MUSEUM DIRECTOR

The University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology & Anthropology seeks candidates interested in the post of Director. We are soliciting applications from individuals with academic qualifications that would allow them to be appointed to the tenured rank of Full Professor at the University of Pennsylvania. Candidates will have demonstrated significant experience in dealing with the kinds of national and international research and educational programs, both public and University level, that the University Museum has conducted and will continue to pursue, as well as experience in administration. The new Director will possess the institutional vision and interpersonal skills necessary for the well-being of the Museum. The successful candidate will also demonstrate significant fundraising achievements and planning abilities.

The University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology & Anthropology is a major institution of research, education and preservation with a full-time staff of 120 and over 200 volunteers. It has a distinguished history of archaeological and anthropological field work which is reflected in collections of holdings in New World archaeology and ethnography, Near Eastern archaeology and ethnography, Egyptology, Classical archaeology, Asian archaeology and fine arts, and the ethnography and archaeology of Africa and the Pacific. The Museum currently sponsors active research in eighteen countries. Many of the Museum's galleries have been recently renovated, although the task is not yet completed.

The University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology & Anthropology also has a long and distinguished record of community education and public outreach. Our Education Department offers extensive programming for school children. The Museum's traveling exhibits and innovative website enable the museum to share its collections and research both nationally and internationally.

Closing date for application is September 15, 2003. Candidates should submit a letter of application along with an academic vita, to:

Chair, Director of Museum Search Committee
University of Pennsylvania
Office of the Provost, 122 College Hall
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6303

The University of Pennsylvania is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer and is strongly and actively committed to diversity within its community. Women and minority candidates are encouraged to apply.
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EDITOR’S CORNER

John Kantner

John Kantner is an assistant professor of anthropology at Georgia State University.

Introducing This Issue

Thanks to the efforts of José Luis Lanata and Gabriela Uruñuela Ladron de Guevara, the Associate Editors for the Exchanges columns, we are pleased to present this issue on Latin American Historical Archaeology. José Luis, who suggested this theme, introduces the issue below.

Latin American Historical Archaeology

JOSE LUIS LANATA, ASSOCIATE EDITOR

During the past 20 years, archaeology has moved from an interdisciplinary era to what may be called an “interphase” period. This change is visible in new theoretical perspectives, novel methodologies, and the significance of archaeological contributions to other non-anthropological sciences. Far from narrowing our goals and purposes, today’s scientific archaeology has a broader spectrum of themes and topics, challenging us to maintain focus in two major areas: the relevance of archaeological theory and the contribution of our science to the knowledge of human history, past and recent.

Historical archaeology—particularly in the Americas—provides a good example of this interphase era. With an important variety of theoretical frameworks—from neo-Darwinism to neo-Marxism, passing through Social Agency—historical archaeologists are covering not the traditional issues, but the newest. Today, historical archaeology is more than the archaeology of the others; it is also the archaeology of us as conquerors and the archaeology of us as conquered during European colonization. And, in Latin American countries, it is also the archaeology of us as victims of 20th-century state terrorism.

The goals of this thematic issue on Latin American historical archaeology are simple: to present an ensemble of current historical archaeological research and to illustrate the variety of theoretical lines that are being explored. This set of contributions is especially valuable since topics on historical archaeology are not frequently covered in American Antiquity and Latin American Antiquity; in this sense, readers are presented here with the state of the art for this area of archaeological inquiry.

Future Thematic Issues

Several people have already contacted me regarding these planned thematic issues:

January 2004 (December 1st deadline) The State of Academic Archaeology

May 2004 (April 1st deadline) Archaeology of American Ethnicity

If you would like to contribute, or if you have ideas for future thematic issues, email me at kantner@gsu.edu or call (404) 651-1761!
Dear Colleague:

SAA has made some important changes for the 2004 membership renewal process. In this column I would like to outline what those changes are and urge you to make life simpler for yourself and more cost effective for the Society by taking advantage of them. Many people have asked when SAA would make electronic transactions available, fast, and easy. Well, the time is now!

First a few words about the new online renewal process; then I would like to ask you to do two things to help SAA function more efficiently.

Online renewal can be accessed through the Members Only section of the SAA website. Just point your browser to www.saa.org and click on Members' login. And while you are at this point in the process . . . MAYb of you have asked for the ability to personalize your logon and password (and yes, I also have to look up that darned member number every single time I log in because I can't remember it either!). The system has been changed so that you can do just that. SAA's executive director sent you a letter earlier this summer outlining the procedure. If you have any problems, just call SAA headquarters (+1 (202) 789-8200) and the staff will be happy to help you.

Now, back to online renewal: Once you have logged in, all you do is click on the red button that says “Dues Renewal” and follow the directions.

If SAA has your current email address, you will already have received an electronic renewal notice. In the next few weeks, we will also be mailing traditional, hard-copy membership renewal invoices for 2004. And this brings me to my two requests:

First, in the future, SAA will be offering you the convenience of doing more and more things electronically. The key to making electronic transactions work effectively for you and for SAA is our ability to contact you electronically. Please give the Society your email address and remember to keep it current—this can also be done easily in the Members Only section of the website. We understand that you don't want to be “spammed” or have your email box crammed with messages from SAA, and I assure you that will not happen. We will not release your email address to others, nor will we use it for any purposes other than to conduct Society business.

My second request is that you please pay your dues when you receive the first renewal notice. Many of you do renew right away, but others wait until the second or third notice, or even longer. (Archaeologists? Procrastinate? What are the chances of that??) Many people probably don't realize how much money SAA spends each year, simply reminding people that their memberships are about to expire or have already expired. When you consider that SAA has more than 6,600 members, the costs quickly add up! If all members renewed after the first notice, SAA saves as much as $15,000 a year! I'm sure we all want as much of our money as possible to go to programs and initiatives rather than to unnecessary administrative costs.

