O‘ahu. Waikāne is one of eleven ahupua‘a within the larger land division of Ko‘olaupoko. Oral narratives of Waikāne include accounts of Kāne, the procreator god, plunging his digging stick into the ‘āina in search of fresh water. The adjoining ahupua‘a of Hakipu‘u and Kualoa are significant for their association with long-distance Polynesian voyaging traditions and renowned voyaging chiefs. Within this richly evocative context of oral traditions, events, and people are places where Native Hawaiians are engaged in cultural heritage management.

Keoni Fox inherited an undeveloped land parcel in Waikāne from his great-grandparents. In addition to inheriting a title to the ‘āina, Keoni inherited a responsibility to care for the heiau on the mauka side of his family parcel (Figure 1). The heiau, known as Kukuiulani, commands a panoramic view of the coastline and barrier reefs of Kāne‘ohe Bay (Figure 2).

Archaeologist and ethnologist J. Gilbert McAllister (1933) conducted the first archaeological survey and mapping of the site. He documented Kukuiulani and numerous cultural landscapes across O‘ahu between 1929–1931. McAllister
described the *heiau* as a small, two-terraced structure with stone and earth paving. Archaeological reconnaissance surveys for the Hawai’i State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD) in 1974 and a proposed golf course development in 1988 recorded the condition of the *heiau* and its associated features (Rosendahl 1988).

In 2002, while surveying the ʻāina prior to constructing his home, Fox noticed construction debris dumped onto the structure and bulldozer damage to the lower terrace. Fox contacted numerous government agencies, including SHPD and the Honolulu Department of Planning and Permitting (DPP) to seek city and state protection for the *heiau*, located on city land acquired from a private developer in 1998.

During the ensuing 10 years, Fox negotiated through layers of bureaucratic jurisdiction and regulations and created preservation and safety plans for the *heiau*. Collaborations with the Waikāne community, the Honolulu Department of Parks and Recreation’s Adopt-A-Park program and the Ko‘olaupoko Hawaiian Civic Club have resulted in community access and re-connection with Kukuianiani. Five truck-loads of construction debris have been removed and the natural environment and watershed are being restored.

Fox and collaborating organizations are acutely aware that the integrity of the natural environment affects the cultural landscape and social well-being of the community. Non-native species are systematically eradicated as roots dislodge the *heiau* walls and canopy trees block sunlight, preventing native ferns and moss from growing. The native understory is crucial in collecting and retaining the abundant rainfall in the area and preventing soil erosion and siltation of the aquatic resources in Kāne‘ohe Bay.
Partnerships Vital in Caring for the ‘Aina

A principal partner in supporting community education, cultural access, and site clean-up efforts at Kukuianiani is the Ko’olaupoko Hawaiian Civic Club. Founded in 1937, the organization is dedicated to the perpetuation and preservation of Native Hawaiian history, culture, and heritage (Ko’olaupoko Hawaiian Civic Club 2012). Organization members engage in community outreach, political advocacy, and cultural education and are often consulted when government or private projects seek knowledgeable citizens connected to the pulse of the Native Hawaiian community. The club has partnered with individuals and community organizations in stewarding several heiau, restoring wetland taro fields, and working toward establishing a cultural preserve in Ha’iku Valley (Figure 3). The Native Hawaiian community recognized the clubs accomplishments in 2011, when chosen as the most outstanding Hawaiian Civic Club from 60 clubs nationwide.

Individually and collectively, Native Hawaiians are initiating strategies to manage their cultural heritage from a holistic, cultural foundation that is rooted in the relationship with and responsibility to the ‘āina they live in. It is within these intersections of cultural and natural resources, traditional and contemporary knowledge, and past and present that Native Hawaiians are constructing a framework to protect, preserve, and manage what they value in their communities.
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Hawai‘i imports more than 85 percent of all its food into the State, and 98 percent of this arrives by ship. The importance of state harbors to this less-than-sustainable reality is undeniable, and the need to improve and expand harbors is inevitable under such practices. So when Don Pakele read through the Hawai‘i Island Commercial Harbors 2035 Master Plan, and noted the proposed construction of a pier at Baker’s Beach along the Hilo coastline where a documented heiau (religious site) stood, he sprang to action (Figure 1; SSFM 2011). He feared the cultural site would be destroyed if the community was not made aware of these development plans. This article describes the community project that developed out of this concern.

