FROM SAA’S BOOK PROGRAM...

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


*History Beneath the Sea: Nautical Archaeology in the Classroom.* Edited by K.C. Smith and Amy Douglass. History Beneath the Sea provides background readings and classroom activities for secondary-level educators who wish to teach history, social studies, and science through the exciting medium of underwater archaeology. ISBN: 0-932839-17-7. Publication date: April 2001. Regular Price: $5.95, SAA Member Discount Price: $4.95.

*Archaeological Research and Heritage Preservation in the Americas.* Edited by Robert D. Drennan and Santiago Mora. The contributors to the volume discuss experiences of archaeological research and heritage preservation under widely varied conditions in locations throughout the Americas from Argentina to Canada. Regular Price: $21.95, SAA Member Discount Price: $17.95.


SEE INSIDE BACK COVER FOR ORDERING INFORMATION
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The tragedy of September 11th left many of us wanting to in some way assist with the recovery and relief efforts in New York, Washington D.C., and Pennsylvania. It is therefore gratifying to know that SAA, inspired by archaeologist Sophia Perdikaris’s (Brooklyn College, NYC) offer of assistance to the FBI, is helping to organize an effort to provide archaeological labor and equipment for sorting through the debris from the World Trade Center. SAA currently has heard from over 500 people who are interested in assisting with the recovery efforts.

On a different note altogether, readers will notice that many changes mark the transition from the SAA Bulletin to The SAA Archaeological Record. One of the most visible additions is that the magazine is now printed in full color, which provides authors the opportunity to include full-color figures with their articles, including photographs, computer images, and charts and graphs. We encourage all potential authors to submit color imagery with their contributions. We are also always looking for compelling cover images. Many members have sent in wonderful photographs, but the selection that we now have available is dominated by imagery of the archaeology of western North America. Readers from Latin American countries, Canada, and the eastern United States are highly encouraged to contribute their favorite archaeology photo!

Another transition that recently has been completed is the movement of all online material to SAAweb. This includes all of the back issues of both the SAA Bulletin and The SAA Archaeological Record. Former editor Mark Aldenderfer and the University of California at Santa Barbara had graciously hosted the online version of the SAA Bulletin for several years; these back issues are now available at http://www.saa.org/Publications/thesaaarchrec/index.html, with current issues available in the members section of SAAweb.

As The SAA Archaeological Record evolves, readers will notice the addition of new features. One of the first will be the dedication of occasional issues to particular themes of interest to the discipline. I’m very excited about the upcoming March issue, which will focus on Public Outreach in Archaeology. Interest in contributing has been overwhelming, and I’d therefore like to start planning the next thematic issue for September 2002, dedicating it to the topic of Gender and Minority Equity in Archaeology. If you are interested in contributing to the second thematic issue, please contact me.

As a final note, I would like to introduce my editorial assistant, Ron Hobgood. Ron is a graduate student here at Georgia State University, and he assists me in all aspects of producing this magazine. If for some reason I cannot be contacted, feel free to email Ron at liuliangduo@yahoo.com.
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

The SAA Committee on Native American Relations would like to respond to the letter by G.A. Clark published in the March 2001 edition of The SAA Archaeological Record (1[2]:3). We respect First Amendment rights of free speech in the United States and Dr. Clark’s prerogative to express his personal views. At the same time, we hope the actions of the SAA demonstrate to Native Americans that Dr. Clark expresses a minority opinion in our profession and does not articulate the official position of our professional society.

For this reason, rather than respond to the myriad factual errors and anthropologically naive statements of Dr. Clark, we note that in 1989 the SAA helped form a coalition of scientific organizations and Native American groups to support the enactment of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA). Since then, the SAA has closely monitored the implementation of NAGPRA and consistently provided advice on the regulations promulgated to enforce the law (see Statement of Keith Kintigh, SAA President, at the Oversight Hearing: Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, July 25, 2000, posted on SAAweb at http://www.saa.org/Government/natamegraves.pdf). The SAA seeks a fair balance between the scientific interests of archaeologists and the human rights of Native Americans.

The official policy of the SAA concerning the treatment of human remains is that “The Society for American Archaeology recognizes both scientific and traditional interests in human remains.” The SAA favors a case-by-case resolution of repatriation claims that is based on “close and effective communication between scholars engaged in the study of human remains and the communities that may have biological or cultural affinities to those remains.” This policy has been in effect since it was approved by the SAA Executive Committee in May of 1986. Since then, hundreds of archaeologists have worked with Native Americans in an atmosphere of mutual respect to address legitimate concerns about the treatment of their ancestors.

We think that Dr. Clark’s tirade about repatriation is misplaced and wrong, and we encourage all professional archaeologists to adhere to the SAA Policy Statement Concerning the Treatment of Human Remains. The future success of archaeology in the United States and elsewhere in the world will be based on fair and equitable participation of indigenous peoples in scientific research, including treating human remains with respect and dignity.

Committee on Native American Relations

Kurt E. Dongoske, Chair
Melissa Baird
Kenneth H. Carleton
T. J. Ferguson
Ruth E. Lambert
Dorothy T. Lippert
Alan May
Robert A. Sattler
Cameron B. Wesson
J. Michelle Schohn

This letter is with reference to John Hoopes’s “An Embarrassment of Riches: Sitio Conte Online,” published in the May 2001 The SAA Archaeological Record (1[3]:30–33)

One should not object to the observation that archaeologists who worked more than half a century ago were not in compliance with today’s idealized (if not always realized) standards of fieldwork. It is another matter entirely, however, when respected archaeologists of that era are flippantly presented as the prototypes of that modern caricature of archaeological disreputability, Indiana Jones. Although Hoopes names both J. Alden Mason and Samuel Lothrop, most of his insinuations of impropriety involve the former.

I think it is important to object that either of these fine gentlemen and scholars should be so unfairly represented. J. Alden Mason, whom I knew as friend and mentor (incidentally, we were not related), was a major figure in Americanist anthropology over much of the first two-thirds of the last century. For readers of Hoopes’s article who, like all too many contemporary archaeologists, know little of their discipline’s history and might be inclined to blithely accept his distorting characterization, I would point out that Mason did original and valuable fieldwork in Sub-Arctic ethnography, Southwestern folklore, and North and South American Indian languages, in addition to archaeology in North as well as Latin America. He was a fine and honest man who strove to do the best by the lights of his time. And even by those lights, inferior of course to our own, he was, along with Lothrop, the very opposite of what Hoopes suggests.

Ronald J. Mason
Department of Anthropology
Lawrence University

Associate Editor’s Response

It was never my intention to impugn the reputations of either Samuel Lothrop or J. Alden Mason, both of whom were giants of their time. Mason was a stellar archaeologist of the first magnitude whose scholarly contributions were exceeded only by his lifelong record of service to the profession. His many accomplishments are described (together with a bibliography that
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DENVER 2002

With more than 1,700 submissions, the 67th Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology promises to be a sure success. Please join your colleagues at the Adam’s Mark Denver Hotel, 1550 Court Place, Denver, CO. At this writing, all types of rooms are available—SAA rate and student- and government-rate rooms. Remember that student- and government-rate rooms are limited and are available on a first-come, first-served basis (as well as require a student or government ID). To reserve your room, please contact the Adam’s Mark Denver hotel directly at (303) 893-3333 and ask for reservations or call the Adam’s Mark Central Reservations line at (800) 444-2326. Please be sure to mention that you are attending the “SAA” or “Society for American Archaeology” meeting.

JANUARY 18, 2002

If you register for a room by January 18, 2002 at the Adam’s Mark Denver Hotel, your name will be entered into a drawing for a one-year membership in SAA. For reservations, see the telephone number above.

ONLINE SUBMISSIONS RISING IN POPULARITY

For the 2002 Denver meeting, 90% of the individual submissions were submitted online via the Web. About 55% of all of the symposia and forums were submitted via the Web. This was the second year that this online submissions option was available. As always, we welcome your feedback. Please drop us an email to the attention of Lana Leon, manager, Information Services (lana_leon@saa.org). We’d like to hear from you!

GETTING TO DENVER

United Airlines has been selected as the official airline for SAA’s 67th Annual Meeting. Special discounts are available: 10% off unrestricted coach or 5% off lowest applicable fare. Plus take an additional 5% off if you purchase your tickets at least 60 days prior to departure!

Call United at (800) 521-4041 for reservations. Please refer to Meeting ID #557XE to access SAA’s special discounts.

NEED A RENTAL CAR IN DENVER?

Hertz has been designated as the official car rental company for the 67th Annual Meeting in Denver. Reservations may be placed through the Hertz Meeting Sales Desk at (800) 654-2240. When booking reservations through this toll free number, please reference the Meeting Number CV#022Q0527 or identify yourself as attending the Society for American Archaeology meeting.

STAFF TRANSITIONS

On October 29, 2001, Stuart Binstock joined the SAA staff as manager, Government Affairs. Stuart has broad-based government affairs experience, including having been the Vice President, Federal Affairs for the American Institute of Architects; Director, Federal Regulatory Affairs for the American Institute of Architect; and Director, Government Relations for the American Association of Port Authorities. His undergraduate degree from Cornell is coupled with a law degree from the Catholic University of America. Please feel free to contact him with regard to all government affairs matters (stuart_binstock@saa.org). We are delighted to welcome him to the SAA staff team.

COMING SOON FROM SAA’S BOOK PROGRAM

Delivering Archaeological Information Electronically

EDITED BY MARY S. CARROLL
Although cosmopolitan in many ways, Denver is still a "cow town," so break out your cowboy hat and boots and visit the old West! Our meeting hotel, the Adam's Mark, is the largest in Colorado and is located in the heart of old Denver. From Larimer Square to "LoDo" (lower downtown), historic buildings abound. Take a walk; enjoy the stately nineteenth-century brick architecture. Stop and see the ornate Brown Palace Hotel. Visit one of our many museums. Find an outdoor café and savor Colorado's blue skies. Watch the street artists perform. Or just sit in the Adam's Mark and look out at the bustle of the 16th Street Mall through soaring windows. The Colorado archaeological community is eager to welcome you to the first SAA meeting in Denver in 17 years. We're glad you are coming—it's been a long time!!

In keeping with our location, the meeting will open with a session that focuses on Western history and prehistory: "Integrating Multiple Histories of Western Pasts" (organized by Dean Saitta [U. of Denver] and sponsored by the Program Committee). An all-star line-up of speakers will address topics as diverse as Kennewick Man, the Sand Island massacre, and Puebloan ethnogenesis using multiple lines of evidence—oral, documentary, and archaeological. This promises to be one of the best opening sessions yet, so be sure to come early! The following four days will be busy with as many as 18 concurrent sessions on a wide range of topics.

As I write, the deadline for submissions has just passed and scheduling of the 2002 Annual Meeting is about to begin. I have been working closely with the wonderful staff at the SAA Headquarters office and with a great Program Committee. Members include David Anderson (NPS Southeast Archaeological Center), Douglas Bamforth (University of Colorado), Brenda Bowser (Washington State University), Carol Gleichman (Advisory Council on Historic Preservation), Art Joyce (University of Colorado), Steve Lekson (University of Colorado), Naomi Miller (University of Pennsylvania Museum), Peter McKenna (Bureau of Indian Affairs), Payson Sheets (University of Colorado), Dean Saitta (University of Denver), Miriam Stark (University of Hawaii), Mary Van Buren (Colorado State University), and Joe Watkins (Bureau of Indian Affairs Anadarko Agency). In Boulder, Curtis Nepstad-Thornberry is providing outstanding assistance with program development.

The Program Committee began laying the groundwork for the 2002 meeting in early summer. The annual Roundtable Luncheon has become a popular feature of our meeting—a place to discuss the hottest topics in an intimate setting and to network with well-known experts. This year, the Program Committee developed a diverse and compelling set of themes and has invited leading authorities to serve as table hosts. The Program Committee has also been concerned with subsidizing these events. As you may know, we ask departments and companies for donations in order to keep luncheon prices below $10. Program Committee members drew up a list of potential donors and you may find a letter from us in your mailbox. If you do, please urge your department chair or company president to make a donation to this important SAA event!

We'll look forward to seeing you in March—this is a meeting not to be missed!!
Contrary to popular opinion, Denver (a.k.a. “The Mile High City”) is not located in the mountains. Rather, it is located on the High Plains at the eastern base of the Rocky Mountains, hence its other nickname, the “Queen City of the Plains.” This location is in the rain and snow shadow of the mountains, resulting in an arid and relatively mild climate in the winter and spring, except for the occasional arctic blast from Canada. Denver receives more than 300 days of sunshine a year. Despite the relative lack of snow in Denver itself, numerous ski areas are close at hand in the mountains. These regional attractions will be the subject of an article in the January issue; this article concentrates on Denver itself. Additional information on any of the attractions discussed here, or on Denver in general, can be found on the Denver Metro Visitors Bureau Web page (http://www.denver.org).

Because the meetings will begin with a plenary session on historical archaeology in the West, titled “Integrating Multiple Histories of Western Pasts,” a brief history of Denver seems in order. At the time of the first Euro-American encroachment into the Denver Basin, the area was inhabited by Cheyenne and Arapaho horse nomads. All this changed in 1859 when gold was discovered in the area. However, the gold deposits in Denver were relatively limited, and Denver soon shifted from a mining camp to a provisioning center for mining conducted in the adjacent mountains. Denver was named after the Kansas Territorial Governor James W. Denver; city founder William Larimer proposed the name in hopes of winning the governor’s favor in a claim-jumping case in which he was involved. While Governor Denver resigned before the case reached his office, the name of the city stuck.

More about the history and prehistory of Denver and the West in general is available at several museums within walking distance of the conference hotel. The Colorado History Museum, at the corner of Broadway and 13th Avenue just south of the Adam’s Mark hotel, has extensive displays on the history and prehistory of the state. Nearby, the Denver Art Museum (100 W 14th Avenue) has extensive collections of Native American artifacts and contemporary art from Latin America, the Plains, and the American Southwest and Northwest. The Black American West Museum and Heritage Center is a little farther away at 3091 California Street, but can be reached by using the light rail from the 16th Street Mall (the museum is across the street from the last stop on the line). This museum is well worth the trip for the excellent exhibits on the role of African Americans in the settling of the west and the terrific book selection in the gift shop. Finally, the Molly Brown House Museum at 1340 Pennsylvania Street (three blocks east of 16th Street) is a good example of upper middle-class homes in Denver at the turn of the nineteenth century.