So, here are the ways you can help your Society:

- **Please renew your membership after receiving your first notice.** Electronic notices have been sent and paper notices will go out by mid-October.
- **Renew online** if at all possible. If not, return your scannable renewal form with your snail mail payment.
- **Get—and stay—connected!** Please share or update your email address with SAA headquarters. Simply go to the Members' Only portion of SAAweb and supply that information. While there, check the rest of your data and make sure it is correct too.

Thanks for your help and your continuing commitment to SAA. I hope to see you in Montreal!

Sincerely,

Lynne Sebastian

P.S. A reminder—all memberships are on a January through December calendar year. We even allow a one-month grace period before your membership is dropped. Please don't let that happen. I hope you'll pay early and online!
Sacred Sites Still on Congress’s Radar

The protection of Native American sites located on federal land has been an important matter for many years, one that has witnessed the passage of laws and the issuance of Executive Orders designed to improve access to, and protection of, sacred sites and the cultural resources contained within them. Over the past couple of years, though, a new cause for concern has arisen to complement the more traditional issues of resource preservation and cultural patrimony—the increasing pace of development is breathing new life into the issue.

Upon taking office, the Bush administration launched a campaign to more aggressively utilize the energy and mineral resources found on public land. This, coupled with the problem of increasing commercial development adjacent to federal land, has resulted in additional pressure on lands considered sacred by Native Americans. Congress’s response has been the introduction of legislation that would establish new procedures to allow Native Americans to manage culturally sacred public lands, to have those lands set aside from any possible development activity, and even to have the federal government hold the land in trust for the Tribes.

In the previous Congress, Rep. Nick Rahall (D-WV) introduced legislation (H.R. 2921) that would have allowed Native Americans to petition federal agencies to have lands under the jurisdiction of the agency declared “unsuitable” for “any or certain types of undertakings,” with the term “undertaking” having the same meaning that it does in the National Historic Preservation Act. Evidence, including oral history, could be presented at a hearing that would have to take place no later than 90 days following receipt of the petition, and a written decision would be issued no later than 60 days after the hearing. A finding of unsuitability for any or certain undertakings would result in that land being withdrawn from existing management plans and protected from undertakings in future management plans. There was also a provision exempting any documents or transcripts promulgated under the petition process from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act, if those materials contained “specific detail” of a Native American practice or sacred site location.

This year, Rep. Rahall has introduced a new bill (H.R. 950) that would establish a very similar process to the one contained in the old bill, only with broader implications. There are new provisions, allowing for the inclusion of “Native science” as evidence in the petition process, and also allowing for sacred lands to be taken into trust for the Tribes and to be managed by them so long as the land is managed in ways that protect its sacredness.

In addition, Senator Ben Nighthorse Campbell (R-CO) has reintroduced his Native American contracting bill (S. 288), which would establish a pilot program for tribes to enter into contracts with the Department of Interior to carry out certain land management functions relating to identifying and caring for lands that are culturally or religiously significant to Native Americans. Campbell, chairman of the Senate Indian Affairs Committee, called a hearing on sacred sites issues on June 18 to discuss some specific sites that are under pressure from commercial development as well as his legislation and the legislation that the Sacred Places Protection Coalition is drafting.

Bills have been introduced and hearings have been held in both chambers over the last two Congresses. Native American and cultural resource protection and management groups are drafting legislation and closely watching Hill activity on this issue. Sacred sites protection promises to be an issue that will be with us for some time, and one that may have enormous consequences for archaeology in the years ahead.
Montreal in 2004

The 69th Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology will be held in Montreal, March 31–April 4, 2004. The meeting sessions, posters, and exhibits, along with a few other activities, will be in Montreal’s convention center, the Palais des Congrès, with other meetings scheduled at the headquarters hotel, the Delta Centre-Ville, 777 Rue University, Montreal, Quebec H3C 3Z7 CANADA; tel: (800) 268-1133 (U.S. and Canada) or (514) 879-1370; fax: (514) 879-1761. A link to a special online reservations screen for the SAA meeting is also available from SAAweb.

An overflow property has also been established: the Holiday Inn Select, 99 Avenue Viger Ouest, Montreal, Quebec H2Z 1E9 CANADA. Reservations may be made via their toll-free phone line for U.S. and Canada—(888) 878-9888 or (514) 878-9888, or via fax: (514) 878-6341. You must ask for the group code AMARC to receive the SAA rate.

A special property has been arranged for student rates—the Hotel Travelodge, 50 Boulevard René-Lévesque Ouest, Montreal, Quebec H2Z 1A2 CANADA. To reserve a room at the SAA rates, please identify the meeting you are attending and call: (514) 874-9090; fax: (514) 874-0907; or email: travdanny@bell-net.ca. For the student hotel, current student IDs will be required.

Please note that all hotel rates, where listed, are quoted in Canadian dollars, the exchange for which fluctuates daily. SAA does quote the U.S. dollar rate on SAAweb, as of a particular date. Reservation details and links may also be found on SAAweb.

Free Memberships in SAA—Let’s Make It Two in 2004 . . .

For a chance at a free one-year membership in SAA, all you need to do is register for a room at the Delta Centre-Ville or at the Travelodge (yes, you can win a free student membership this year as well!) by January 9, 2004. One person registered by that date at each of these properties will receive a free year’s membership in SAA. Be sure to let the hotel know that you are attending the “SAA” or “Society for American Archeology” meeting to receive our special rates at these properties.