Uncle Don’s worries were well-founded, as the previous Master Plan’s EIS suggested constraining harbor development would cause the combined loss of $11.7 billion for the two Hawai‘i Island harbors (R.M. Towill Corp. 2001). Seemingly to ensure that cultural sites would not contribute to such constraints, the significance of the heiau was steadily reduced in the final EIS. The first description of existing conditions in the project area noted: “the only traditional Hawaiian sites identified by the studies are a heiau next to the West Project Area” (R.M. Towill Corp. 2001:4-8). Three paragraphs later, the heiau is downgraded to a “possible heiau near the West Project Area” (R.M. Towill Corp. 2001:4-11), and one page after that, it is an “unconfirmed heiau site” (R.M. Towill Corp. 2001:4-12). Finally, this sacred site is essentially dismissed when it’s called an “unconfirmed ‘heiau’ located near the project site” (R.M. Towill Corp. 2001:4-15). In a matter of eight pages, this heiau has gone from a documented sacred site, noted on TMKs as early as 1932, to an unconfirmed site—requiring quotation marks.

Armed with an understanding of government agencies and processes from decades of government employment, and a deep concern for Hawaiian cultural sites, Uncle Don set about raising community and government awareness about the impact to this site. Sadly, the heiau is threatened by the construction of a pier slated to serve cruise ships, bringing tourists to Hilo—tourists who would likely enjoy learning about the kind of site endangered by the pier’s construction. Beyond its obvious sacred nature, he recognized the significance of the site as the last known heiau existing in the town of Hilo. To our knowledge, all other heiau in Hilo town have been destroyed over the centuries, so protecting it is that much more important.

**Community Work**

Community-based archaeology begins with a mindset that situates archaeologists among communities composed of descendants and other stakeholders who value heritage management. We should be happy to relinquish the notion that archaeologists are the primary caretakers of the past, finding strength in sharing this responsibility with a larger community. Establishing relationships with local and descendant communities ensures they not only benefit from archaeological work, but serve as partners in projects as well. Identifying projects that local communities, archaeologists, and other stakeholders find mutually interesting and important is key. The proposed development and impact to the Baker’s Beach heiau, whose Hawaiian name has eluded our group, has proven to be such a project.

Taking the lead on this community-driven project, Uncle Don brought together a group of individuals from local Native Hawaiian communities, as well as three archaeologists. This group initially included Kīhei Seto and Kīhei Nahale-a, Kanaka Maoli (Native Hawaiian) community advocates; Theresa Donham, the Archaeology Branch Chief of the State Historic Preservation Division (formerly the Hawai‘i Island lead archaeologist); and Sean Nāleimaile and myself, both Kanaka Maoli archaeologists. Collectively, our goal is to protect this heiau and spare it from the fate of every other known heiau in the Hilo area. The group seeks to do...
this by clearing the overgrown site and bringing public awareness to the *heiau* largely through partnerships with educational institutions.

Each member has brought their own set of experiences and skills to the group, beginning with Uncle Don, who spearheaded the government permit process. He engaged a dizzying array of State and County agencies, including the State Historic Preservation Division, Land Division, Harbors Division, and the County of Hawai‘i Planning Department. Theresa Donham, the State Archaeologist, also helped in this capacity. It took 11 months to secure all the necessary permits to access the *heiau* before we could begin the process of clearing it. After we secured the permits, we also sought surveyors who could establish the boundaries between State land and residential leases; here Sean Nāleimāile helped.

With permits in hand, and a number of stakeholders invested in the project, we gathered at the *heiau* in April 2012 to get to work. Our efforts that day began and ended with cultural protocols: introducing ourselves to ancestors tied to the land and ensuring that they remain there at the end of the day.