For those interested in the nightlife of Denver, the Adam’s Mark is well situated to take in a variety of sights, sounds, and tastes. The Adam’s Mark itself is located on the 16th Street Pedestrian Mall. The only traffic allowed on 16th Street are free shuttle buses operated by the city. Otherwise, the area is open to pedestrians and is filled with outdoor cafes, street vendors, and a host of shops and restaurants in a mixture of new and historic buildings. The north end of the mall ends in Lower Downtown (also known as “LoDo”). Aside from Coors Stadium (where the Colorado Rockies play), LoDo is known for its numerous night spots, restaurants, and shops. One of the more popular restaurant types in the area are the numerous brew pubs. Colorado, in fact, is one of the leading beer producers in the United States, due in part to a large number of micro-breweries. There is, of course, a large brewery in the metropolitan area as well, and for those who would like to drive to Golden, the Coors brewery gives tours that include tastings.
Dear SAA members:

As you know, the 2002 Annual Meeting will be held in the Adam’s Mark Hotel in Denver. Some of you may also know that the Adam’s Mark hotel in Daytona Beach, Florida has had a suit brought against it by the state of Florida, and that several Adam’s Mark hotels around the country, including the Denver property, have been picketed by the NAACP. The lawsuit alleges that actions taken by the Daytona Beach hotel in Florida against members of a black college reunion were discriminatory. A class-action lawsuit was filed in 1999, and was settled out of court for several million dollars. But a later court threw out the settlement, arguing it was not a class-action suit. Florida then brought suit against the Adam’s Mark. That case will be heard in November. The Adam’s Mark has issued an apology, but the NAACP has requested an admission of guilt.

Some members have brought this issue to the SAA’s attention, wondering why the SAA would patronize a hotel chain that allegedly indulged in discriminatory activities. I am writing to let you know that the SAA Board is aware of and deeply disturbed by the situation. We need first to see the outcome of the trial before we decide if and how we respond. We have no evidence that the Denver hotel has been discriminatory.

One way that we cannot respond is to change the venue of the 2002 meeting. SAA contracts with hotels for the annual meeting at least five years in advance. We signed a contract with the Adam’s Mark in 1997—two years before the lawsuit was filed. To pull out of Denver now means that we would have to pay the hotel to compensate them for the lost business—we are contractually obliged to do this, and pulling out for moral or ethical reasons is not sufficient to break the contract. Our insurance will also not cover such losses. In addition, it is far too late to arrange another venue, so there would be no 2002 meeting, meaning that SAA would lose the revenue that it expects from the meeting. Put that loss together with what we would owe the Adam’s Mark were we to pull out, and the SAA would lose about $1,000,000—and that would destroy the SAA financially.

After the trial’s outcome, the SAA Board will decide what, if anything, the Society wishes to do. We have already had extensive discussions with the Denver Adam’s Mark Hotel. It would be premature to discuss possible actions here, but we will keep the Society apprised of the situation. Assuming that the trial finishes in time, further information will appear in the January issue of The SAA Archaeological Record. I wanted to make sure that the membership was aware of this issue and aware that the SAA Board has been and will continue to watch the case carefully.

Bob Kelly

President
What’s new with the SAA’s Public Education Committee (PEC)? The short answer is . . . “a lot!” The long answer is that the PEC has redesigned itself to address new goals and challenges in our outreach efforts. Since its formation in 1990, we have been the advocate for public outreach and education within the society. Our mission remains the same: The Public Education Committee seeks to promote awareness about and concern for the study of past cultures, and to engage people in the preservation and protection of heritage resources. Committee projects aim to aid educators, interpreters, archaeologists, and others about the value of archaeological research and resources. But we have some new ideas and projects to share with all SAA members.

The PEC met for two days prior to the annual meeting in New Orleans. Our retreat at Bayou Segnette State Park, on the outskirts of New Orleans, served to renew our strategic plan and to develop new initiatives for the committee. The retreat was organized by then-PEC chair Shereen Lerner, who was assisted by a planning committee of Mary Kwas, Joelle Clark, Carol Ellick, Dorothy Krass, and myself. We owe special thanks to Ed Friedman of the Bureau of Reclamation, who provided funding for the retreat and to Nancy Hawkins of the Division of Archaeology of the Louisiana Department of Culture, Recreation, and Tourism, who arranged our stay at Bayou Segnette.

We have restructured the committee into three task groups, each directed to one of the audiences we think it important for SAA to reach. These audiences are educators, the general public, and members of SAA. We also renewed our commitment to a fourth partner, Native American educators, who have been an important focus of our outreach program. This group has participated in several workshops organized and sponsored by the PEC (see The SAA Archaeological Record 1[4]:9 for an update on the activities of PEC for this group). For each of our audiences, we identified the messages that we think are important for the SAA to present and new projects that we can develop.

**EDUCATOR TASK GROUP**

The goal of this group is to take these messages to teachers and educators:

- The past is important, interesting, and fun.
- Archaeology is a multidisciplinary process that uses scientific methods to understand and interpret the past.
- Archaeology provides primary source material and serves as one way of knowing about the past.
- Archaeological resources are finite and fragile, and there are ways to enjoy the past without destroying it.
- Because the past belongs to everyone, everyone can be involved in its care and stewardship.

Activities of this group will focus on increasing SAA’s visibility as a source of information about archaeology for teachers and other educators and to produce some content for this target audience. The SAA and PEC will share booth space this fall at the National Association of Interpreters Conference in Des Moines, Iowa and the National Council for the Social Studies Annual Meeting in Washington, D.C. More than 5,500 teachers or interpretative professionals attend one of these conferences. We think this will be a great opportunity to talk about archaeology and the SAA. In future years, we plan to expand our outreach to attend the American Association of Museums Annual Meeting and the National Science Teachers Conference as well as regional conferences. Several of our state public education coordinators will staff these booths and provide us with local assistance. (By the way, there are still a few states that lack coordinators. If you’re interested, check out the SAAweb and contact Shirley Schermer, Chair of Network.)

Other plans from the Educator Task Group include continuing to publicize our new teaching module History Beneath the Sea (available now from the SAA office; a second module will be produced this year) and creating bookmarks and fliers publicizing SAA resources for educators.

**SAA MEMBER AND OTHER ARCHAEOLOGISTS TASK GROUP**

This task group worked on strategies to take the following messages to an audience of SAA members and other archaeologists:

Public outreach/education:

- is important,
- is a duty and a responsibility of professional archaeologists,
• is a specialty as valuable and legitimate as any other (lithics, ceramics, etc.),
• should be paid for,
• has standards,
• should be included in consideration for hiring, promotion, and tenure,
• is a two-way street between the public and the professional,
• is an important part of professional development.

Of additional importance:
• The past belongs to everyone.
• A good public program includes planning and evaluation.
• SAA/PEC are here to help provide resources and guidance to professionals who want to include outreach/education in their projects.
• All professionals need to make an attempt to include outreach/education, but there are specialists who are trained to do it.
• We must learn to trust the public; it is especially important for CRM firms to trust and work with the public.
• There are competing narratives and hidden agendas associated with working with the public.

The projects that this group plans for the coming year include two workshops to be held at the annual meeting. Bonnie Christianson has developed a proposal for a workshop sponsored by the PEC, titled “Archaeologists as Educators: Techniques for Classroom Explorations and Public Outreach,” which will be taught by a classroom teacher and will focus on techniques that archaeologists can use to improve their materials for classroom presentations. Carol Ellick has planned the workshop “Integrating the Past: Public Programming and CRM Contracts.” It will be sponsored by Statistical Research, Inc. and PEC. We also plan to continue the popular archaeology month poster contest, so watch for announcements about submitting your state’s poster for consideration.

GENERAL PUBLIC TASK GROUP

Our final task group took on the job of defining messages for everyone else. As might be expected, this was a large task, because there are many publics, including descendant groups, the interested public, the “not yet interested” public, and the hostile public, and we need different messages for each. Our messages for these groups include:

Descendant Groups
• Archaeology can contribute to descendants’ understanding of their pasts, especially when done in collaboration with living descendants.
• Archaeology can teach that there was a rich history before A.D. 1492.
• Through the investigation of the past, we can understand the variability of human cultures.

Interested Public
• Archaeological sites are fragile.
• Archaeological sites can be enjoyed without being destroyed.

“Not Yet Interested” Public
• We need to capture, sustain, and enhance interest.
• Archaeology is exciting; it tells a story; it is a mystery.
• There are opportunities to learn and to be involved in the process of archaeology.
• Everyone’s history matters; we are all stewards of the past.

Hostile Public
• Personalize archaeology—it is your past.
• The past should be preserved for future generations—for your grandchildren.
• Archaeology can produce a product you can be proud of (especially for the corporate public).
• Archaeology can produce good public relations; preservation is positive.

Future projects include the production of Web-based resources, like a planned project called “Diaries from the Field,” which will highlight archaeological research, short radio spots about archaeology, and material developed for those interested in heritage tourism.

The PEC wants to know what you as SAA members want in the way of public outreach material and we want you to share your experiences with us. We always welcome new members and ideas from anyone. I encourage you to email me.

PEC, continued on page 37
n past issues of the SAA Bulletin (18[1]:16–17, 18[2]:11), colleagues have noted the variety of study abroad opportunities available to students and the potential benefits of such programs, whether these be field schools, semester programs, or research ventures. However, for archaeology students studying overseas, much can be gained beyond classroom and field learning, including a clearer comprehension of the contexts in which histories and archaeologies are made. Moreover, there is much to offer in the way of cultivating archaeology and anthropology programs abroad, including education instruction and building professional ties that allow for cross-country funding and joint authorship of research findings.

In sub-Saharan Africa, while archaeological funds often are limited, infrastructures weak, and politics contentious, local peoples actively embrace their rich pasts and promising futures, giving archaeology a prominent position in building national and regional histories. Undoubtedly, enthusiasm for the past must be considered alongside the day-to-day needs of the majority of citizens in the present. Thus, many Africans view the study and construction of the past as essential, while considering the activity of archaeology as secondary and overly expensive. Despite this, African archaeology programs have found a way to survive and, in many cases, flourish.

We have spent a significant portion of the past three years studying and working in Tanzania and Eritrea as archaeology students and teachers. Through our experiences, we have come to understand the importance of being abroad in both academic and non-academic settings. Consequently, study abroad has been more than a time away from the U.S. or a semester of credit; rather, it has taught us the value of uncovering and building pasts with local interests at heart, guided by scientific practice and a humanistic outlook. We urge others to work with local experts and help to develop archaeological networks and infrastructures that might further the ongoing success of local archaeological initiatives.

A TALE OF TWO EXPERIENCES

Tanzania

In 1985, Professor Peter Schmidt launched the Archaeology Unit at the University of Dar es Salaam (UDSM) in Tanzania. Today, the program continues to thrive, and the infrastructure, which includes an archaeology library and a computer center, expands annually. Much of this is the result of Tanzanian initiatives since the middle 1990s under the leadership of Dr. Bertram Mapunda and Dr. Felix Chami. From 1997 to 1998, Walz attended UDSM with Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowship support from the U.S. Department of Education. The principal goals of studying abroad were to refine language skills, select an exciting dissertation project, build professional relationships, and inculcate African perspectives on the archaeological past. More than this, the Archaeology Unit and various in-country experiences provided exposure to the maze of issues and archaeopolitics surrounding research and conservation efforts in Tanzania.

Studying and practicing archaeology overseas spurred the selection of a dissertation topic—an examination of coast/hinterland relations in northeastern Tanzania from the Iron Age through the Colonial Period. Research on this topic is essential to transforming Tanzanian history from a dichotomized past where the coast and hinterland are treated separately to a regional history in which Africans contributed to the rise and perpetuation of coastal urbanism and the foundation of historic Tanganyika. Thus, in foreign contexts, the selection of the topic of study is as central to the development of fledgling archaeologies as infrastructural or financial assistance. This is of particular importance in countries where there are vast geographical or chronological gaps in archaeological coverage and where colonizers penned early interpretations of regional history.

In eastern and southern Africa, Iron Age and historical archaeology merit particular attention from archaeologists. Why?
These archaeologies have discernible cultural and historical linkages to modern populations. Consequently, archaeological, oral historical, and historical linguistic avenues of inquiry highlight issues that are pertinent to contemporary peoples. In countries such as Tanzania, where the majority of archaeological funding is devoted to human origins instead of later times, a movement toward at least equitable treatment of later periods is essential to archaeology's growth. However, more recent archaeologies require substantial investment by student archaeologists because language acquisition and cross-training in multiple disciplinary methods are a necessity. These investments are well rewarded by providing answers to essential questions with the help and involvement of local peoples.

As for the future, in cooperation with the Center for African Studies at the University of Florida and Dr. Audax Mabulla, the current head of the Unit, Walz is assisting in the establishment of a cooperative archaeological field school that will train Tanzanians and Americans in a collaborative environment. Moreover, dissertation work in Tanzania is planned to incorporate UDSM students and subsequently may offer instruction in GIS. This technological training would provide methods for approaching the unexplored past of the country with greater alacrity while minimizing destruction of sites for research purposes. It is hoped that this experience as well as future ventures abroad will assist in the construction of an archaeology pertinent to local peoples while fostering continued intellectual exchange and cooperation with Tanzanian colleagues.

**Eritrea**

In 1996, archaeologists from the University of Asmara and the University of Florida initiated a collaborative program designed to enhance university teaching, research, and institutional capacity building in Eritrea, under the leadership of Peter Schmidt. This relationship, forged five years after Eritrea’s independence, continues to develop today. As a student Fulbright fellow from 1999 to 2000, Curtis served as a full-time lecturer in the Department of Archaeology at the University of Asmara while simultaneously conducting a regional archaeological survey and excavation project for his dissertation.

The University of Asmara’s institutional philosophy advocates that foreign researchers contribute directly to the university’s teaching mission by designing research projects that commit substantial research time and resources to student training and integrate research methodologies and findings into teaching practices. Dissertation research sought to meet these expectations by establishing a project sensitive to local interests and priorities and developed through active collaboration with the Director of the National Museum of Eritrea, Dr. Yoseph Libsekal. Central to this objective was the involvement of University of Asmara undergraduate archaeology students in all phases of the dissertation research project. This was made possible through an archaeological field school and laboratory methods curricula that provided Eritrean undergraduates with experience in the methods and theory of archaeological survey, excavation, and laboratory analysis. During their training, students supplied critical feedback on the archaeological and oral historical components of Curtis’s project, informing practice and interpretation. What made this training especially valuable was that students designed and implemented individual research projects using primary data for their senior theses, leading to the construction of Eritrean interpretations of the past.