The Combined Federal Campaign (CFC)

Once again, SAA is participating in this national workplace giving effort that permits U.S. federal employees to make contributions to more than 1,400 charitable organizations and agencies through payroll deductions or contributions. Federal employees who wish to make contributions to SAA through the CFC should designate their contributions to organization #1022. On behalf of SAA, thank you to all of the federal employees who have contributed to the CFC over the past three years.

Staff Transitions

Daniel Kreps joined the staff on August 13, 2003 as coordinator, Administrative and Financial Services, replacing Melissa Byroade, who headed off to Georgetown University Law School.

Committee Interest form

As we swing into fall, are you thinking about serving on a SAA committee? There is a committee interest form on SAAweb where you may select committees that may interest you. Once you submit the form, your names are forwarded to the chairs of those committees in which you have expressed an interest. Check it out at http://www.saa.org/aboutSAA/Committees/commintrst.html to take you directly to the form.

On Technology and People

As promised in previous columns, SAA unveiled its new online live database system on August 8, 2003. One of the most asked for features—selecting one’s own login and password—is part of the new package! In late July, members received a letter from SAA with the initial login and password. After logging on the first time and changing those, they are what you would like them to be, customized to your memory. This is the first step in making the members-only side of SAAweb a much easier tool to use.

As part of the new electronic package, having your email address is one of the most important components. If you forget your customized login and password, they can be emailed to
The January 2003 issue of The SAA Archaeological Record (3[2]) contains a number of interesting and useful articles about writing and publishing archaeology. My comments concern the gender issues raised directly or indirectly by four of these articles. The questions raised are: who writes about archaeology, what kind of person is seen by the public as an archaeologist, and is there a connection between the two? And, if the image of the archaeologist as bearded is of concern to women as archaeologists, the remedy may be for us to write more articles for the public and publish in venues that are more visible to both the public and the profession (with photos of bare chins).

The paper on gendered subfields of archaeology (3[2]:25–28), based on publications in American Antiquity (AA), is heartening in most ways. It is good to know that selection of a research specialty is less gender-based than it used to be (with the exception of ground stone, which appears to have attracted only women, and flaked stone, still dominated by men, even if not statistically significant). What is disturbing about the data in this article is that they show that women have published less in AA than their relative numbers in the profession would predict. Without examining the submission rates of women and men through time, we cannot know whether women submit fewer articles or their papers are rejected more. Another possibility is that women are more likely to publish in other journals or in books. It is possible that papers published in AA are not an index of the publication accomplishments of women archaeologists. To use myself as an example, I have never even submitted a paper to AA, although I have well over 100 peer-reviewed publications. Why not? Other publishing venues seemed more appropriate for my work.

The article on the geographics of publishing in American Antiquity suggests that publishing elsewhere may be more widely true for women archaeologists than men (3[2]:29–33). This paper looks at the places about which archaeological articles are published. Although the focus is on the Americas, a group called “Old World” is part of the analysis. This category is really “everywhere except the Americas,” including the continents of Asia, Africa, Europe, and Australia, not to mention numerous islands, all lumped together. Of course, this was necessary for the point that was being made, which concerned what areas of the Americas have been favored for publication and some possible reasons why. I am not complaining about that focus, I am merely using the author’s data to make a different point. The dissertations that the author has counted as “Old World” are approximately half the total number (about 45% on the graph). The number may have been even larger given that the method chosen to identify dissertations may have missed more Old World projects than American—he certainly would have missed mine on Neolithic Korea (“Han River Chulmun togi: Subsistence and Settlement”). Even given the 45% level, the articles in AA have always been less than 10% of the total number published. What does this have to do with gender? Women, at least in the past, have disproportionately selected to do their archaeology outside of the Americas (Nelson 1994). This may help explain their smaller representation in AA, as noted above.

In “The Archaeologist as Story Teller,” Peter Young uses an example from only one woman in a 4-page article (3[2]:7–10), although several men are mentioned by name (some, of course, as bad examples). I know that he solicits articles from women as well as men, so I am not accusing him of even unconscious bias. Is it simply that men come to mind when the subject is archaeology, or are women, often in shakier positions regarding their jobs, less likely to wish to tread outside the clearly delineated grounds of “what counts”? According to folklore, women as a whole are better with words than men as a whole. Why aren’t we writing more for the popular press?

Finally, I must comment on the fact that archaeologists are still seen as male by the general public, as highlighted by the comment by Mitch Allen’s son (3[2]:5–6) that all archaeologists look alike—they all have bushy beards. The exclusion of women that this image creates has been commented on by Linda Cordell (1993) and me (Nelson 1997:42), and possibly scores of others. I used Alfred Kidder’s (1949) division of archaeologists into the

Sarah Milledge Nelson
Sarah M. Nelson is a Professor at the University of Denver, and COSWA Chair.
“hairy chested and the hairy chinned,” an expression that even more graphically excludes women, as a section heading for Gender in Archaeology which was published by Mitch Allen’s own press, but even Mitch (who is an important supporter of gender and women’s issues) makes not even a passing comment about the gender bias inherent in such a perception. The point here is not to slam anybody, but to note that the comment about bushy beards is relevant to the topic. It shows that the perception of the archaeologist as white and male has not changed as much as the possibilities for choice of a research specialty by women. (Also see the article by Jane Eva Baxter [2002], who doesn’t mention beards, but does note the predominantly white male image of the archaeologist in films.)