The group was advised in protocols by Kīhei Seto and Kīhei Nahale-a, as well as Kaliko Beamer-Trapp, who performed the morning prayers, and Halena Kapuni-Reynolds and Kāhealani Walker who did closing protocols.

Our group that day included residents living in the surrounding neighborhood, members of the local Native Hawaiian community, and University of Hawai‘i at Hilo students and staff. With a bevy of hand tools, we carefully cleared a section of the *heiau* (Figures 2 and 3). While we only made a dent in our larger project, it was obvious that we had had a successful event because the smiles at the end of the long work day were just as big as when we had started (Figure 4). Since then, our group has held smaller work days, but has expanded to include more community members, such as Uncle John Kanui, from the Hawaiian Homeland community of Keaukaha down the road, and Kerry Okinishi, a fisherman who fishes the waters around Baker’s Beach.

For my part, I have used my position at the University to guide students toward a more engaged archaeology, one which has relevance for local communities and one which has significance beyond an accumulation of knowledge. I am fortunate to have secured an academic position in my hometown, in a department invested in community work, so that my efforts can directly impact the Native Hawaiian and local communities that nurtured me.

My connections at the University have also put me in touch with experts in other disciplines, such as the researchers with the Spatial Data Analysis and Visualization Lab
(SDAVL). The Baker’s Beach heiau group is currently working with SDAVL on a digital archiving project that will create a publicly available 3-D photorealistic model and interactive 3-D tour of the heiau. This project simultaneously allows our group to raise awareness about this significant cultural site by providing virtual access, while protecting it from the potential negative impact of having large numbers of the public physically visit the site. We plan to incorporate video clips on the tour, including discussions by Uncle Don who has done much archival research on the heiau, as well as oral histories from individuals who previously lived by the heiau and learned about it from older relatives.

The sacred nature of the site does not lend itself to excavation, which the community has not expressed a desire for, and planned archaeological work currently calls for more archival research, continued interviews with knowledgeable community member, surveying of the surrounding areas, and mapping of the site. The heiau has never been mapped in detail, and this is an activity in which students can contribute to the process. This is where the project stands, and we do plan to organize a regular work schedule so that the heiau can be cleared and cared for by community members and the next generation. We do hope this small project can serve as a model for other communities that may also seek to care for cultural sites in their own areas, and we have begun this process by recording the steps needed to secure government permits to do this kind of work. An 11-month process is more than most grassroots groups can endure, and if we can clarify that process, thus making it easier for the next group, we will have made a small contribution beyond our initial motivation of protecting this heiau.
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David Alan Breternitz was born on November 12, 1929 in Freemont, Nebraska. He passed away in Cortez, Colorado, on March 5, 2012 at the age of 82.

Dave grew up in Nebraska, LaJunta, and Denver, Colorado. He was an active Boy Scout and a member of the Koshare Troop in LaJunta, attaining the rank of Eagle Scout. Dave graduated from South High School in Denver in 1948. He received his BA in Anthropology from the University of Denver in 1952, where he was a member of the University Soccer team.

Breternitz and Barbara Myers were married in Denver on December 26, 1952. He served as a Second Lieutenant in the Army in Korea in 1953-1954. Dave attended the University of Arizona Point of Pines Archaeological Field School for two summers in 1952 and 1954, where he obtained material for his Master’s Degree, awarded by the University of Arizona in 1955. His Master’s Thesis was published as the first *Anthropology Papers of the University of Arizona*.

Dave’s first full-time job in the field was as Curator of Anthropology at the Museum of Northern Arizona in Flagstaff. During this period, he excavated and reported on important archaeological sites in the Flagstaff and Verde Valley areas of Northern Arizona. He briefly worked as an archaeologist for the Arizona State Museum on excavation in advance of the construction of I-40 across Northern Arizona, and also as the Laboratory Director for the Joint Casas Grandes Expedition in Northern Chihuahua, Mexico, before completing his Ph.D. at the University of Arizona. His doctoral dissertation was a ground breaking association of prehistoric southwest pottery types with associated tree-ring dates. The published version of his dissertation is Number 10 in the *Anthropology Papers of the University of Arizona* and continues to be widely cited after 50 years.