Under the leadership of the Director of the National Museum and Schmidt, Curtis helped develop a course curriculum and program infrastructure, including the establishment of an archaeological laboratory and the acquisition of scientific equipment for the Museum and Archaeology Department. In addition, using donations, grant monies, and institutional support, a nucleus of library resources critical to student development and classroom instruction was compiled. While teaching resources were of central concern, curatorial needs also received attention, an element often ignored by archaeologists in foreign settings. In total, these initiatives provided an infrastructure for teaching, learning, and research.

Although rewarding, balancing pedagogical responsibilities with dissertation goals was a challenge compounded by working abroad under the temporal and financial restraints inherent to...
most dissertation projects. The highly politicized arena of university politics and bureaucracy also offered unforeseen obstacles. While difficult, this interactive learning experience will be beneficial to developing more fully informed archaeological models and fostering long-term collaborative relationships with colleagues in Eritrea.

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

Those who study abroad, particularly students, should take active roles in both learning from foreign academics and helping to build archaeology departments and research programs. As a consequence, relations between countries are smoothed, critical intellectual linkages established, and resources supplied for the further cultivation of archaeology and anthropology abroad. Moreover, local universities are empowered to document and preserve their nation’s antiquities. In the case of Tanzania, the story has come full circle; Tanzanians now constitute the full faculty of the Archaeology Unit at UDSM and currently receive requests from American and European students seeking archaeological training and instruction. In fact, Dar is now among the leading archaeology programs in sub-Saharan Africa. The Eritrean archaeology program, on the other hand, has just begun. Though unique, the Eritrean program is informed by the Tanzanian experience. High enrollment in the undergraduate archaeology program at the University of Asmara and the continuation of three Eritrean students in the Anthropology Masters Program at the University of Florida foretell a promising future. In sum, graduate students studying and working abroad have much to gain and much to offer fledgling archaeology programs in Africa and elsewhere. Where will you choose to get involved? Where will you make your contribution?
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In 1992, the 40-plus member Council of Europe (CoE) promulgated the European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage, or what is commonly known among European archaeologists as the Malta Convention (http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/EN/WhatYouWant.asp?NT=143). As of today, most of the 16 European Union (EU) countries have ratified the treaty, notable exceptions being Italy, Greece, the Netherlands, Spain, and Germany. Others may have ratified the treaty by the time this is published. The EU has overriding legal powers and tends to concern itself with political and economic integration, while the CoE uses friendly persuasion and deals with cultural issues.

The Malta Convention has to some extent become the European version of the National Historic Preservation Act, but the EU has also incorporated archaeological requirements into its environmental regulations apart from the Malta Convention requirements. The Malta Convention and recent EU regulations have caused, and will continue to cause, many changes in the way archaeology is conducted in Europe. The vast range of languages, laws, and cultures in Europe—including the archaeological culture—makes implementing these new regulations a daunting task.

Of particular interest to those of us in the private sector, the EU has also passed economic rules stating that if EU money is involved in a project, the bidding process must be open to all qualified bidders in all EU countries. The requirements are similar to those requiring adherence to federal law when federal money is used for projects in the U.S. This ruling has been interpreted by some to mean that an archaeologist qualified in the U.K. should be able to run a project in France, and vice versa. This is not welcome news in some countries. EU policy also implies that there will be competitive bidding, and thus private enterprise will get its dirty little foot in the door.

As a result, it has become important to know what constitutes an “archaeologist,” what is adequate fieldwork, and what makes up a proper report. At last year’s annual conference of the European Association of Archaeologists (EAA) in Lisbon (September 2000), discussions of standardization and attempts at understanding the problem were major topics. As the American Cultural Resources Associations (ACRA) executive director, I was privileged to be able to participate, along with Chuck Niquette, secretary-treasurer of the Register of Professional Archaeologists (RPA), in one such workshop and was an observer in another.

One of these sessions was a roundtable discussion headed by Willem Willems of the Netherlands, president of the EAA, and Jean Paul Demoule of France. The original purpose of the roundtable was to reach some kind of agreement on how the Malta Convention should be implemented. But it soon became obvious that the roundtable would not get past reviewing the differences in how archaeological heritage management (AHM) is implemented in individual countries. Even for Europeans accustomed to dealing with cultural diversity, the range of laws and practice was a little surprising.

One representative from each country was allowed to sit at the table and speak for their country. The participants were then presented with nine questions, which they answered in order before moving on to the next question. Participants were encouraged to sum up the situation in their country. The overall view gained from this exercise was impressive in its complexity and gave one a sense of the enormity of the problem of integration in Europe. The following paragraphs describe some of the responses to three of these questions. A more extended discussion of all nine is presented in the US/ICOMOS article.

Who Owns the Remains?

Each member, or at least the first few to speak, spoke with
absolute certainty that everyone else would agree with them. Few did. In the Netherlands, it seemed to be a given that artifacts should not remain with the owner of the land. Accidental finds belong to the finder or landowner, while artifacts found in an excavation (all excavations are licensed) belong to the state. In France, artifacts belong to the landowner on terrestrial sites but not from underwater sites. In Portugal, accidental finds of value are constitutionally recognized as the “national heritage,” and the courts have prevented landowners from keeping them, although the finder can be compensated. In the U.K., the artifacts from normal run-of-the-mill AHM projects are owned by the landowner in England and Wales, and by the Crown in Scotland and Northern Ireland, while “treasure” belongs to the state; underwater ownership is ambiguous. In Norway, artifacts belong to the state. Germany is a special case due mostly to its federal system of government. Of the 16 states in Germany, not all have enforceable rules governing AHM. Denmark and the Republic of Ireland allow the landowner to own the site but the artifacts belong to the state. Greece owns all below-ground remains, allowing the landowner to have “possession” of the site and perhaps compensation for the artifacts of value. Few of these countries appear to have seriously approached the issue of AHM and the tons of artifacts and thousands of sites that will be found as a result of the treaty, nor have they determined who owns them, who wants them, and how they will be cared for.

Who Chooses the Archaeologist and Decides on the Scope of Work?

This question quickly became “what government agency gives out the permits?”, and it seemed to be understood by most present that the permits were for excavation. The public’s interest in cultural properties was not discussed. The Malta Convention and nearly all the European archaeologists I met refer to AHM archaeology as “rescue archaeology,” with the implication that such archaeology is not planned or managed and only involves excavation. While this is, of course, not true, and Europeans employ the three phases of identification, evaluation, and mitigation just as in the U.S., the first two phases seem to get short shrift, at least in discussions of this sort.

In France, the government gives out the permits under a centralized system that seems to be the standard in Europe. In many countries, permits are only given to a handful of government-approved and government-run institutions, with no allowance for the private sector. The U.K. is much more like the U.S. In Germany, each state has different rules about who gets permits, and it is actually illegal to call yourself an archaeologist in Germany if you are not university-degreed. In Denmark, all work is done by museums, universities, and the state. In Portugal, it is illegal to dig a site, even on your own land, without a permit from the Ministry of Culture. In Hungary, there is a strong permitting process and permits are given to institutions. In the Republic of Ireland, individuals must go through a rigorous vetting process each time they apply for a permit, which includes a personal interview and an examination of past history and experience; the personal interview may be waived on subsequent permit applications. Presently in the Netherlands, only three types of institutions can receive permits: the state service, universities, and municipalities (provided they employ an archaeologist). This will change by 2002, when the whole system will be upgraded to a private-sector system based on the Malta Convention.

Who Controls the Quality of the Work?

This question goes hand-in-hand with the issue of competition. There is a great fear in some countries that if archaeology is allowed to become competitive and the private sector is allowed to enter the fray, the quality of the archaeology will be degraded. This assumes, of course, that the quality of the work today is above reproach. One of the oft-repeated complaints at the roundtable and the conference in general was the poor quality or complete absence of reports. In Germany, for example, not all
Most countries of Europe have some version of the first method, through regulation and contracts. A second is to insure that the final product meets certain standards at each step of the way. This is, of course, prohibitively expensive. And even with monitors looking over the shoulders of investigators every day, the quality of the work in the AHM setting has yet to be consistent by itself. One approach is to make sure that the persons doing the work are qualified before they are given a permit, instead of paying your dues and playing politics, with little formal, objective vetting of individuals beyond academic degrees. There is, however, a movement afoot to develop pan-European professional certification standards.

The U.S. system tends to rely on the third method, controlling quality by regulating the final results of a project. While many would argue that the U.S. could use some of the upfront professional standards and licensing, our system has really hinged on approval of the final report by a government agency. Such a system is, of course, only as good or as strong as or objective as the regulators.

The role of private companies in AHM does not seem to be on the radar in most European countries. There seems to be considerable confusion even as to how it is possible to hold a company responsible for a project.

All in all, the Lisbon EAA conference was an eye-opener. Tremendous changes are taking place in Europe. Germany was recently forced to change its constitution to allow women in the army, and when the rest of Europe can peacefully get Germany and the U.K. out of the radar in most European countries. There seems to be considerable confusion even as to how it is possible to hold a company responsible for a project.

The role of private companies in AHM does not seem to be on the radar in most European countries. There seems to be considerable confusion even as to how it is possible to hold a company responsible for a project.

The greatest voiced concern is the question of maintaining the quality of the work in the AHM setting. There would appear to be three ways to approach this, none of which is ideal or sufficient by itself. One approach is to make sure that the persons doing the work are qualified before they are given a permit, which is the current system in most of Europe. A second is to have monitors looking over the shoulders of investigators every step of the way. This is, of course, prohibitively expensive. And a third is to insure that the final product meets certain standards through regulation and contracts.

Comments

Most striking about these discussions is the fear of the private sector and competition, the latter being more greatly feared than the former. There is a fear of loss of control and of the comfortable life of pre-AHM archaeology with its attendant academic and governmental perquisites.

There seems to be a consensus that one can only do, and presumably understand, archaeology in the country where one is a citizen and was educated. There is a general opinion that private companies only want to make a profit, even though university professors and government bureaucrats make more than the private companies owners in most cases. It is implied that for-profit firms will always underbid and do shoddy work, despite the fact that if they do shoddy work, they will not stay in business long after the regulatory agencies turn down a few of their reports. The old concern that AHM cannot be research still exists, although this is becoming less of an issue for many. And there is the fear that private firms pay technicians too much, thus ruining the archaeological ethic of pain and suffering necessary to become an archaeologist!
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If you want to write for the public, forget everything you learned about writing technical reports. Although the purpose in both is to inform, writing for the public involves different kinds of information presented in different ways. It is often referred to as interpretation, and if you think of it as translating from one specialty language to another, you will be on the right path. The following tips on writing for the public work well for all kinds of materials, including brochures, booklets, handouts, exhibits, posters, and websites.

READ STRUNK & WHITE FREQUENTLY. Buy a copy of The Elements of Style by William Strunk, Jr. and E. B. White (less than $10). Read it all the way through (it’s only about 85 pages) and then read it again every six months. Applying the principles of this book will do more to improve your writing than anything else.

WRITE SIMPLY. Use familiar words, not specialized technical terms. Use active verbs and avoid forms of “to be.” Archaeologists are accustomed to using words that sound precise and scientific, but these technical words do not evoke strong mental images for the general public. Note the difference in these two sentences: “Depicted in these illustrations are representatives from alien cultures” compared with “Notice the different styles of clothing worn by these people from three different cultures.” Remember that for the public, houses are not “habitation units” and food is not “subsistence.”

BE AWARE OF SEXISM, RACISM, AND ETHnocentrism in LANGUAGE. Some words seem innocent, but carry unintentional meanings. At one place I worked, the homes of the prehistoric Native Americans were always called “huts.” Granted, from our perspective, a building with a thatched roof and dirt floor seems very primitive. But if that’s the best the community had and everyone lived in them, they were “houses.” Think carefully about the words you choose to describe other cultures.

DEFINE ARCHAEOLOGICAL TERMS. All fields have specialty words, and archaeology is no exception. When using specialty language in public writing, always provide definitions. Unless you tell them, the public will not know what a “feature” or “profile” is.

KEEP IT SHORT. Write in short sentences, each averaging about 15 words. Keep paragraphs much shorter than is done in technical writing; three to eight lines per paragraph is sufficient. Break up long paragraphs, even if it seems a little awkward at first.

PRECISION ISN’T EVERYTHING. In writing, archaeologists have a tendency to qualify all statements and note every exception. Giving too many details will cause the nonspecialist to miss the important points.

PUT PEOPLE IN THE PAST. Archaeologists write about features and artifacts and cultural patterns. It seems they sometimes forget that people were the producers of them. Adding people to your writing can bring your subject to life.

EMPHASIZE SIMILARITIES. The differences between peoples of the past and of today seem quite obvious; it’s the similarities that are often overlooked. We all need food to eat and a warm place to sleep. We fall in love, cherish our children, and value our elders’ wisdom. Remember to stress our shared humanity.

Q&A FORMAT IS VERY EFFECTIVE. A good way to organize information when writing for the public is to pose questions as subheads with the explanations to follow. Choose questions that the public is likely to ask, which you probably already know from regular interactions. On websites, a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) page is common.

START OFF WITH A RIVETING PARAGRAPH. Write a lively lead paragraph that will grab the attention of your readers and tempt them to read more. A dry first paragraph is not likely to encourage further reading. Below is an example of a good lead paragraph:

As dawn breaks on the Chilean coast long ago, a child stands at a hearth fire. Peering across a creek, he gazes out at a misty backdrop of trees and marsh that softens the wet plain. Moving around the fire to escape the shifting tendrils of smoke, the boy places his bare right foot...
Evaluating twentieth-century industrial archaeological sites for eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places presents multiple challenges, such as inadequate research questions, the requirements of extensive site documentation, and considerations of the effects of demolition or modification of the historic fabric. The determination of eligibility by the Keeper of the National Register for the Virginia Shipbuilding Corporation highlights many of these issues. The shipyard was mitigated during Section 106 review for the Woodrow Wilson Bridge Project. The bridge spans the Potomac River just south of the City of Alexandria, Virginia, and is part of the Interstate Beltway around Washington, D.C. I would like to use this unusual case as an example to discuss issues of significance and integrity of twentieth-century archaeological sites.

**How Significance is Defined**

The significance of twentieth-century sites is often not clear, particularly when compared to earlier sites or when compared to sites directly connected to significant events or individuals. Until recently, research questions did not “specifically address the major social, cultural, economic, technological, or political changes that occurred in the first half of the 20th century” (Renaud 2000:28). As a consequence, twentieth-century properties were routinely being “ignored, or dismissed, in favor of earlier historic and/or prehistoric aspects of the property” (Renaud 2000:28). To surrounding communities, the sites are important because they represent ties to the recent past, which people more easily connect with than eighteenth- or nineteenth-century sites. “These are the sites that help us understand who we are as a local community, who we are as ethnic or racial or religious groups, and what our particularistic history here has been. They answer the question, ‘Where’s my part of the city, the part that shows that I’ve been here?’” (Beckelman 1994:3). These sites need to be more thoroughly studied in the context of rapid cultural, economic, political, technological, and social changes. In addition, twentieth-century sites are often well-documented with extensive paper and photographic records. We need to be careful not to fall into the trap of “thinking that an archaeological site won’t tell us anything we could not learn from the documents . . . [because if we do] . . . either we are asking the wrong question of the site, or we are foolishly asking the same question of the site that we would of the documents” (Renaud 2000:29).