A possible research project could discover whether proportionately more women’s papers are rejected at AA than men’s, or whether women are more likely to publish their work elsewhere. It might be possible to design a project to see whether women are hesitant to publish in the popular press. But I can’t envision the project that would demonstrate the effect of the bearded image on women archaeologists’ submissions to AA. Still, subtly it may play a part. Women can only change this perception by being visible in all their naked chins (I am not mentioning chests here) and by publishing in places that are read by the public.
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LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Congratulations on the recent thematic issue of The SAA Archaeological Record on Site Preservation. There does not seem to be a lot of readily accessible information out there on preserving sites in place, and the articles should be very useful in helping us identify a variety of strategies for protecting important sites. You may like to point out to your readers that there are some additional sources of information that may also be useful for site preservation on private lands:

- The “Strategies for Protecting Archeological Sites on Private Lands” website at http://www2.cr.nps.gov/pad/strategies/ is a National Park Service project, co-sponsored by SAA and others, that provides information on a wide variety of tools that are available, and currently being used, for protecting archaeological sites on private lands.


Sue Henry Renaud, RPA
Heritage Preservation Services
National Park Service
At the 2003 SAA annual meeting in Milwaukee, the Society sponsored a well-attended forum titled Resolving the Curation Crisis with its partners the Council for Museum Anthropology, the American Anthropological Association, and the Society for Historical Archaeology. The forum discussants and attendees participated in often-animated discussions of the state of collections management, the national curation crisis, and museum closures. Another topic that generated some of the most visceral and energetic discussion focused on deaccessioning archaeological collections, which is driven by the realization that there just isn't enough room or funding sources to store everything we find.

Indeed, this is often a very controversial and angst-laden topic that can involve a variety of different interpretations of the actual meaning of the term “deaccessioning.” For many attending the forum, and no doubt many of you, it means only one thing—getting rid of our collections. For the next several paragraphs, I’m going to attempt to dispassionately define/describe my interpretation of deaccessioning on behalf of my colleagues on the SAA Curation Committee.

Taken from an often-quoted article from the late Marie Malaro, an expert in the curation field, deaccessioning is defined as “the permanent removal of an object that was accessioned (officially accepted) into a museum collection” (1998:217). One key term in Malaro’s definition is “object.” In many museum collections of art, history, and ethnography, for example, only an object or small group of objects are deaccessioned through a well-documented procedure. A principal difference and conundrum for archaeologists and archaeological collections managers, however, is that there is the potential to deaccession hundreds, possibly thousands, of objects. This ends up causing fear and concern and is where any deaccessioning conversation usually stops. We have passed that point and must create solutions.

Another critical term that needs to be clarified in Malaro’s definition is “remove.” For most of us, “remove” sounds pretty scary. On the other hand, “remove” involves a number of carefully considered options by museum curators and administrators. Most institutions remove an object(s) by:

- Donation: donating the object(s) to another institution.
- Transfer: directly conveying physical custody and management responsibility to another party.
- Exchange: disposing of a collection item in return for a collection item of equal value.
- Repatriation: removing particular Native American objects and remains as a result of laws and accompanying regulations, such as NAGPRA.
- Educational Use: using material remains for scientific study or hands-on school programs. These are usually objects that lack provenience information but retain their educational value.
- Destruction: disposing of an object(s) by deliberate destruction because the item has deteriorated beyond repair or use, or it is harmful to museum staff or researchers.
- Sale: offering an object(s) or collection for sale by public auction (forbidden for federal collections).

While museum professionals, including archaeologists, have faced the world of deaccessioning for years, the archaeological profession must now begin to accept that this process is likely to be inevitable. It does not mean, however, that we must just get rid of our collections. Part of the archaeological conundrum is of our own making. We simply can’t continue to keep everything we find. As Childs (1999) pointed out, the codes of ethics for SAA and Society for Professional Archaeologists imply that all materials recovered during professional activities are to be curated, keeping in mind the long-term interests of future researchers. The prevailing sentiment is that all archaeologically recovered objects may have research value at some future time and therefore should be collected and retained. This is a paradigm we must rethink.

The vast majority of museums deaccession by donation, transfer, or exchange in accordance with its mission and scope of collections. The overriding position of museum curators in private or public institutions is to make every effort to keep the material in
the public domain. Often an object(s) is donated, transferred, or exchanged that is desirable to another institution—in other words, there is a willing receiver. This is the approach that needs to be made for archaeological collections. It is the unfortunate nature of archaeological material that there are not likely to be willing takers of those 15 boxes of fire-cracked rock or debitage for which your institution no longer has room. Despite that challenge, every effort needs to be made to facilitate donation, transfer, or exchange of archaeological collections to a willing institution rather than taking them to a dump. Another option is to encourage more consideration of how we keep what we have by developing tiered storage requirements. Many collections should be maintained in 36 CFR 79-defined, highly controlled environments. Other collections might be stored in less-controlled underground facilities in secured locations, for example. All of this will involve hard work, but it is possible and worth it.

We must be proactive as a profession in approaching this issue for new collections. We need to reassess our collecting strategies. Each scope of work must clearly spell out the collecting strategy for a project. This does not mean refusing to collect historic period material if your research is focused on a prehistoric occupation and visa versa. It does mean developing a sampling strategy for redundant material classes such as shell and architectural debris (e.g., brick fragments, rusty nails, and window glass). Because of the very serious nature of sampling for future research endeavors, it must be done very carefully and under the guidance of an expert in the material being sampled.

Another thing that needs to happen is the lead federal agency identified by Congress, the National Park Service, must revisit the regulation on procedures to deaccession federally owned or administered archaeological materials. It was initially proposed in 1990 as part of 36 CFR Part 79 Curation of Federally-Owned and Administered Collections, but not promulgated due to the controversy it engendered. Many attitudes have changed.