Dave moved his family to Boulder, Colorado, in 1962 and began a successful academic career as a professor in the Department of Anthropology at the University of Colorado. While at CU, Dave mentored hundreds of undergraduate and graduate students, many of whom went on to have successful careers of their own in the profession. While at CU Dave, conducted archaeological research at Dinosaur National Monument (1963–1965); worked on the plains of Eastern Colorado and North and West Africa (1967–1968 and 1972); and ran the University of Colorado Mesa Verde Research Center (1966–1978). In 1967–1968, Dave moved his family to Tunisia in North Africa and then Nigeria in West Africa to work on the Kanji Rescue Archaeology Project and returned in the fall of 1972 to complete the project. This gave the Breternitz family the unique opportunity to live and work in these countries and to travel the world as a family.

Dave’s work at Mesa Verde for 13 summers with the CU Field School included both undergraduate and graduate students and was a fertile ground for many of the now prominent academic, federal, and contract archaeologists and anthropologists. His work in southwestern Colorado, based out of Mesa Verde, included a complete inventory of Mesa Verde National Park, excavations in Wetherill and Chapin Mesas, Morefield Canyon, and at Mummy Lake, BLM lands in southwestern Colorado, and work at Chimney Rock, Lion and Johnson Canyons, and at Mancos Canyon during the development of the Ute Mountain Ute Tribal Park.

In 1978, the University of Colorado was awarded the Dolores Archaeological Project (DAP) and at that time was the largest project in the country. Dave moved from Boulder to Dove Creek, Colorado, to serve as the Principal Investigator for the DAP for the next eight years. Upon completion of the DAP, Dave retired from CU in 1986 and remained in Dove Creek. During his retirement years, Dave worked on projects across the Southwest run by former students. He loved being in the field and sharing his knowledge of archaeology.

Dave’s son Cory and his daughter Susan followed him in the profession and worked with him at Mesa Verde and on the DAP. Dave, along with Barbara, was an avid supporter of Dove Creek and a full-time Dove Creek Bulldog Booster, attending as many high school sporting events as possible. Their youngest daughter Nancy graduated from Dove Creek High School in 1984. Dave and Barbara were Grand Marshalls of the annual Pick and Hoe Parade in Dove Creek in 1992. Dave enjoyed travel, and he and Barbara made many trips to the British Isles, establishing life-long friendships with people in England, Ireland, and Scotland. Dave And Barbara took each of their grandchildren, with them on trips to the British Isles upon their graduation from high school.

Dave will be remembered for his irreverent wit and sharp intellect and as a loving husband, father, grandfather, friend, colleague, and mentor to the many generations of archaeologists he influenced. He is survived by Barbara, his wife of 59 years; his son Cory (Adrian); his daughters Susan (Doug) Goulding and Nancy Steele; and seven surviving grandchildren.
DYLAN BLAIR BRETERNITZ
1990–2011

Dylan Blair Breternitz was born on July 2, 1990 in Phoenix Arizona. He was 21 years old when he died on Christmas morning in 2011 from unsustainable injuries at his home in Taos, New Mexico.

Dylan was the only son of Cory Breternitz and Adrian White and brother to Jessie Breternitz. He grew up in the Willo Historic Neighborhood in central Phoenix and attended Kenilworth Elementary School, Villa Montessori, and North High School. He was a competitive swimmer from the age of 5 and was on the City of Phoenix, Arizona State University Swim Club, and North High School swim teams. From the age of 15, Dylan worked on archaeological projects for Soil Systems, Inc. and PaleoWest Archaeology in the American Southwest as his father, mother, and grandfather had done for decades. His love and passions were black-and-white landscape photography and people. He loved the outdoors and exploring the back country.