The decisions about what to preserve is determined by social values, political forces, and other phenomena. Listing archaeological sites on the National Register of Historic Places authenticates the significance of sites by making them a component of our official public memory (Little 1999:19). According to the National Register of Historic Places, there are four criteria in which sites can be found significant: (A) sites that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or (B) that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or (C) that
embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic value, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or (D) that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history. Criterion D is most often cited for archaeological sites.

Determining Integrity

The concept of integrity is central to any National Register eligibility argument. For industrial properties, integrity can be elusive, particularly for those sites that have been adapted to new uses or modernized, and equipment and building modification has occurred. Recycling of industrial complexes is common, especially when large amounts of capital have been invested and there is demand to extract value from the plant (Dyen 1994:1). However, it is important to realize that “the process of deindustrialization of a community and its industrial site(s) are as integral to its industrial heritage as are the eras of buildup or full production in that industry” (Dyen 1994:3). The question is, should these sites be evaluated for a specific time period or should they be evaluated over their entire life span? I argue for the latter. The following is a brief case study that involved the nomination of a twentieth-century shipbuilding complex in Alexandria, Virginia.

Evaluating the Significance of the Virginia Shipbuilding Corporation

Construction on the Virginia Shipbuilding Corporation (VSC) shipyard began in February 1918. The first keel was laid on May 28, 1918, and the shipyard was completed in September 1918. The shipyard was built at the southernmost end of Alexandria’s waterfront in what is now called Jones Point Park. In all, nine 9,400-Dead-Weight-Ton (DWT) steel cargo steamers were completed before the company went bankrupt and closed in 1922. In 1928, many of the buildings and machinery were sold at auction and dismantled; only the Administration Building was spared (Morin et al. 2000).

The VSC site played a significant role in the economic and maritime history of the City of Alexandria. The shipyard was an economic force in the city, employing between 2,500 and 3,000 workers. Most laborers, particularly skilled laborers, came from outside the city, rented spare bedrooms or boarding-house rooms, and ate at the company commissary. The VSC site clearly had local significance, and the archaeological remains of the site were evaluated, in part, in terms of this significance (Morin et al. 2000).
At the national level, this site was one of five created to build 9,400 DWT cargo steam vessels, but it did not play a major role in the nation’s overall World War I effort. The shipyard was average in size and possessed all the accoutrements of a WWI-era shipyard—a fabrication shop with upstairs mold loft, blacksmith shop, boiler shop, craneways, shipways, and rail lines. Given these factors, the VSC site would not be potentially significant at the national level and was not evaluated in terms of this level of significance (Morin et al. 2000).

Evaluating the Integrity of the Virginia Shipbuilding Corporation

The VSC was first evaluated under Criterion D. Archival research discovered extensive documentation in maps, construction documents, and black-and-white photographs depicting the construction, use, and demolition of the shipyard. The archaeology found partial remains of the shipyard buildings and demonstrated that the yard was clearly documented in historic records, maps, and plans of the site. Archaeology did not find intact artifact assemblages, except for the partial building remains. It was determined that the archaeological record did not have the potential to provide information important in history. Therefore, it was not recommended eligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion D.

The VSC site was also evaluated under Criteria A and C. In order to be recommended as eligible under these two criteria, the site must possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. As stated in National Register Bulletin #15, “integrity is the ability of a property to convey its significance,” and “to retain historic integrity a property will always possess several, and usually most, of these aspects.” The site does not retain sufficient integrity to convey its association with the historic VSC nor its association with locally significant maritime properties. Therefore, the site cannot be recommended as eligible for listing in the National Register under either Criterion A or C.

The Historic Resources Identification and Evaluation Report (Martin and Stevenson 1998) on the National Register of Historic Places-listed Alexandria Historic District notes that industrial and waterfront development is a character-defining feature of the historic district and that the World War I to World War II period is one of several historic contexts associated with the district. The majority of above-ground historic resources associated with this character-defining feature as well as historic context are no longer extant within the boundaries of the district. Archaeological evidence of these industries, such as the VSC site, is more prevalent and is considered significant in the context of the historic district (Martin and Stevenson 1998:6–3).

The VSC Administration Building was previously determined to be a contributing element in the
Alexandria Historic District. The archaeological remains of the VSC site have a clear association with the Administration Building; therefore, these remains and the Administration Building are considered as one overall historic/archaeological resource. The shipyard is within the boundaries of the Alexandria Historic District. Given these factors, the archaeological record of the VSC property was recommended and listed as a contributing element to the Alexandria National Register Historic District in association with the Administration Building.

Conclusion

The VSC shipyard was not a special or extraordinary industrial complex, neither in the ships it built nor in its machinery and layout. As a result, it was not eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion A or C. Furthermore, it possessed little archaeological integrity and could not be recommended eligible under Criterion D. However, it was a remnant of World War I manufacturing in Alexandria, a significant historic context, and archaeological findings confirmed the building layout as depicted in plans and maps. In addition, while the shipyard was in operation, it played a major role in Alexandria’s economy. Finally, the archaeological remains have a clear association with the extant Administration building and both are within the existing National Register of Historic Places Alexandria Historic District boundaries. Thus the shipyard was able to be recommended and determined eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places as a contributing element to the Alexandria Historic District.
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Do you count the Indiana Jones trilogy among your video collection? I know that many of my archaeology colleagues who grew up with the trilogy as part of their summer entertainment do indeed own the complete set. While many of us have become accustomed to people comparing our work to that depicted by the adventuresome and debonair Dr. Jones, you may have missed the three archaeological-themed films released this summer while you were in the field.

While we, as professional archaeologists, might cringe (or at least shift uncomfortably in our seats) at the thought of anyone taking Hollywood seriously, we simply cannot deny the powerful pull of archaeology, Hollywood-style. Many impressionable children and adults do indeed believe that what they see on the silver screen is based in reality. I was led to this recent research project when two 9-year-olds recently visited the site I manage. They didn't have any idea what archaeology was and certainly wouldn't take my word that they were on an archaeological site! They were literally blank slates. Where are children receiving their information, and how is that information shaping the way they view archaeology, archaeologists, and cultural resources? A recent Harris Poll indicated that most people prefer to receive their information about archaeology through popular media (The SAA Archaeological Record 1[1]:14). So, I went to the movies this summer in search of answers.

**Movie One: Lara Croft Tomb Raider**

I saw this movie surrounded by pre-pubescent with parents in tow. The premise of the film is built around the very successful computer game developed in 1995. Lara Croft from her inception has been a celebrity franchise of sorts. Her creators have been careful to create a character with a detailed biography; she even has a blood type (http://www.visionsoflaracroft.com/lara_profile.htm). While the game version of Lara Croft is a bounded creation mostly through imagination and cyberspace information, the Lara Croft depicted by Angelina Jolie appears larger than life.

There are good guys and bad guys in the cinematic sense. From an archaeological perspective, I would argue that they are all bad guys. The only archaeologist named as such, Alex West, acts as Lara's nemesis in the tomb-raiding trade. A central scene in the movie was shot at Angkor Wat (the first movie ever shot at this World Heritage Site) where Alex West is shown destroying a Buddha relief using local laborers who cheer upon the completion of their task.

So why should we be worried about Lara Croft? Many children and teens idolize the character and may take to heart her credo. Lara doesn't consider tomb raiding as a job, merely a way of life—although she has been known to uncover archaeological artifacts on commission (http://www.visionsoflaracroft.com/lara_profile.htm, under Employment). Secondly, Lara Croft is shown stealing cultural artifacts for personal fame and glory, not to mention the devastation she leaves in her wake. Angelina Jolie has just committed to making two additional movies as Lara Croft, completing the trilogy—goody, goody.
ARTICLE

Movie Two: Atlantis the Lost Empire

I saw this movie surrounded by children and their parents. While the dialog was witty, this movie (made by Disney) may do more damage than Lara Croft. The movie is set in 1914 and right away we are introduced to Milo Thatch, a linguist and cartographer who works at a Smithsonian-like museum in Washington, D.C. In the wonderful world of Disney, Thatch is personally financed by a rich old man intent on finding the lost, no longer mythical, world of Atlantis. We are soon catapulted into a pseudo-military expedition complete with lots of ammunition and a motley crew of characters. The bad guys in this film are depicted as treasure hunters, mercenaries, and adventure capitalists. The academic, Milo, is shown as a bumbling comedic character who is taken advantage of for the sake of personal gain.

Throughout the course of the movie, various characters make incendiary comments such as, “if we had given back every stolen artifact, you’d be left with an empty museum,” or “we are doing archaeologists a favor, . . . robbing graves, plundering tombs, nobody got hurt—well, maybe somebody got hurt that we didn’t know about.”

We should worry about the latest Disney creation because while the entire premise of Atlantis may be fanciful, it is very real in the minds of children. This story very clearly uses human characters (not mermaids, tea cups, or talking animals) that are portrayed in very human activities, which are not as easily assignable to fiction. This movie may be their first and possibly last exposure to archaeology, which is depicted as pseudo-science and no more than treasure hunting.

Movie Three: The Mummy Returns

The audience was a mixed bag of children, teens, and adults. I was impressed that attendance was still strong in late July, two full months after its opening. I was dreading this movie the most after laughing and cringing my way through the original (also a summer blockbuster). The Mummy Returns is a sequel with the same cast of characters, although the two main characters are now married. While no one is called an archaeologist in this movie, it is certainly implied, and large excavation scenes are shown. Tombs are looted in Egypt, and the goodies are carted off to the manor home in England. In this version, the bad guy (besides the reincarnated mummy, Imhotep) happens to be the curator of the British Museum.

All three movies depict a gentleman archaeology that includes reaping the rewards of stolen cultural artifacts and often destroying cultural resources in the process. All three movies also show archaeology devoid of science. We should worry about the explicit and implicit statements made in these movies to their audience. Children are especially vulnerable to these messages. Children form foundations of knowledge about the world around them at an early age, and this includes how they feel about cultural resources and whether or not these resources have value. (Boys, ages 9–20, are the largest group of archaeological vandals, according to Ryan 1992.)

Archaeology and Popular Culture

Popular culture is the preferred method for the rapid exchange of ideas. As anthropologists, we should be aware of the products from Hollywood concerning our own profession and learn why these images resonate with the general public.
Most people have a natural curiosity about archaeology. We are fortunate that Hollywood has provided a cast of characters that serve as archetypes for the adventurous hero/heroine, which has proved to be a winning formula for any archaeologically themed production. We can use this natural interest to educate the public beyond the fantasy and introduce them to the exciting reality of scientific discovery. Your own introduction to archaeology may have begun with the romantic and exotic depiction that Steven Spielberg brought to the Indiana Jones movies, but somewhere along the way your curiosity was channeled toward science rather than science fiction. One day in the field during a summer season is usually enough to convince anyone that archaeology is much harder and less glamorous than it looks on the big screen.

A major goal among many archaeologists concerns public interpretation and teaching stewardship or management of cultural resources. Many of the visitors to our sites and educational programs can become interested in the subject of archaeology because of their exposure to Hollywood-style archaeology. I even use posters from these movies to help begin my discussion of archaeology with both elementary school children and college students because they can relate to these strong popular culture images. Because both children and adults are immersed in popular culture, these movies and their characters are common ground and can be used as a stepping stone for discussing larger archaeological issues such as science versus pseudo-science, conservation of cultural heritage, and archaeological ethics.

Don’t worry if you missed these films while you were out in the field; they will all be out on video soon!
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WRITE IN THE PYRAMID STYLE. In the pyramid style of writing, used by newspapers, the most important information is in the first paragraph. Succeeding paragraphs add details, fill out the story, and recap what has been covered previously. Even if readers only look at the headline and first paragraph, they will receive the basic information. The pyramid style works especially well for shorter pieces, such as exhibit copy, brochures, and Web information.

SPELL-CHECK AND PROOF-READ. Last but not least, always run your finished manuscript through the spell-check on your computer, and have one or two other people read it over to catch errors that the spell-check might have missed. Never provide a sloppy product to the public!
ARCHAEOLOGY IN 2001: CURRENT RESEARCH BASED ON THE SAA ANNUAL MEETING PROGRAM

John F. Chamblee and Barbara J. Mills

The topical divisions used in the 1992 study are still broadly applicable, but recent trends justify the creation of new topics in future comparisons. For the sake of consistency, we simply note these trends and continue with the existing categories. One of these trends is a new focus on career development. Most presentations addressing this issue were included in the categories of public archaeology or CRM/legislation because they usually addressed jobs in these two areas. Another newly emerging topic might be called geographic information systems and digital methods. In our analysis, these presentations were generally placed into laboratory and quantitative methods or settlement patterns and regional systems categories.

In building our data set, we tried to ensure consistent classification. Mills made decisions regarding topical classifications, consulting Chamblee on ambiguous cases. We split the straightforward task of geographic classification, consulting each other when necessary. Some geographic data were already entered by SAA members if they submitted their abstracts electronically.

**Results**

Figures 1 and 2 compare percentages of presentations and sessions for the 2001 annual meeting by topical and geographic areas, respectively. The higher proportion of general descriptive/culture historical topics in the session data stems from the fact that sessions reporting results from particular projects cover many topics and can only be classified in a general way, whereas individual papers within sessions may be more specifically placed in another research category.

**Trends in Geographic Areas**

In terms of geographic area, it is clear that the 2001 meetings were well represented by those working in Mesoamerica/Central America. A greater proportion of sessions were presented on the archaeology of this area of the world than the combined eastern and western North America, although the proportion of North American presentations as a whole was still higher.
Besides the highest ever Mesoamerica/Central America representation in the 2001 session data and one of the lowest years for European presentations, the six years of recent session data show that the 2001 meetings were generally not the lowest or the highest in geographic representation (Figure 3). Nonetheless, the six-year session data and the longer-term presentation data (Figure 4) do show a couple of interesting trends in the geographic focus of research presented at the annual meetings. Although North American archaeology still makes up the largest segment of presentations, the proportion of sessions focusing on Mesoamerica and Central America was higher in 1997 (Nashville), 1999 (Chicago), and 2001 (New Orleans). Indeed, with the exception of the 2000 meetings in Philadelphia, the six-year session data point to one of the most salient trends in the geographic data: a steady increase in the proportion of sessions focusing on Mesoamerica/Central America.