In a climate where space is equated with money, archaeologists must face the hard reality that we simply can’t keep everything. The professional community and its representatives must address this critical issue or we face the possibility that decisions will be made for us. Our new paradigm should be that the best deaccession policy is a good collecting policy.
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SONDERMAN, continued on page 41
Montreal has been selected to host the 69th Annual Meeting of SAA (March 31–April 4, 2004). This will only be the fourth time that the SAA holds its Annual Meeting outside of the USA, three of which have been in Canada. It is therefore uncommon to hold the annual meeting north of the border, even though Montreal can be listed among the most visited Canadian cities by our friendly neighbors to the south. It is a personal honor to serve the Society as Program Chair, a demanding task for which it is difficult to satisfy everybody. In the course of doing the best job I can, I will always tell myself that you can’t make an omelet without breaking eggs—if the Montreal Meeting is a popular one, it will mean more headaches and more omelets. More seriously, the greater the participation, the greater the opportunity for me to organize a fascinating and well-balanced program. The Montreal meeting should be unique and remembered for a long time. Montreal promises to be an adventure for our American guests, but don’t forget to bring your passport to avoid any problems or delays at Canadian Customs. The intellectual atmosphere should be warm and will be stimulated by the excitement of gathering in a French City with European charm. I hope that the submissions you have just sent will reflect the vitality of our discipline, something we should all celebrate in Montreal.

Regarding the use of LCD projectors for PowerPoint presentations, we will keep the status quo—presenters are responsible for bringing their own computer and LCD projector to the room, and no extra time is allowed in case of technical problems. Rooms will be equipped with a table and an extension cord.

It is SAA members who organize symposiums and poster sessions and participate in forums and special events. The quality and diversity of these events are not the responsibility of the Program Chair or the Program Committee. It is our sincere wish, however, that this Annual Meeting be remembered as an effort to favor communication between members within and outside the various symposiums, forums, and other organized sessions. The emphasis should be placed on dialogue. Cultural relations, ethnicity, political frontiers, and globalization are regularly impacting the archaeological agenda, directly exposing our discipline to contemporary political situations that are more complex than ever before; we can help to shape some of these issues.

The Opening Session of the Montreal Meeting supports our main objective of creating a friendly atmosphere that encourages dialogue between members. The title of the Opening Session is “Transcending the Modern Borders: Integrating Archaeological Data at a Regional Scale.” Adrian L. Burke (Université de Montréal) and Richard A. Boisvert (New Hampshire State Archaeologist) have accepted my invitation to work within the dialogue approach by combining American and Canadian scholars to discuss various topics of central interest to all archaeologists. They have prepared an opening session that we hope will attract a large and diverse audience. This is a unique opportunity for those archaeologists working in the bordering American states and the provinces of eastern Canada to draw attention to cross-border collaborations. Due to the regional scale of many of the archaeological phenomena we study, archaeologists in northeastern North America regularly work across linguistic, state/provincial, and international borders. We have had considerable success in working and communicating across these borders, especially in the last 25 years. It is this encouragement of dialogue across borders and the minimization of differences that we want participants to take with them from the Montreal Meeting.

By the time you read this, the deadline for submissions will have passed. But from the emails received before the deadline, I could feel a real enthusiasm for participating in the Montreal meeting. I will update you in the November issue of The SAA Archaeological Record about some of the exciting symposia. Montreal is a special city and we are planning a special meeting, including several events that will entice you to come to Montreal and that are sure to provide exceptional memories. We welcome diversity in archaeological approaches, provocative
Come to the next Annual Meeting of the SAA held in Montréal from March 31 to April 4, 2004, and taste Québec’s multicultural life in a charming setting. Located between park-covered Mont-Royal and the Saint-Laurent River, Montréal is a cosmopolitan North American city with Old World charm. Although it is the second-largest French speaking city in the world after Paris, the Montréal Island is nonetheless truly bilingual, hosting two distinct yet closely intertwined communities. The city, founded by French colonists in the mid-17th century, lies in a region occupied for centuries by Iroquoians. A century or so later, it was conquered by the British, who introduced their own institutions and architecture. Since that time, Montréal has acted as a point of convergence between cultures and as a welcoming metropolis for immigrants from around the world.

The convention center where the conference will be held is located near Old Montreal, whose cobblestone streets dating from the French and English regimes are lined with stone houses converted into art craft shops and fine restaurants. A few streets away, visitors can walk through Chinatown or relax in a café in the Quartier Latin; jazz bars and cinemas also are easily found. Montréal is host to innumerable fine restaurants—you can find anything from traditional French cuisine to Latin American, African, or Asian food. But your experience in Montréal won’t be complete without a taste of the local spring-season specialty: maple syrup!

Montréal is famous for its vibrant open-air festivals in the city’s numerous parks that attract locals and tourists at all times of the year. When the weather is too harsh, locals simply head to the underground city—a massive complex of shops and restaurants accessible using the Métro. Several historic buildings line the streets of the city center, as do museums dedicated to fine art (Musée des Beaux Arts de Montréal), contemporary art (Musée d’Art Contemporain), architecture (Canadian Center for Architecture), local history (McCord Museum, Musée d’Histoire de Montréal), and archaeology (Musée Pointe-À-Callière). With its four universities and several colleges, the city hosts a large student community and, needless to say, a very dynamic nightlife. But Montréal is first and foremost a liveable city whose charm lies not only in its attractions but also in its relaxed atmosphere and hospitality. It is a perfect setting for the next SAA meeting.

Hope to see you here!
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thoughts and renewed subjects, and the honoring of past and present leaders of the archaeological community.