He worked two summers in Peru on the PANC project for the Chicago Field Museum of Natural History and served as the project photographer in 2008 after graduating from high school. He had a natural ability for understanding and interacting with people of all ages, cultures, and walks of life. Dylan had a total acceptance and tolerance of people different from himself. He loved his friends and family and was loved in return. We have lost a very special person from our lives.
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Artifact Casting
Northeast Archaeology Research Center, Inc.
Farmington • Maine • USA

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

Call us or email today to learn more at 207-860-4032
nearc@nearchaeology.com
www.nearchaeology.com
POSITIONS OPEN

POST-DOCTORAL FELLOWSHIPS IN THE PROGRAM IN EARLY CULTURES BROWN UNIVERSITY, PROVIDENCE, RI

The Program in Early Cultures at Brown University (PEC) invites applications for a post-doctoral fellow to participate in a Mellon-Sawyer Seminar, “Animal Magnetism: The Emotional Ecology of Animals and Humans.” This will be a one-year position, beginning on July 1, 2013. Funded by the Mellon Foundation, this Sawyer Seminar addresses the emotional, symbolic, and social dimensions of past human relations with animals. Three themes inform the year-long program—animals as symbolic resources for the human imagination, the emotional bond between humans and animals, and the nature of such bonds as both extensions and complications of human society. The applicant’s specific research and teaching interests, geographical and temporal specializations and areas of expertise are left open, although these should focus on pre-modern cultures in the Old or New Worlds. The successful candidate will teach two courses—one each term—on topics related to the Sawyer Seminar. The fellow will also help coordinate the activities of the Seminar during the academic year. In their applications, candidates should submit a proposal describing research to be done over the course of the fellowship. Applicants must have received their Ph.D. within the last five years, from an institution other than Brown. Candidates should submit a letter of application, a list and brief description of proposed courses, and curriculum vitae by April 1, 2013. Applicants should arrange for three letters of reference to be submitted by the application deadline. Applications received by that date will receive full consideration, but the search will remain open until the position is closed or filled. Application materials must be submitted online at https://secure.interfolio.com/apply/21243.

NEWS & NOTES

A conference focusing on the colonization of the Americas during the last Ice Age will be held on October 17 to 19, 2013 at Santa Fe, New Mexico. The Paleoamerican Odyssey Conference will feature lectures, artifact collections, and a banquet. The Center for the Study of First Americans of the Texas A&M University is organizing the event, designed to have something of interest for everyone—the archaeologist, avocational archaeologist, student, and anyone interested in archaeology. More information on the conference and its activities is available at www.paleoamericanodyssey.com.

Sponsored by the Kansas State University, the 35th Annual Flint Hills Archaeological Conference will be held at Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas, on March 22 to 23, 2013. Abstracts must be submitted by March 1, 2013, to Donna C. Roper (drroper@ksu.edu). The event’s contact person is Lauren W. Ritterbush (lritterb@ksu.edu), Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Social Work, 204 Waters Hall, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS 66506. Conference details and updates, are available at http://www.flinthillsarchconf.info/.

CALENDAR

APRIL 3–7

MAY 15–19
Canadian Archaeological Association Annual Meeting. Whistler, British Columbia. Contact: Eldon Yellowhorn ecy@sfu.edu.

MAY 26–31
International Rock Art Congress will be held at the Marriott Pyramid North Hotel, Albuquerque, New Mexico, USA. Hosted by American Rock Art Research Association (ARARA). Registration and more information: http://www.ifrao2013.org. Contacts: Conference Co-Chair: Donna Gillette rockart@ix.netcom.com, 805-343-2575; Conference Co-Chair: Peggy Whitehead whw-pjw@att.net, 303-426-7672. ARARA website www.arara.org.

NOVEMBER 20–24
The 112th AAA Annual Meeting will be held at the Chicago Hilton in Chicago, IL. The 2013 meeting theme is Future Publics, Current Engagements (http://aaa-net.org/meetings).
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