The longer-term presentation data also show an increase in papers on Mesoamerica and Central America. Between 1983 and 2001, the proportion of papers about this geographic area has nearly doubled. The proportions were relatively stable across the 1983, 1991, and 1992 meetings, but reached nearly 30 percent in the 2001 meetings. This number could not be explained by the New Orleans venue because the 1991 meeting was also in New Orleans.

Within North America, there has been a decrease in the number of sessions and papers focusing on western North America. The presentation data show the same trend for both eastern and western North America. By comparing the 1991 and 2001 presentation data, we can hold the venue constant and see that there has been a drop of about 10 percent in the number of presentations on western North American topics. Anecdotal data indicate that many of our southwestern colleagues skipped the 2001 New Orleans meeting in order to present at the Denver meetings in 2002, but this seems insufficient to explain the drop from 1991 to 1992 that is part of the trend.

Nearly all other geographic areas fluctuate considerably. One exception is that sessions focusing on the archaeology of Europe...
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appear to show a consistent trend of decreasing representation. By contrast, however, the number of presentations has held steady since 1983.

The above trends cannot be evidence for fewer archaeologists working in western North America or Europe. Based on data compiled by Melinda Zeder (1997:122–123), North Americanists comprise the greatest number of SAA members and there are more SAA members in western states than in any other subregion. One possible explanation for this discrepancy is that North Americanists (and possibly Europeanists as well) are increasingly presenting papers in nongeographically based sessions. If the session or paper abstracts mentioned an area, we coded it, but some presentations and some sessions are intentionally non-areal in focus. We conclude that Mesoamericanists are more likely to present papers and organize sessions that focus on a particular region/project/site than are their North American or European counterparts. The greater proportion of sessions devoted to Mesoamerica is also tied to the fact that the average number of presentations in Mesoamerican sessions is lower, at 6.7 papers per session, than the overall average of 9.1 per session.

Trends in Research Topics

Percentages among the research topics fluctuate from year to year, but there are trends that are generally stable when one looks at the presentation data from 1983 to 2001. Trends across this longer period of time are clearer than they are in the six years of session data, but the trends themselves are the same in both data sets.

For reasons mentioned above, culture historical sessions are always the largest category. Table 1 shows the top three categories for presentations in 1983, 1992, and 2001, and Figure 5 shows long-term trends in paper presentations. The only topic to drop from the top three list is subsistence and nutrition. In fact, this topic has the only clear declining trend among presentations over time.

In both the session data and the presentation data, the emergence of religion and symbolic communication as a top-five category is noteworthy and suggests that this long-neglected topic is gaining renewed interest. Likewise, the growth of physical anthropology, peaking in 2001, is significant—especially so in the era of NAGPRA. More sessions and presentations are also being organized around methodological topics, no doubt because of the growth in remote sensing, GIS, and archaeometric research. Sociopolitical organization has remained popular. Subtopics in this category that we included are gender and identity, and these now account for a small but potentially growing number of presentations.

Trends by Gender

We also looked at patterns in the presentations by male and female SAA members in 2001 compared to the 1992 data. The 2001 data represent a total of 1,316 male and 886 female presenters, which shows slightly greater parity (60 percent male vs. 40 percent female) than at the 1992 meetings (Feinman et al. 1992:454), where women were only 33 percent of the presenters.

Figure 6 re-creates the data presented by Feinman et al. (1992:Figure 8) for male/female topical preferences at the 1992 annual meeting, while Figure 7 shows the data for 2001 presentations. One of the strongest trends in the 1992 data was that men were proportionally more likely to present papers related to settlement and regional systems than were women. Another topic in the 1992 data that was much more likely to have a male presenter was paleoenvironment and geoarchaeology. These topics are still more popular among male rather than female presenters, but the gap has closed for both. Similarly, one of the most female-dominated topics of 1992—production, use, and exchange—now shows more parity between male and female presenters.

**TABLE 1. TOP THREE RESEARCH TOPICS AMONG PAPER PRESENTATIONS AT 1983, 1992, AND 2001 ANNUAL MEETINGS.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Production, Use, and Exchange</td>
<td>Settlement Patterns and Regional Systems</td>
<td>Production, Use, and Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Subsistence and Nutrition</td>
<td>Sociopolitical Organization</td>
<td>Settlement Patterns and Regional Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Settlement Patterns and Regional Systems</td>
<td>Production, Use, and Exchange</td>
<td>Sociopolitical Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. Distribution of presentations by research topic at 1983, 1991, 1992, and 2001 annual meetings.
Two other topics that were more often addressed by female presenters in 1992 are still more likely to be presented by women: subsistence and nutrition, and public archaeology. Two additional topics now show more disparity between male and female presenters, with women proportionately better represented: CRM and legislation, and physical anthropology and disease. The greater proportion of women studying subsistence and nutrition is consistent with the trends noted by Zeder (1997:Figure 5.9); in her 1994 SAA census data, women were more likely to conduct both faunal and archaeobotanical analyses than were men.

Besides subject matter, another way to look at the representation of men and women at the meetings is in terms of meeting role. Feinman et al. (1992:454) point out that greater status is accorded to the role of discussant. Their data showed an increase in female discussants from 8 percent in 1983 to 22 percent in 1992. At the 2001 annual meetings, 36 percent of the discussants were women (including discussants in the new forum format). This indicates significant gains for women's participation in the meetings. If parity is measured by the proportion of women presenting at the 2001 meetings (40 percent), then it almost has been achieved.

**Trends in Format**

Last, we compare the 1,856 papers and 172 posters presented at the 2001 annual meeting by topical and geographic areas. As might be expected, many researchers have adopted the poster as the most appropriate means of reporting results of methodological research, paleoenvironmental and geoarchaeological studies, subsistence and nutrition, culture historical reconstructions, and public archaeology (Figure 8). A shift to posters may, in part, account for the decline in papers related to subsistence and nutrition.

One of the most striking results of the comparison of the papers and posters presented at the 2001 meeting was in geographic area. Researchers in North America presented posters in far...
greater numbers than researchers working in other areas (Figure 9). Of the five poster symposia organized in 2001, three were related to North America, one to South America, and one to Oceania. Mesoamerican and Central American researchers, on the other hand, are much less likely to present posters. The high percentage of SAA poster presentations on western North America is probably an important factor in the declining percentages of North American paper sessions and presentations noted above.

Concluding Thoughts

We note that almost ten years ago, Feinman and colleagues (1992:450) stated that “if archaeology was indeed at a crossroads in the middle 1980s, then the field is still perched at that same fork in the road.” The trends that we outline in this article suggest that despite the incorporation of new theoretical and methodological approaches, we may not have been perched at a fork after all. With few exceptions, the general topics that were most popular in 1983 are still popular in 2001. In addition, the overall stability in the data indicates that changes in geographic areas of interest and general research topics occur at rates that are difficult to measure in cycles of less than 20 years. We leave it to other organizers to see if this conclusion concerning change within our professional culture is borne out.
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The Council of Councils began when I emailed William Lipe, then president of the SAA, to argue that the SAA was not doing enough to reach out to its counterpart organizations at the state level. Dr. Lipe invited me to do something about it. In 1998, with the support of the SAA Executive Committee, I chaired the first Council of Councils at the SAA Annual Meeting in Seattle. This meeting was attended by 24 organizations. The goals of the new Council were (1) to foster communication and cooperation among professional councils around the country and (2) to improve communication between the SAA and those professional councils.

At the next two meetings, in Chicago (1999) and Philadelphia (2000), attendance dropped off, and I doubted whether the level of interest justified further meetings. At the urging of Keith Kintigh, Dr. Lipe’s successor, I organized the 2001 meeting despite those misgivings. Attendance in New Orleans included 26 individuals representing 18 organizations, and those present voiced a wish for a continued forum for inter-council discussions. Provided that the SAA continues to support it, the Council of Councils is likely to become a permanent fixture of the annual meetings.

By this point, the Council has a fairly uniform format. All four meetings to date have occurred from 8 to 10 A.M. on Thursday, and continuing this time slot would make it easy for people to predict and thus attend the meeting. “Housekeeping” issues usually take a few minutes; the remainder of the first hour is then taken up by a discussion of the nuts and bolts of maintaining professional archaeological councils, with at least one presentation by a council in the area. Over the years, the participants have indicated that this is the most valuable part of the meeting—it lets them see how other organizations have dealt with the problems they face. The second half of the meeting is devoted to a specific topic, this past year’s being “Should the Professional Councils Support Registration/Certification and Licensing in Archaeology?” Because of the small size and informality of the group, such discussion is free-flowing and productive.

In 2001, participants felt that the Council should establish a list server so that, between SAA meetings, the various councils can discuss issues about council management, seek help from sister organizations on specific issues, and for similar purposes. Such a list server would also be valuable to the SAA, allowing it to quickly contact the councils about issues of interest to the professional community as a whole. I attempted to establish such an inter-council list server after the initial meeting in Seattle, but it did not attract subscribers and after a few months I pulled the plug on it. Four years later, however, email and list servers are less of a novelty and the consensus was for trying again. The list server will be open to all officers and other representatives of professional councils around the country. If you are interested in subscribing, please email me at dap@unm.edu.

As a second outgrowth of Council activities, SAA Information Services Assistant Christa Neikirk is building a Web page with links to the various professional councils. This should make it easier for people to identify the councils in their area. If you are interested in having your council linked to the SAA website, please contact her directly at christa_neikirk@saa.org.

After four meetings, it is time to hand over the organization of the Council of Councils to someone with fresh ideas. Sarah Neusius, who faithfully attended the previous meetings as the SAA Board’s representative, has volunteered to take over this task, beginning with the 2002 meeting in Denver. If you wish to find out more about that meeting, or if your state or local professional has not yet been contacted about the Council, please contact Dr. Neusius at sawn@grove.iup.edu. Dr. Neusius would also appreciate any suggestions for activities or discussion topics at future Council meetings.

In closing, I wish to thank the SAA Board and Executive Committee, including past presidents Lipe and Kintigh and executive director Tobi Brimsek, for their support of the Council of Councils and for allowing me to serve as the organizer and chair from 1998 through 2001.
For the past 22 years, I have been acquiring and preserving archaeological survey, testing, and excavation reports. I print a quarterly bibliography from these data. The October–December 2000 listing ended with report number 17,458. Oregon, as one of the western states, is 53 percent federal land (BLM and U.S. Forest Service), and, as a result, an average of 793.5 reports have been generated each year. The majority of the reports are unpublished gray literature generated by Section 106. Most were written by federal employees ranging from 40-hour “techs,” agency archaeologists, to Ph.D.s. But the database also contains every published report, journal, or book I have been able to collect or buy over the years.

As each report is reviewed, the project boundaries are drawn onto a set of USGS quad maps and given a color code to differentiate the project from nearby projects. The color code is put on the cover sheet. Each cover sheet also contains the basic data needed for the SHPO computer database (county, legals, map name[s], author, date, title, district, agency, project acres, surveyed acres, and additional variables). The report number is assigned later. Sites are assigned Smithsonian-style permanent numbers and mapped in as well. Review of reports and data entry is a single process. This insures sites were not missed and that the database is current.

The reports are collected in quarterly groupings that are further subgrouped by county. I place a 2 x 14-inch marker with the county name between each group with the counties in alphabetic order. For multi-county or miscellaneous reports, I created a ZMISC category that sorts out as the last “county.” The reports are entered into a computer database without the report numbers. At the end of the quarter, the file is sorted by county and map name (for several maps, the report is keyed alphabetically in descending order) and a report number is assigned by the computer. I then pull each county grouping and physically sort them, write the report number onto each report, then pull the maps noted on the cover sheet and write the number onto the maps. This usually takes less than a day.

The reports are stored on bookshelves. Each quarter has a larger index tab sticking out that lists the year, quarter, and starting report number. It takes seconds to manually find any report on file.

As a result of this process, every report is mapped onto USGS quads. Every prehistoric or historic archaeological site is mapped. Every isolated find (<10 artifacts, no features) is mapped with a small pencil “I.” All newly reported historic sites are mapped in as well. In essence, the map-based system is a paper GIS. We are working on placing this data into an electronic GIS. Projects are tied to the maps through the report numbers inscribed on the maps. Testing or excavations are tied to the Smithsonian numbers on the maps as well by placing them adjacent to the Smithsonian number.

There is no need to do traditional bibliographic research in Oregon. Just pull a map and everything known about the area is instantly available. Reports are pulled by report number and a tab placed to mark the location. The site forms are also available by Smithsonian number in county-based side-pull file cabinets.

There are over 22,000 prehistoric and 10,000 historic archaeological sites on file.

I have read and reviewed the 17,000+ reports, so I can often point researchers to interesting reports they may wish to look at that are near their project areas. But one of these days, I will retire. The person replacing me will have no idea of what is in those massive files.

There is a low-key, old index database that contains the minimal data to print out a quarterly bibliography distributed to agency, academic, and private archaeologist in Oregon. It contains the county, date, report
number, title, district (or consulting firm), agency, township, range, numbers of prehistoric, historic and archaeological isolates, number of historic sites, and keywords tied to those numbers.

Sample:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Isol</th>
<th>Hist</th>
<th>Bldg</th>
<th>Acre</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clackamas
17039 Oetting, Albert
1999 Archaeological Investigations for the Portland General Electric Bull Run Hydroelectric project, Clackamas County, Oregon
Heritage Research Associates Portland General Electric
T1S, 2SR5E, 6E, 7E
Scatter, Flake, Test

The series of numbers indicate that three new prehistoric sites were recorded—all scatters—and four isolates were recorded—all flakes—and no new survey was done.

At the end of each quarter, the total project acreage and survey acreage is summed. If the survey was greater or equal to the project, it is placed into a 100-percent subcategory, and the rest goes into a sample subcategory. The total number of prehistoric and historic archaeological sites, isolates, and historic sites is also summed. This allows us to add together all the quarters of a calendar year and produce a federal report down to the acre for the SHPO end-of-year reports.

I have designed a Microsoft Access 2000 database in anticipation of my retirement. It is set up to aid my replacement and future researchers to find the key data they may need. This database contains a number of linked tables. The report number provides the link. The database has a county table with a lookup list. Each author is stored by last and first name in a separate table. The report date, title, district (or firm), agency, and the number of prehistoric, isolates, historic, buildings, project acreage, and surveyed acreage are in another table. A keyword list is a separate table.