Regarding the Roundtable Luncheons, plans are being made for these popular events and funding is on its way. You may have received a letter asking for your help. I ask you to please consider this since it is a very important aspect of the Annual Meeting. Be assured that you or your institution will be acknowledged in the Program. The participation of the members is the best insurance for a lively luncheon encounter.

It will be a pleasure to meet you in the most exciting city north of the border at the end of March. By then, it may still be cold outside—but it is always warm inside.
CALLS FOR AWARDS NOMINATIONS

The Society for American Archaeology calls for nominations for its awards to be presented at the 2004 Annual Meeting in Montreal. SAA's awards are presented for important contributions in many areas of archaeology. If you wish to nominate someone for one of the awards, please send a letter of nomination to the contact person for the award. The letter of nomination should describe in detail the contributions of the nominee. In some cases, a curriculum vita of the nominee or copies of the nominee's work also are required. Please check the descriptions, requirements, and deadlines for nomination for individual awards. Award winners will receive a certificate. An Award citation will be read by the SAA president during the annual business meeting, and an announcement will be published in *The SAA Archaeological Record*.

**Award for Excellence in Archaeological Analysis**

This award recognizes the excellence of an archaeologist whose innovative and enduring research has made a significant impact on the discipline. Nominees are evaluated on their demonstrated ability to successfully create an interpretable bridge between good ideas, empirical evidence, research, and analysis. This award now subsumes within it three themes presented on a cyclical basis: (1) an Unrestricted or General category (first awarded in 2001); (2) Lithic Analysis; and (3) Ceramic Analysis. The 2004 award will be presented for Excellence in the General Category, for which submission requirements are as follows:

- Letter of nomination describing in detail the nature, scope, and significance of the nominee's research and analytic contributions.
- Curriculum vita
- Any other relevant documents, including letters of support.

**Deadline for nomination:** January 5, 2004. **Contact:** Kelley Ann Hays-Gilpin, Department of Anthropology, Box 15200, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, AZ 86011; tel: (928) 523-6564; email: kelley.hays-gilpin@nau.edu.

**Crabtree Award**

Presented to an outstanding avocational archaeologist in remembrance of signal contributions of Don Crabtree. Nominees should have made significant contributions to advance understandings of local, regional, or national archaeologies through excavation, research, publication, site preservation, and/or public outreach.

**Special requirements:**
- Curriculum vita
- Letter of nomination
- Letters of support

**Deadline for nomination:** January 6, 2004. **Contact:** John E. Clark, Department of Anthropology, Brigham Young University, 950 SWKT, Provo, UT 84602; tel: (801) 422-3822; email: jec4@ad.byu.edu.

**Book Award**

The Society for American Archaeology annually awards a prize to honor a recently published book that has had, or is expected to have, a major impact on the direction and character of archaeological research. The Book Award committee solicits your nominations for this prize, which will be awarded at the 2004 Annual Meeting of the SAA. Books published in 2001 or more recently are eligible. Nominators must arrange to have one copy of the nominated book sent to each member of the committee. Please contact the chair of the committee, Guy Gibbon, for an updated list of the committee members: Dr. Guy Gibbon, Chair, Department of Anthropology, University of Minnesota, 395 Humphrey Center, Minneapolis, MN 55455.

**Deadline for nomination:** December 1, 2003. **Contact:** Guy Gibbon at the address above or tel: (612)-625-3597; email: gibbo001@umn.edu.

**Award for Excellence in Cultural Resource Management**

Presented to an individual or group to recognize lifetime contributions and special achievements in the categories of program administration/management, site preservation, and research in cultural resource management on a rotating basis. The 2004 award will recognize important contributions to program administration and management. This category may include individuals employed by federal, state, or local government agencies. This category is intended to recognize long-term, sustained contributions to the management of the archaeological record.

**Special requirements:**
- Curriculum vita
- Any relevant supporting documents

**Deadline for nomination:** January 6, 2004. **Contact:** Kay Simpson, The Louis Berger Group, Inc., 203 E. Cary Street, Suite 100, Richmond, VA 23219; tel: (804) 225-0348; fax: (804) 225-0311; email: ksimpson@louisberger.com.
**Dissertation Award**

Members (other than student members) of SAA may nominate a recent graduate whose dissertation they consider to be original, well written, and outstanding. A three-year membership in SAA is given to the recipient.

**Special requirements:**
- Nominations must be made by non-student SAA members and must be in the form of a nomination letter that makes a case for the dissertation. Self-nominations cannot be accepted.
- Nomination letters should include a description of the special contributions of the dissertation and the nominee’s current address. Nominees must have defended their dissertations and received their Ph.D. degree within three years prior to September 1, 2003.
- Nominees are informed at the time of nomination by the nominator and are asked to submit a copy of the dissertation to the committee by October 31, 2003 (to be mailed to the committee chair, Michelle Hegmon).
- Nominees do not have to be members of SAA.

**Deadline for nomination:** October 15, 2003. **Contact:** Michelle Hegmon, SAA Dissertation Award Committee, Department of Anthropology, Box 872402, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 85287-2402; tel: (480) 965-6213; fax: (480) 965-7671; email: michelle.hegmon@asu.edu.

**Fryxell Award for 2005**

The Fryxell Award is presented in recognition for interdisciplinary excellence of a scientist who need not be an archaeologist, but whose research has contributed significantly to American archaeology. The award is made possible through the generosity of the family of the late Roald Fryxell, a geologist whose career exemplified the crucial role of multidisciplinary cooperation in archaeology. Nominees are evaluated on the breadth and depth of their research and its impact on American archaeology, the nominee’s role in increasing awareness of interdisciplinary studies in archaeology, and the nominee’s public and professional service to the community. The award cycles through zoological sciences, botanical sciences, earth sciences, physical sciences, and general interdisciplinary studies. The 2005 Fryxell Award will be in the area of interdisciplinary studies. The award will be given at the SAA’s 70th Annual Meeting, March 30–April 3, in Salt Lake City, Utah. The award consists of an engraved medal, a certificate, an award citation read by the SAA president during the annual business meeting, and a half-day symposium at the Annual Meeting held in honor of the awardee.

**Special requirements:**
- Describe the nature, scope, and significance of the nominee’s contributions to American archaeology.
- Curriculum vita.
- Support letters from other scholars are helpful. Three are suggested.

**Dienje M. E. Kenyon Fellowship**

A fellowship in honor of the late Dienje M. E. Kenyon has been established to support the research of women archaeologists in the early stages of their graduate training. This year’s award, of $500, will be made to a student pursuing research in zooarchaeology, which was Kenyon’s specialty. In order to qualify for the award, applicants must be enrolled in a graduate degree program focusing on archaeology with the intention of receiving either the M.A. or Ph.D. on a topic related to zooarchaeology, and must be in the first two years of that program. Strong preference will be given to students working with faculty members with zooarchaeological expertise. Only women will be considered for the award. Applicants will be notified via email that their applications have been received. Applications will consist of:
- A statement of proposed research related to zooarchaeology, toward the conduct of which the award would be applied, of no more than 1,500 words, including a brief statement indicating how the award would be spent in support of that research.
- A curriculum vita.
- Two letters of support from individuals familiar with the applicant’s work and research potential. One of these letters must be from the student’s primary advisor and must indicate the year in which the applicant entered the graduate program.

**Deadline for nomination:** January 9, 2004, preferably sent via email as an attachment in Microsoft Word. **Contact:** Heidi Katz, Thinking Strings, P.O. Box 537, South Orange, NJ 07079; email: hkatz@thinkingsstrings.com.

**Lifetime Achievement Award**

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

**Special requirements:**
- Curriculum vita.
- Letter of nomination, outlining nominee’s lifetime accomplishments.
• Additional letters may be submitted but are not required.

**Deadline for all nomination materials:** January 5, 2004. **Contact:** Norman Yoffee, Department of Near Eastern Studies, 2068 Frieze Bldg., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1285; tel: (734) 647-4637; fax: (734) 936-2679; email: nyoffee@umich.edu.

**Fred Plog Fellowship**
An award of $1,000 is presented in memory of the late Fred Plog to support the research of an ABD who is writing a dissertation on the North American Southwest or northern Mexico or on a topic, such as culture change or regional interactions, on which Fred Plog did research. Applications should consist of a research proposal no more than three pages long and a budget indicating how the funds will be used.

**Special requirements:**
• ABD by the time the award is made.
• Two letters of support, including one from the dissertation chair that indicates the expected date of completion of the dissertation.
• Description of the proposed research and the importance of its contributions to American archaeology.

**Deadline for nomination:** December 5, 2004. **Contact:** Stephen Plog, Department of Anthropology, PO Box 400120, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA 22904-4120; email: sep6n@virginia.edu.

**Poster Award**
Two awards are given to the best presentations of archaeological research in poster sessions. One award acknowledges the best poster whose principal author is a student. The second award acknowledges the best poster by a non-student. A panel of approximately 20 archaeologists, with varied topical, geographic, and theoretical interests, serves as judges.

**Deadline for Submission:** Presented at the poster session at the SAA Annual Meeting. **Contact:** Maria Nieves Zedeño, The University of Arizona, Bureau of Applied Research in Anthropology, Tucson, AZ 85721; tel: (520) 621-9607; fax: (520) 621-9608; email: mzedeno@u.arizona.edu.

**Award for Excellence in Public Education**
This award recognizes outstanding contributions by individuals or institutions in the sharing of archaeological knowledge with the public. In 2004, eligible candidates will be educators who have contributed substantially to public education about archaeology through the development and/or presentation of educational programs, publishing, and/or the distribution of educational materials and other activities. An educator is an individual involved in education who is not a professional archaeologist, who writes, speaks, or otherwise presents information to the public or facilitates institutions and other individuals in their public education efforts. These individuals may include pre-collegiate educators, administrators, heritage interpreters, museum educators, and others. Candidates will be evaluated on the basis of their public impact, creativity in programming, leadership role, and promotion of archaeological ethics. The nominee does not need to be an SAA member.

**Special Requirements:**
Nominators will work with the Chair to assemble a nomination file that will include:
• A formal letter of nomination that identifies the nominee and summarizes their accomplishments. These accomplishments should be contextualized by addressing the following types of questions: Where does the nominee’s work fit within public education? What is the extent of the nominee’s work and impact on the field of archaeology? On students? On the general public? On other disciplines?
• Supporting materials should demonstrate (not merely assert) the nominee’s qualifications and actions. In other words, supporting materials should not be expected to stand on their own but should demonstrate the case being made in the nomination letter. Examples of supporting evidence might document the impact of a specific program in terms of the numbers of the public involved, personnel qualifications and deployment, the frequency of programs offered, formal evaluation results, and feedback from the audience. Secondary nominator letters are welcomed as well.
• Prior nomination does not exclude consideration of a nominee in subsequent years. Self nominations are accepted.

**Deadline for nomination:** January 5, 2004. The Chair of the committee will work closely with nominators in supplying the above items for completing a nomination file. Nominators are encouraged to contact the Chair by November 1, 2003, to begin this process. **Contact:** Patrice Jeppson, 2200 Benjamin Franklin Parkway, E1812, Philadelphia, PA 19130; tel: (215) 563-9262; email: pjeppson@kern.com.