Sites are in a table that contains data on the temporary number, Smithsonian number, presence of lithics, ground stone, prehistoric ceramics, burials, rock art, housepits, other features, flora, fauna, historic artifacts, a descriptor for the historic artifacts or feature, and if the site contains diagnostics of the Paleo, Early, Middle, or Late Archaic periods.

There is a table for radiocarbon dates that contains the Smithsonian number, feature dated, uncorrected date, variation, uncorrected calendar date and suffix (BC/AD), drainage basin and lab number. There is also a table for sourcing that contains the Smithsonian number and a pull-down list of sources identified by the Obsidian Lab in Oregon. A table of concordance with other lab names has been prepared for data entry.

An experimental research-question memo filed as a table is also present. Each report is read (speed read) for key theories, hypotheses, empirical observations, or methodologies, which are then typed into this table. Given the time issues, this will probably be dropped, or we may try scanning executive summaries into this field. I have entered the first 1,000 reports to test out this system. Since I read and reviewed these reports more than 20 years ago, I can pull out key research issues fairly quickly. A database-entry person would have serious problems trying to look for this kind of data.

This database will be tied to the map GIS and to a separate site-file database on each archaeological site (hooked by Smithsonian number). The site database will include text fields describing the data. Since any word can be searched in these text fields, the entire complex of linked databases will have powerful search capabilities.

Every report, published or unpublished, on any site (temporary number or Smithsonian number) can be pulled in seconds. If I want to look at mining in Baker county, or mining on the Granite quad, or the Bailey Gulch Mine, the system will give me results in seconds, generic or specific.

This is how I have handled the gray literature issue in Oregon.
KATHARINE BARTLETT
1907-2001

Katharine Bartlett, an early Southwestern anthropologist and a founding staff member of the Museum of Northern Arizona, died on May 22, 2001 at her home in Sedona, Arizona. She was 93.

Born in Denver, Colorado in 1907, Ms. Bartlett received her M.A. in anthropology from the University of Denver in 1929, studying under Dr. E. B. Renaud. In 1930, she traveled to Flagstaff, Arizona for a summer position at the fledgling Museum of Northern Arizona, cataloging artifacts from the museum’s excavations in the Medicine Valley and assisting with the newly created Hopi Craftsman Exhibition. Her summer assignment soon evolved into her life’s work as she joined the museum’s staff permanently in the fall of 1930, remaining to serve as an essential member of the museum’s guiding team until her retirement in 1981.

Over her 51 years at the Museum of Northern Arizona, Ms. Bartlett worked closely with museum director Harold S. Colton and his wife, Mary-Russell, to direct the museum’s research on the Colorado Plateau in such diverse areas as archaeology, ethnology, zoology, botany, and geology. She carried out archaeological fieldwork in northern Arizona with Dr. Colton, ethnographic fieldwork with the Hopi, and archaeological surveys of Glen Canyon prior to its flooding by the construction of the Glen Canyon Dam.

She served as the museum’s first Curator of Anthropology from 1930 to 1952, establishing the system for organizing the museum’s anthropology collections that is still used today. From 1953 to 1981, she served as Librarian and Curator of History, collecting and organizing thousands of books, periodicals, and archives into a comprehensive collection of research material on the anthropology, geology, and natural history of northern Arizona. Trained as a physical anthropologist, Ms. Bartlett analyzed human skeletal material from many museum and National Park Service excavations. In addition to her primary work as curator and librarian, she planned exhibits, edited museum publications, and researched and published articles on northern Arizona history.

Some of Ms. Bartlett’s 60 publications include many articles in the museum’s interdisciplinary research journal Plateau on such diverse topics as Southwestern Indian craft arts, Hopi history and ethnology, Spanish exploration of the Southwest, and the archaeology of northern Arizona. Ms. Bartlett’s work on artifacts from the Tolchaco gravels of the Little Colorado River Valley was some of the earliest research into Paleoindian occupation of the Colorado Plateau. Her MNA Bulletin analyzing manos and metates from museum excavations, Pueblo Milling Stones of the Flagstaff Region and Their Relation to Others in the Southwest: A Study in Progressive Efficiency, has become a standard reference on groundstone food-processing technology.

Katharine Bartlett was honored in 1984 as the first Fellow of the Museum of Northern Arizona for her significant contributions to the museum and the Southwest. In 1986, she was an invited participant in a conference sponsored by the Arizona State Museum that highlighted the work of early women anthropologists in the American Southwest. The conference was subsequently presented as the Smithsonian Institution “Daughters of the Desert” exhibit, which traveled to museums throughout the country. In addition to being honored as a “Daughter of the Desert,” in 1991 Ms. Bartlett received the Sharlot Hall Award for her contributions to Arizona history, and in 1995 she received the Byron Cummings Award from the Arizona Archaeological and Historical Society. She was a charter member of the Colorado-Wyoming Academy of Science and the Arizona Academy of Science and a Fellow of the American Anthropological Association and the Society for American Archaeology. She was listed in the first edition of the International Directory of Anthropologists in 1938 and the first edition of Who’s Who of American Women in 1959.

Ms. Bartlett shared a home with artist and archaeologist Gene Field Foster from 1953 until Ms. Foster’s death in 1983. Ms. Bartlett is survived by her niece, Jane R. Stevens of La Jolla, California, nephews George B. Robinson of Maplewood, New Jersey and Thomas B. Robinson of Chazy, New York, and 11 grand-nephews and -nieces, including her namesake, Katharine Bartlett Stevens.

The family requests that, in lieu of flowers, contributions can be made to MNA in memory of Katharine Bartlett.
Guillermo Focacci Aste, 78, renowned archaeologist, died December 31, 2000 in Arica, Chile. Born in Lima on March 21, 1922, and raised in Arica, Focacci graduated from Instituto Comercial as an accountant in 1942. He later became interested in archaeological studies as he excavated important sites in the Arica area such as Playa Miller, in the Camarones valley, and several more in the Azapa valley. Together with Percy Dauelsberg and Sergio Chacón (both recently deceased) and Professor Luis Alvarez Miranda, they developed the foundation of Arica’s prehistory. They are considered the first team to do research in a truly scientific way in the area. Focacci was a former director of the Archaeological Museum of Azapa in Arica and author of important publications on Chilean archaeology, particularly of the Arica region. His most influential legacy is contained in the collections that are part of the Museo San Miguel de Azapa. In 1961, Focacci and his friends organized the First Congress of Chilean Archaeology, which included archaeologists from Peru and Bolivia. Among them, the young Luis Lumbreras, Carlos Ponce, and, from Chile, well-known figures such as Grete Mostny and Gustave Le Paige. When the Regional Museum closed its doors in 1967, the Universidad del Norte offered to keep the collections, and, immediately after hiring Focacci, developed a plan for a new museum.

Focacci was always very motivated for the study of local prehistory. Although he did not have formal academic training, his knowledge and experience were recognized by Universidad del Norte first and later by Universidad de Tarapacá. He learned from practical situations and from his devotion to reading. He was a dear friend and an excellent companion in innumerable field experiences, a loyal collaborator in all administrative functions, and a ferocious fighter in defense of archaeological patrimony. Focacci has written an important page in the history of archaeological research for the South Central Andean area. It is without a doubt that archaeologists working in northern Chile and the South Central Andean area have lost a major figure. His wife Julita Castro and a son survive him.

IN MEMORIAM

GUILLERMO FOCACCI ASTE

1922-2000

Mario A. Rivera

Mario A. Rivera is a Visiting Professor at University of Chicago.

A los 78 años de edad, falleció el 31 de Diciembre del año pasado, el arqueólogo ariqueño Guillermo Focacci A. Compañero de innumerables jornadas, colaborador nuestro en los quehaceres administrativos, luchador incansable por la protección del patrimonio arqueológico, Guillermo Focacci ha escrito una página imborrable en la historia de la investigación de nuestro pasado en el territorio nacional. Junto a los también desaparecidos Percy Dauelsberg H. y Sergio Chacón C., y al profesor Luis Alvarez M. sentaron las bases para la institucionalidad de la arqueología y la museología en el Norte de Chile, dando con su quehacer, un empuje vital al desarrollo de la arqueología del área Centro Sur Andina. Juntos constituyeron el que quizás haya sido el primer grupo de trabajo serio con una fundamentación práctica basado en los trabajos de terreno. Su obra principal está resumida en las colecciones que conforman el patrimonio del Museo San Miguel de Azapa, pero cuyo verdadero antecedente es el Museo Regional de Arica, así como los innumerables trabajos y presentaciones científicas publicadas en revistas de renombre internacional y congresos de reconocido prestigio. Este grupo del que Guillermo Focacci no solo formó parte sino también se sintió plenamente identificado fue también el responsable de la primera convocatoria científica a nivel Andino realizada en Chile para discutir los avances de la arqueología nacional, evento que se cristalizó en Arica en Septiembre de 1961. Cuando el Museo Regional de Arica cerró sus puertas, la Universidad del Norte le abrió las suyas para recibir el legado de este grupo, conjuntamente con la incorporación de Focacci a la propia Universidad en Arica, en 1967.

A pesar de haber sido un hombre de mundo, con experiencia de vida en cuanta actividad uno pueda imaginar, Focacci siempre se sintió motivado por la experiencia del hombre en el pasado. Su conocimiento no provino de las aulas, a las que llegó después de haber aprendido por experiencias propias y muy prácticas, y por su profundo interés en la lectura. Fue así como se formó un profesional de conocimientos ilimitados, una verdadera historia viviente del pasado histórico de la
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Balance Sheets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current assets:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents</td>
<td>$ 1,289,326</td>
<td>$ 1,180,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates of deposit</td>
<td>118,000</td>
<td>177,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable</td>
<td>5,232</td>
<td>7,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued interest receivable</td>
<td>9,299</td>
<td>4,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses and deposits</td>
<td>63,507</td>
<td>36,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total current assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,485,364</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,405,690</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>508,349</td>
<td>414,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property and equipment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>118,299</td>
<td>115,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and fixtures</td>
<td>62,572</td>
<td>54,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer software</td>
<td>49,406</td>
<td>49,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less accumulated depreciation</strong></td>
<td>230,277</td>
<td>218,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 2,011,575</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,849,943</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS**

Current liabilities:

| Accounts payable and accrued expenses | $ 6,594 | $ 4,975 |
| Deferred revenue:                    |         |         |
| Membership dues, current portion     | 383,146 | 365,318 |
| Subscriptions                        | 165,643 | 172,291 |
| Cooperative agreements               | 57,515  | 248,737 |
| Meetings and other                   | 268,730 | 197,668 |
| **Total current liabilities**        | **881,628** | **988,004** |

Deferred life membership dues, net of current portion: 26,238

Total liabilities: 907,866

Net assets:

| Unrestricted:                      |         |         |
| Undesignated                       | 688,911 | 568,084 |
| Board-designated                   | 242,691 | 142,328 |
| **Total net assets**               | **931,602** | **710,412** |
| Temporarily restricted              | 121,657 | 81,214  |
| Permanently restricted              | 50,450  | 41,840  |
| **Total liabilities and net assets** | **$ 2,011,575** | **$ 1,849,943** |

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.
### SOCIETY FOR AMERICAN ARCHAEOLOGY
#### Statements of Activities

For the Year Ended December 31,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>Temporarily Restricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership dues</td>
<td>$564,087</td>
<td>$564,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual meeting</td>
<td>365,225</td>
<td>365,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>256,189</td>
<td>256,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public programs and services</td>
<td>168,170</td>
<td>45,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization and administration</td>
<td>137,092</td>
<td>8,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member programs and services</td>
<td>6,615</td>
<td>6,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards</td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net assets released from restrictions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public programs and services</td>
<td>4,973</td>
<td>(4,973)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total revenue</td>
<td>1,503,509</td>
<td>40,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program services:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>143,138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual meeting</td>
<td>257,521</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>318,596</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public programs and services</td>
<td>272,137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member programs and services</td>
<td>8,065</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards</td>
<td>4,498</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support services:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and general</td>
<td>247,731</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership development</td>
<td>30,633</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenses</td>
<td>1,282,319</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in net assets</td>
<td>221,190</td>
<td>40,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net assets, beginning of year</td>
<td>710,412</td>
<td>81,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net assets, end of year</td>
<td>$931,602</td>
<td>$121,657</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.
The Clements-DeGolyer Library Grants. The William P. Clements Center for Southwest Studies offers research grants to applicants who live outside the greater Dallas-Fort Worth area to encourage a broader and more intensive use of the special collections at DeGolyer Library. The library consists of almost 90,000 volumes of rare and scholarly works, 350,000 photographs, and approximately 4,000 linear feet of archival materials pertaining to the trans-Mississippi West, the Spanish Borderlands, and the history of transportation, especially railroads worldwide. The library's website is http://www2.smu.edu/cul/degolyer. The Clements-DeGolyer Library Grant provides an opportunity to conduct scholarly research in the DeGolyer Library on any aspect of the Southwestern experience. The $400 a week grant is awarded for periods of one to four weeks to help defray costs of travel, lodging, and research materials. Applicants should provide a project outline, identifying its pertinence to the DeGolyer Library collection and the requested length of research time; a curriculum vita; and two letters of reference from persons who can assess the significance of the project and the scholarship record of the applicant. Grant recipients are expected to consult with DeGolyer Library staff about available resources in their specialty area and to recommend the acquisition of additional research materials that will deepen the library's collection. Recipients might also be asked to deliver an informal lecture or seminar talk on their research topic. Deadlines for applications are September 14 and March 15. Awards will be announced on October 1 and April 1. Send applications to David Weber, Director, Clements Center for Southwest Studies, Dallas Hall, Room 356, 3225 University Ave., P.O. Box 750176, Dallas, TX 75275-0176. If you have questions, however, please contact Andrea Boardman, Associate Director, at (214) 768-1233 or at swcenter@mail.smu.edu. Our website address is http://www2.smu.edu/swcenter.

New Website. A website to facilitate scholarly exchange in the field of Southeast Asian archaeology and anthropology has been created by Christopher King, University of Hawai`i, in conjunction with the University of Pennsylvania Museum, Ban Chiang Project. The website came online July 9, 2001 and begins with a searchable bibliography with an initial database of over 3,500 references. Users can search for references in various ways, mark the ones they need, then automatically display them in one of a dozen different journal styles pertinent to archaeologists and physical anthropologists. Users can also export the references into their personal bibliography database programs. The URL is http://seasia.museum.upenn.edu.

Julian D. Hayden Student Paper Competition. The Arizona Archaeological and Historical Society is pleased to announce the fourth annual Julian D. Hayden Student Paper Competition. Named in honor of long-time AAHS luminary, Julian Dodge Hayden, the winning entry will receive a cash prize of $500 and publication of the paper in Kiva, The Journal of Southwestern Anthropology and History. The competition is open only to bona fide undergraduate and graduate students at any recognized college or university. Co-authored papers will be accepted only if all authors are bona fide students. Subject matter may include the anthropology, archaeology, history, linguistics, and ethnology of the American Southwest and northern Mexico, or any other topic appropriate for publication in Kiva. Papers should be no more than 30 double-spaced, typewritten pages (approximately 8,000 words), including figures, tables, and references, and should conform to Kiva format. If the paper involves living human subjects, author should verify, in the paper or cover letter, that necessary permissions to publish have been obtained. Previous entries will not be considered, and all decisions of the judges are final. If no publishable papers are received, no award will be given. Judging criteria include, but are not limited to, quality of writing, degree of original research and use of original data, appropriateness of subject matter, and length. Deadline for receipt of submissions is January 15, 2002. Late entries will not be accepted. Send four copies of the paper and proof of student status to: Julian D. Hayden Student Paper Competition, AAHS, Arizona State Museum, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721-0026. For more information, contact Laurie Webster at (520) 325-5435 or lwebster1@mindspring.com.

The following archaeological properties were listed in the National Register of Historic Places during the third quarter of 2001. For a full list of National Register listings every week, check Recent Listings at http://www.cr.nps.gov/nr/nrlist.htm.

• Arizona, Apache County. Rattlesnake Point Pueblo. Listed 8/02/01.
• California, Plumas County. Red Dog Townsite. Listed 9/14/01.
• Colorado, Boulder County. Boulder County Poor Farm. Listed 9/13/01.
• Connecticut, New Haven County.


**NEWS & NOTES**

The George C. Frison Institute is dedicated to enhancing research into questions of the Paleoindian period and the peopling of western hemisphere, especially as Wyoming data bears on these significant research topics. Last year’s winners of the Frison Institute grants were Dr. Bruce Bradley of Cortez, Colorado and Dr. Jack L. Hofman of the University of Kansas, Lawrence. Each grant will pay up to $500 directly to the principal investigator. Deadline for submission is February 15, 2002. For more information and an application write to: Director, George C. Frison Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of Wyoming, Laramie, WY 82071; email: anpro1@uwyo.edu; or see our web page at http://uwadmnweb.uwyo.edu/anth/Frison/FRISON.html

**US/ICOMOS announces the 2002 International Summer Intern Program in Historic Preservation.** US/ICOMOS (the United States Committee, International Council on Monuments and Sites) is seeking US-citizen graduate students or young professionals for paid internships abroad in summer 2002. Past host countries have included Argentina, Australia, Bulgaria, Croatia, France, Ghana, Great Britain, India, Lithuania, Malta, Norway, Poland, Slovak Republic, Spain, Transylvania, and Turkey. These are entry-level, professional positions, where participants work for public and private nonprofit historic preservation organizations and agencies, under the direction of professionals, for a period of three months. Internships in the past have required training in architecture, architectural history, landscape architecture, materials conservation, history, archaeology, interpretation, museum studies, and cultural tourism. In some countries with convertible currency, interns will be paid a stipend equivalent to $4,500 for the 12-week working internship. In other cases, the stipend is based on local wages. Exchanges offer partial or full travel grants. Applications must be graduate students or young professionals with at minimum a bachelors degree (masters degree or near completion of masters preferred), 22 to 35 years old. Applicants should be able to demonstrate their qualifications in preservation and heritage conservation through a combination of academic and work experience; the program is intended for those with a career commitment to the field. Speaking ability in the national language is desirable. Attendance at the orientation and final debriefing programs in Washington, DC is obligatory. Applications are due no later than February 15, 2002. For further information and to receive application forms, contact: Grachel Kubaitis, Programs Officer, US/ICOMOS, 401 F Street NW, Room 331, Washington, DC 20001-2728; tel: (202) 842-1862; fax: (202) 842-1861; email: gkubaitis@usicomos.org. Updated information on the 2002 program will be posted as available. Further general information and the application form can be found at the US/ICOMOS website: http://www.icomos.org/usicomos.

**SAA COMMITTEES**

PEC, from page 9

(beck@grove.iup.edu) and to join with us at the next annual meeting by attending a public education workshop or session or joining the Public Education Interest Group. I also encourage you to respond to SAA President Bob Kelly’s suggestion to contribute to one of the SAA endowment funds (The SAA Archaeological Record 1[4]:8). Through the years, most of the SAA’s public education and outreach initiatives have been funded through partnerships with other agencies. Your contributions will make us more effective in our efforts to provide information about archaeology to our many publics.
POSITIONS OPEN

Position: Repatriation Coordinator
Location: Tucson, Arizona

The Arizona State Museum (ASM) invites applications for a repatriation coordinator to administer the activities of the State Historic Preservation Laws that deal with repatriation and burial agreements (ARS 41-844 and ARS 41-865), serve as chair of the Repatriation Committee, coordinate NAGPRA activities, teach, and conduct research in Archaeology or Bioarchaeology. As an academic professional, the selected candidate is a member of the general faculty of the University of Arizona and is eligible for a continuing status, peer-reviewed evaluation process similar to tenure. The position is in the curatorial sequence and rank (assistant, associate, or full curator) will be determined based on qualifications. Minimum qualifications include: M.A. in Anthropology (Ph.D. preferred), research and field experiences in Archaeology and Bioarchaeology, demonstrated research capability as evidenced through professional publications, and familiarity with NAGPRA or state reburial legislation. To apply, please submit a cover letter, CV, and names and contact information for three references to Dr. Lane Beck, Chair, Repatriation Search Committee, Arizona State Museum, University of Arizona, P.O. Box 210026, Tucson, AZ 85721-0026. Review of applications will begin 1/09/02 and continues until filled. The University of Arizona is an EEO/AA Institution and nomination of women, persons of color, and members of other underrepresented groups. EOE/AA Institution.

Position: Assistant Professor
Location: Boise, Idaho

The Boise State University Department of Anthropology invites applications for a tenure-track assistant professor in archaeology beginning August 2002 with an emphasis in hunter-gatherer research in an area of American archaeology and with a background or specialization in ethnoarchaeology, faunal analysis, or ethnoarchaeology. Applicants must have a history of fieldwork and publication in their area of expertise. Send a letter describing research and teaching experience, vita, transcript, a sample of published work, as well as names and addresses of three referees to Chair, Search Committee, Department of Anthropology, 1910 University Drive, Boise State University, Boise, Idaho 83725-1950. Selection process will begin January 15, 2002, and will continue until position is filled. Boise State University is strongly committed to achieving excellence through cultural diversity. The University actively encourages application and nomination of women, persons of color, and members of other underrepresented groups. EOE/AA Institution.

Position: Assistant Professor
Location: Sacramento, California

California State University, Sacramento. Entry-level assistant professor tenure-track position in archaeology to begin fall semester, 2002. The department seeks a specialist in the archaeology and prehistory of Latin America with research expertise in Formative or Post-Formative cultural complexes and a record of successful research and publication relating to Mexico, Central, or South America (with northern Mesoamerica preferred). Someone with an active program of theoretically informed research is desired. The successful applicant must be prepared to support the general archaeology curriculum in the department and develop new undergraduate and graduate offerings dealing with the processes of food domestication, the evolution of cultural complexity, and the emergence of state-level societies. Ph.D. in Anthropology required at the time of application. Details and further information are available on the department’s website, http://www.csus.edu/anth/html/opportunities.html. Submit a letter of application along with a curriculum vita and the names, telephone numbers, and (if available) email addresses of three references. Send materials to: George W. Rich, Chair, Search Committee, Department of Anthropology, California State University, Sacramento, 6000 J street, Sacramento, CA 95819-6106. Review of applications will begin on December 3, 2001. The position will remain open until filled.

Position: Assistant Professor
Location: Durango, Colorado

Fort Lewis College, Department of Anthropology, seeks applicants for a tenure-track Assistant Professor in Southwest archaeology, beginning August 26, 2002 (budgetary approval pending). Teaching duties comprise three courses per semester (12 credit hours) including Southwestern Archaeology, Introduction to Archaeology, Computers in Archaeology, Quantitative Methods, and courses in interdisciplinary programs such as General Education and the Southwest Program. The successful candidate will demonstrate excellence in teaching and research, and possess a Ph.D. in the appropriate field at the time of appointment. A secondary area of expertise in the Americas is highly desirable. Submit a letter of application, CV, and the names and addresses of three references to Dr. Philip Duke, Department of Anthropology, Fort Lewis
POSITIONS OPEN

College, Durango, CO 81301 by December 31, 2001. Pre-interviews will also be held at the AAA meeting in November 2001. Fort Lewis College is an AA/EEO employer. Women and minorities are encouraged to apply.

Position: Cartographic/Geographic Information Systems Specialist
Location: New Orleans, Louisiana

R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates, Inc. has an immediate opening for an experienced cartographic/geographic information systems specialist to join the professional staff of our Graphics department in New Orleans, Louisiana. The successful candidate will minimally possess a graduate degree from an accredited university. This position requires expertise and interest in the use of various computer-assisted graphics programs and GIS packages, including Microstation, AutoCAD, Geomedia Pro, and ArcInfo. This position requires excellent time and personnel management, as well as interpersonal skills. A background in archaeology or cultural resources management is desired but is not required; we will train the right person. R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates, Inc. is a national leader in the field of cultural resources management and historic preservation. The offered position comes with excellent benefits, BCBS Medical/Dental, Term Life, STD, full cafeteria plan, and a liberal 401(k) plan. The salary is competitive and negotiable. Send letter, resume, and names/contact information for (3) references to: R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates, Inc., Attention: G. W. Biondo, HRM, 309 Jefferson Highway, Suite A, New Orleans, Louisiana 70121-2512, tel: (504) 837-1940; fax: (504) 837-1550. Alternatively, these documents may be submitted via e-mail to: gbiondo@rcgoodwin.com or neworleans@rcgoodwin.com.

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

R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates, Inc. is recruiting project managers and assistant project managers for its New Orleans, Louisiana office. Successful candidates for these positions must possess, at minimum, a M.A. in Anthropology/Archaeology, have completed an archaeological field school, and served in a similar capacity for at least one year. These positions require superior writing, management, and interpersonal skills. Computer skills, artifact analysis, experience with report or proposal writing, and Section 106 training are highly desirable. Opportunity for advancement to significant management responsibilities is available for the right candidate. These are full-time, salaried, professional positions that come with a full benefits package (paid holidays, vacation, and sick leave; health, dental, and life insurance; Term Life; and a liberal 401(K) plan). Salaries are highly competitive and commensurate with educational and professional experience. Send letter, resume, and names/contact information for at least three references to: R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates, Inc., Attention: G.W. Biondo, HRM, 309 Jefferson Highway, Suite A, New Orleans, Louisiana 70121-2512, tel: (504) 837-1940; fax: (504) 837-1550. Alternatively, these documents may be submitted via email to: gbiondo@rcgoodwin.com or neworleans@rcgoodwin.com. Equal Opportunity Employer.

Position: Senior Archaeologist
Location: Greenbelt, Maryland

Greenhorne & O’Mara, Inc. is in search of a senior archaeologist (principal investigator) for Greenbelt, Maryland. The successful candidate will have a master’s degree, Ph.D. preferred, in archaeology or anthropology with a focus on prehistory, and 10+ years archaeological experience in the Middle Atlantic region. Must have proven ability to manage all aspects and phases of archaeological investigations. Must have demonstrated ability in writing cultural resources management reports. Excellent written/verbal communication skills are required. Send resume to: vboyd@g-and-o.com, or fax: (301) 220-2595, Attn: V. Boyd. http://www.G-and-O.com. eeo/aa m/f/h/v.

Position: Assistant Professor
Location: Bethlehem, Pennsylvania

Lehigh University invites applications for a tenure-track, assistant professor of anthropology position, to contribute to an interdisciplinary Department of Sociology and Anthropology. Candidates’ primary research and teaching interests should be in the area of medical anthropology, with an area specialty. Preference will be given to candidates who have regional expertise in South or East Asia and can contribute to the Asian Studies program. The successful candidate is expected to take a turn in teaching core courses and augment existing research methods in cultural anthropology. Ph.D. is required as is demonstrated excellence in teaching and research. The position will begin in fall 2002. The deadline for applications is December 17, 2001. Women and minorities are particularly encouraged to apply. Send a letter of application, including a vita, names of four references, and a one-page statement of interest to: James R. McIntosh, Chair, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Lehigh University, 681 Taylor Street, Bethlehem, PA 18015.

Position: Director, William S. Webb Museum of Anthropology
Location: Lexington, Kentucky

University of Kentucky, Department of Anthropology is seeking qualified applicants for the position of director of the William S. Webb Museum of Anthropol-
Anthropology and Office of State Archaeology. This is a 9-month tenure-track faculty position, in the Special Title Series, available at the assistant-professor level beginning August 16, 2002. Successful candidates must have a strong background in administration, collections management and curation, site file management, teaching, and the legal and ethical issues of repatriation. S/he must be an active researcher in the field of eastern North American archaeology and have a proven research and publication record. Evidence for excellence in teaching should also be submitted. The candidate is expected to teach one course every fourth semester and to work one month during the summer for an additional 1/9-month salary. To ensure full consideration, applications should be received by November 15, 2001. The search will remain open until the position is filled. The University of Kentucky is AA/EEO: women and minorities are especially encouraged to apply. Applicants should submit a letter describing their museum and site file management, teaching, and research experience; vita; and names/address of 3 references to: Chair, Museum Director Search Committee, Department of Anthropology, 211 Lafferty Hall, University of Kentucky, Lexington KY 40506-0024.

Position: Assistant Professor
Location: Memphis, Tennessee

University of Memphis, Department of Anthropology invites applications for an anticipated full-time, tenure-track position in Archaeology at the rank of assistant professor beginning August 2001. Ph.D. in anthropology is required at the time of appointment. Candidate must have specialization in geoarchaeology and/or lithic analysis in Southeastern United States. Priority will be given to applicants specializing in the Paleoindian/Archaic period. The successful candidate will be expected to have a commitment to local research and have strong computer mapping and/or quantitative skills. In addition, the candidate should be prepared to contribute to the undergraduate and graduate programs within the department and will be expected to teach introduction to archaeology and physical anthropology. The department is seeking a colleague with research and teaching expertise in areas that complement, but do not duplicate, the existing departmental strengths, and whose theoretical and methodological perspectives link with the department’s strong commitment to applied anthropology. Review of applications will begin November 1, 2001, and will continue until position is filled. The University of Memphis is an equal opportunity/affirmative action employer. Please send a letter of application including letter outlining research interests and academic experience, vita, and names, telephone numbers, and email addresses of three references to: David H. Dye, Committee Chair, Department of Anthropology, University of Memphis, Memphis, TN 38152-3390, tel: (901) 678-3330, fax: (901) 678-2069.

Position: Senior Project Manager
Location: Austin, Texas

Parsons Engineering Science, Inc., a national leading full-service environmental firm, is seeking a self-motivated individual to build and lead a cultural resources program within the Austin, Texas office. Candidate must meet or exceed the Secretary of the Interior’s qualifications, know the regulatory process, and have demonstrated experience in project management, marketing, and budget and proposal formulation. M.A. or Ph.D. required in directly related field. Experience in Texas cultural resources management preferred. To apply, fax or send resumes to: Parsons Engineering Science, Inc., Human Resources Dept., 8000 Center Park Drive #200, Austin, TX 78754. Email resumes to: sherri.lynch@parsons.com. EOE/H/V/F/M.

Position: Curator (Assistant Scientist)
Location: Carbondale, Illinois

The Center for Archaeological Investigations, Southern Illinois University Carbondale, seeks a curator (assistant scientist) beginning August 2002. Curator manages the center’s large archaeological collections and records from the Midwest and the Southwest, as well as local site file records and NAGPRA issues. Curator must be an active, fundable researcher. Ancillary duties may include teaching, public outreach, and interpretive activity. A Ph.D. in Anthropology or related discipline with a specialization in archaeology is required. Some background in museum methods and curatorial techniques is required. Topical and geographic specialties are open; individuals with laboratory-orientated specializations are encouraged to apply. Preference will be given to applicants with ongoing fundable research, competitive grants/fellowships, publications, and museum experience. Closing date is December 7, 2001. Degree must be completed by July 1, 2002. Send letter, vita, and list of references to: Dr. Brian Butler, Director, Center for Archaeological Investigations, Southern Illinois University Carbondale, Mail Code 4527, Carbondale, IL 62901-4527; tel: (618) 453-5031, fax: (618) 453-8467, email: bbutler@siu.edu. SIUC is an equal opportunity/affirmative action employer.

Position: Visiting Scholar
Location: Carbondale, Illinois

Southern Illinois University Carbondale, Center for Archaeological Investigations seeks its 2002–2003 visiting scholar (VS). The VS organizes and conducts an archaeological conference at SIUC, resulting in an edited volume of selected papers. VS assembles and edits conference volume while in residence. The successful candidate is also expected to pursue her/his research and teach one seminar in her/his specialty. 11-month term
The University of Texas at San Antonio

Location: San Antonio, Texas

Position: Assistant Professor

USU is an AA/EEO employer.

University of Utah

Committee Chair, Department of Sociology, Social Work and Anthropology, Utah

Position is filled. Send letter of application that includes a statement of teaching experience, vita, names and contact information, see http://www.usu.edu/~anthro. Review of applications begins November 1, 2001, and will continue until the position is filled. Please send letter of interest, vita, names, telephone numbers, and email addresses of three references. Applicants who are not U.S. citizens must state their current visa and residency status. The review of applications will begin November 1, 2001, and will continue until the position is filled. Send all application materials by mail to: Search Chair, Department of Anthropology, University of Texas at San Antonio, 6900 North Loop 1604 West, San Antonio, TX 78249-0652. The University of Texas at San Antonio is an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer.

POSITION: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

LOCATION: LOGAN, UTAH

Utah State University seeks a full-time, tenure-track assistant professor specializing in the archaeology of the American West who will also serve as the director of the USU Museum of Anthropology, a small teaching museum. Minimum qualifications include Ph.D. by time of appointment and potential for quality teaching, research, publication, and grantsmanship. Preferred qualifications include strong research, publication, and granting record; and prior teaching, museum, and program development experience. Anticipated teaching assignment is 3–4 courses per year; ability and willingness to teach archaeology field school in some summers. For program information, see http://www.usu.edu/~anthro. Review of applications begins November 15, 2001, and continues until position is filled. Send letter of application, vita, names and contact information for three references, and a reprint or reprint to: Archaeology Search Committee Chair, Department of Sociology, Social Work and Anthropology, Utah State University, Logan, UT 84322-0730. USU is an AA/EEO employer.

POSITION: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

LOCATION: SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS

The University of Texas at San Antonio Department of Anthropology, pending budget approval, invites applications for a tenure-track assistant professor position in the archaeology of complex societies to begin Fall 2002. Required qualifications: Ph.D. in anthropology or archaeology by August 31, 2002; theoretically motivated research interests focusing on the nature and development of social and cultural complexity in the New World. Preferred qualifications: areal focus on Mesoamerica or South America; evidence of excellence in teaching; promise of developing a funded research program; desire and ability to contribute to graduate program growth; ability to complement current faculty specializations. Responsibilities include teaching general anthropology, basic courses in archaeology, and elective courses in area of specialization; ongoing research; and service in a dynamic program offering both an undergraduate and graduate major. Courses are offered either at the UTSA Main or Downtown campuses. Applicants must submit a letter of application that includes a statement of teaching and research interests, a C.V., and the names, telephone numbers, and email addresses of three references. Applicants who are not U.S. citizens must state their current visa and residency status. The review of applications will begin November 1, 2001, and will continue until the position is filled. Send all application materials by mail to: Search Chair, Department of Anthropology, University of Texas at San Antonio, 6900 North Loop 1604 West, San Antonio, TX 78249-0652. The University of Texas at San Antonio is an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer. Women and minorities are encouraged to apply.

POSITION: DIRECTOR

LOCATION: HEMET, CALIFORNIA

The Western Center Community Foundation (WCCF) seeks a highly qualified person to lead the long-range development of the Western Center for Archaeology & Paleontology (WCAP), ensuring financial stability and assuming responsibility for overall management and administration of WCAP programs and operations. The Director will work with the University of California, Riverside (UCR) and other academic administrators and faculty to develop and enhance the academic programs of the museum and related facilities and programs. The ideal candidate should have a combination of experience and accomplishments to qualify as the chief administrative officer of a major museum and educational enterprise: recognized excellence in an academic field compatible within the research focus of WCAP; an earned doctorate with a record of responsible museum-related experience; a record of continuing and demonstrated leadership in research, government, private, or nonprofit sectors; demonstrated success in fund raising or obtaining extramural funds, donations, private gifts, and earned revenues; experience in long-range and strategic planning, budget development, and staff supervision; and excellent organizational and leadership skills sufficient to coordinate WCAP efforts with university administration. The successful applicant will have an advanced degree and a record of scholarly achievement sufficient for appointment to a senior position in an academic department. He or she will possess a commitment to ethical and collaborative decision-making, superior oral and written communication skills, and a highly developed public presence that will effectively represent WCAP to local, regional, national, and international audiences. Compensation: negotiable, depending on experience and qualifications. Closing date: December 31, 2001 or until filled. Please send letter of interest, curriculum vitae, and current references to: Joan S. Schneider, Ph.D., Interim Executive Director, Western Center Community Foundation, 300 East Newport Road, P.O. Box 828, Hemet, CA 92546. Tel: (909) 791-0033; fax: (909) 791-0032; jschneid@citrus.ucr.edu. Website: http://westerncenter.ucr.edu.
November 14–17
The 58th Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Archaeological Conference will be held at the Marriott Hotel in Chattanooga, Tennessee. For more information, see http://www.uark.edu/campus-resources/seac/index.html.

November 14–18
The 34th Annual Chacmool Conference, “Chacmool 2001—An Odyssey Of Space,” will be held at the University of Calgary, Alberta, Canada. For further information, fax: (403) 282-9567; email: cjcluney@hotmail.com.

November 16–19
The 4e Festival International Du Film Archéologique is held in Brussels, Belgium. Screenings will be held at Fortis Banque auditorium, 1 Rue de la Chancellerie. For information, tel/fax: +(32-2) 672-82-91; email: asblkineon@hotmail.com; web: http://users.wing.be/asblkineon.

November 26–29
The X Congreso Uruguayo De Arqueología will be held in Montevideo. For information, contact aua_us@yahoo.com.

November 28–December 2
The 100th Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association will be held at the Marriott Wardman Park Hotel in Washington, DC. Special activities exploring the history of American anthropology will be presented as part of this centennial meeting. Information appears at http://www.aaanet.org.

November 29–December 1
The 2nd Annual Laurier Brantford Interdisciplinary Conference will be held with the theme “Grave Concerns: The Ethics of the Dead.” Topics include rights of the dead; the repatriation/reburial of skeletal remains and funerary offerings; preservation and commemoration of battlefields and other sites of mass death; the personal and public aspects of death; disposal of the dead; and death, art and censorship. For more information, contact Sue Mestekemper; email: brantford@wlu.ca; web: http://www.wlu.ca/~wwwbrant.

January 3–6
The 103rd Annual Meeting of the Archaeological Institute of America will be held at the Philadelphia Marriott in conjunction with the American Philosophical Association. The AIA Annual Meeting brings together professional and avocational archaeologists from around the world to learn about the latest developments in the field. Registration rates and deadlines, with preliminary program information, is available at http://www.archaeological.org. For immediate questions, please contact the AIA Meetings Department at meetings@aiabu.edu.

January 9–12
The 35th Conference on Historical and Underwater Archaeology, sponsored by the Society for Historical Archaeology and the Advisory Council on Underwater Archaeology, will be held at the Adam’s Mark Hotel in Mobile, Alabama. The plenary session and meeting theme is “Colonial Origins,” in recognition of the 300th anniversary of Mobile’s founding by French colonists. For information, contact Amy Young, Department of Anthropology and Sociology, P.O. Box 5074, University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg, MS 39406; fax: (601) 266-6373; email: amy.young@usm.edu. For local arrangements information, contact Bonnie Gums, Center for Archaeological Studies, HUMB 34, University of South Alabama, Mobile, AL 36688; fax: (334) 460-6080; email: bgums@jaguar1.usouthal.edu.

March 20–24
The 67th Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology will be held at the Adams Mark Hotel, Denver, Colorado. For more information, contact SAA Headquarters, 900 Second St. N.E. #12, Washington, DC 20002; tel: (202) 789-8200; fax: (202)789-0284; or email: meetings@saa.org; web: http://www.saa.org.
**APRIL 5–6**

A Trans-Borderland Conference, “Social Control on Spain’s North American Frontiers: Choice, Persuasion, and Coercion,” will be held at Southern Methodist University, Dallas, TX. This conference marks the culmination of a year-long dialogue between scholars from Mexico, the U.S., and Spain, as each explores the nature of social control in the region he or she knows best, explaining how and why the institutions and practices in that region depart from or adhere to what are generally perceived as “norms” on the Spanish frontier. For more information, contact Andrea Boardman, Associate Director, Clements Center for Southwest Studies, Dallas Hall Room 356, Southern Methodist University, P.O. Box 750176, Dallas, TX 75275-0176; tel: (214) 768-1233; fax: (214) 768-4129; email: swcenter@mail.smu.edu; web: http://www2.smu.edu/swcenter.

**MAY 18–21**

The 16th Biennial Conference of the Society of Africanist Archaeologists will be hosted by the Department of Anthropology at the University of Arizona in Tucson. For further information, contact David Killick (email: killick@email.arizona.edu) or Charles Bollong (email: cbollong@email.arizona.edu) or visit the SAFA website at http://www.rz.uni-frankfurt.de/~bornu/safa/safa.htm.

**JUNE 4–9**

The 4th Agon International Meeting of Archaeological Film of the Mediterranean Area held in Athens is a biennial festival and screens films about folk art and other endangered Mediterranean popular traditions. For more information, contact Maria Palatou, Secretary, AGON c/o Archaiologia ke Technes (Archeology and Arts), 10 Karitsi Square, 102 37, Athens, Greece; tel: (30.1) 33.12.990; tel/fax: (30.1) 33.12.991; email: mpalatou@arxaiologia.gr.

**MAY 3–4**

The First Chicago Conference on Eurasian Archaeology, hosted by the University of Chicago Department of Anthropology, is being convened to allow scholars and students working in the region an opportunity to share recent results and discuss priorities for future investigations. The theme of the meeting is “Beyond the Steppe and the Sown: Integrating Local and Global Visions.” For further information, see the conference website at http://acc.spc.uchicago.edu/eurasianconference/ or contact David Peterson at dpeterson@uchicago.edu.

**APRIL 24–27**

The 5th Cinarchea Internationales Archäologie-Film-Kunst-Festival held in Kiel, Germany is a biennial festival and scholarly conference focused on recent international productions about the field, previous international prize winners, notable older productions, and experimental archaeology. The 2002 conference theme is “Discoveries, Films, False Friends: Archaeological Films Working for Profit and Propaganda.” Screenings will be held at the Stadthalle in central Kiel. Entry deadline: December 1. For information, contact Dr. Kurt Denzer, Director, CINAR- CHEA, Breiter Weg 10, D-24105 Kiel, Germany; tel: (49.431) 579.4941/4942; tel/fax: (49.431) 579.4940; email: agfilm@email.uni-kiel.de; web: http://www.uni-kiel.de/cinarchea/index.htm.

**NOVEMBER 16–18**

The 2nd Conference of the Société Des Américanistes De Belgique is on the theme of “Roads to War and Pipes of Peace: Conflict and Cooperation in the Americas, Past and Present.” It will take place at the Université Libre de Bruxelles (Brussels). For more information, contact the Organizing Committee of the Société Des Américanistes De Belgique, Musées Royaux d’Art et d’Histoire (Section Amérique), Parc du Cinquantenaire 10, 1040 Bruxelles, Belgique; email: collosab@ulb.ac.be.
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Society for American Archaeology
900 Second Street NE, #12
Washington, DC  20002-3557 USA
Telephone: +1 202/789-8200
Fax: +1 202/789-0284
CALL FOR VOLUNTEERS

You can help the 67th Annual Meeting in Denver run smoothly. We need enthusiastic volunteers to help out the SAA team March 20-24, 2002, in meeting support services and as session attendants. In return for 12 hours of your time, you will receive FREE meeting registration (refunds available to preregistered participants will be processed after the meeting), a COMPLIMENTARY copy of the 67th Annual Meeting Abstracts book, $5 stipend per shift, and SAA’s sincere gratitude. This is a great opportunity to meet fellow archaeological enthusiasts and get involved in all aspects of our fun and exciting meeting. Act quickly as opportunities are limited. For details and a volunteer application, contact Andrew Caruso at SAA headquarters, 900 Second Street NE, Suite 12, Washington, DC 20002-3557; email andrew_caruso@saa.org; fax: (202) 789-0284; telephone: 202 789-8200.