**Gene S. Stuart Award**
Presented to honor outstanding efforts to enhance public understanding of archaeology, in memory of Gene S. Stuart, a writer and managing editor of National Geographic Society books. The award is given to the most interesting and responsible original story or series about any archaeological topic published in a newspaper with a circulation of at least 25,000.

**Special requirements:**
• The nominated article should have been published within the calendar year of 2003.
• An author/newspaper may submit no more than five stories or five articles from a series.
• Six copies of each entry must be submitted by the author or an editor of the newspaper.
Deadline for nomination: January 5, 2004. Contact: A'ndrea Elyse Messer, 201 Rider House, Penn State, University Park, PA 16902; email: aem1@psu.edu.

Student Paper Award
This award recognizes original student research as a growing component of the Annual Meeting, and is a way to highlight outstanding contributions. All student members of SAA are eligible to participate. The papers will be evaluated (read) anonymously by committee members on both the quality of the arguments and data presented, and the paper’s contribution to our understanding of a particular area or topic in archaeology.

Many sponsors recognize the importance of student research in archaeology and have contributed to the award.

McGraw-Hill has generously contributed $300 to be given to the Student Paper Award winner!

In addition, the award winner will receive a citation from the SAA president, a piece of official SAA merchandise, and over $1,000 worth of books/journals from the following sponsors:

University of Arizona Press
AltaMira Press
University of California Press
Cambridge University Press
University Press of Colorado
Elsevier Science
University Press of Florida
University of Iowa Press
McGraw-Hill
University of Nebraska Press
The University of New Mexico Press
University of Oklahoma Press
University of Pittsburgh Latin American Archaeology Publications
Prentice Hall
University of Texas Press
Thames and Hudson
University of Utah Press
Westview Press/Perseus Books

Special requirements:
• A student must be the primary author of the paper and be the presenter at the 2004 Annual Meeting.
• Six copies of the conference paper and relevant figures and tables must be submitted (please submit these copies without a name so that they may be reviewed anonymously)
• The paper should be double-spaced, with standard margins, and 12-pt font. The submitted paper should include any relevant figures, tables, and references cited. An average 15-minute paper is approximately 10–12 pages in length (double-spaced, not including references cited, figures, and tables).

Deadline for submission: January 5, 2004. Contact: Caryn M. Berg, Chair, SAA Student Paper Award Committee, Department of Anthropology, University of Denver, Denver, CO 80208; email: bergcm@mail.colorado.edu.

Douglas C. Kellogg Fund for Geoarchaeological Research
Under the auspices of the Society for American Archaeology’s Geoarchaeology Interest Group, family, friends and close associates of Douglas C. Kellogg formed a memorial fund in his honor. The fund will provide support of thesis or dissertation research, with emphasis on the field and/or laboratory parts of this research, for graduate students in the earth sciences and archaeology. Recipients of this award will be students who have (1) an interest in achieving the M.S., M.A., or Ph.D. degree in earth sciences or archaeology; (2) an interest in applying earth science methods to archaeological research; and (3) an interest in a career in geoarchaeology.

Money donated to the Douglas C. Kellogg Fund is not to be used for the annual award. Instead, the interest generated each year will be awarded on an annual basis to the recipient. Initially, a minimum of $500 will be awarded; the amount of the award will increase as the fund grows and the amount of annual interest increases. The first Douglas C. Kellogg Award will be made in Montreal at the 69th Annual Meeting of the SAA (Spring 2004).

Applications must include:
1. A one-page cover letter briefly explaining the individual’s interest and how he or she qualifies for the award.
• A current resume or vita.
• Five (5) copies of a 3–4 page, double-spaced description of the thesis or dissertation research that clearly documents the geoarchaeological orientation and significance of the research. One illustration may be included with the proposal.
• A letter of recommendation from the thesis or dissertation supervisor that emphasizes the student’s ability and potential as a geoarchaeologist.

Deadline for submission: January 5, 2004. Contact: Paper copies of the items listed should be mailed to Dr. Rolfe Mandel, Chair, Committee for the Douglas C. Kellogg Fund, Kansas Geological Survey, 1930 Constant Ave., University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS 66045-2121. Electronic submissions will not be considered. However, for additional information, Dr. Mandel may be contacted at mandel@kgs.ku.edu.
Latin American archaeologists have uniquely impacted the definition of historical archaeology over the last 15 years or so. For the first time in the history of the discipline, Charles Orser’s recent A Historical Archaeology of the Modern World pays as much attention to Latin America as to Europe and the U.S. Previously concerned with a narrow American definition of “post-prehistoric sites in the New World,” historical archaeology has broadened its scope to include the archaeology of all historical societies (Anders Andrén 1997). This move to a broader outlook was led by scholars outside of Europe and the U.S., including a Latin American (Pedro Paulo A Funari), a South African (Martin Hall), and the British Siân Jones, who together co-chaired a WAC3 session on historical archaeology. This approach resulted in the publication of groundbreaking Historical Archaeology, Back from the Edge, reviewed in several scholarly journals (e.g., Carman 2000; Silliman 2001). And in 1994 and 1995, Historical Archaeology in South America, edited by Stanley South, published 15 volumes distributed in the U.S. and Latin America, which contributed to the spread of ideas and interpretations of young scholars such as María Ximena Senatore (1995) and Andrés Zarankin (1995), who are now often cited in the international literature.

As a result of the increasingly central role of Latin America in historical archaeology, the prestigious Encyclopedia of Historical Archaeology, edited by Orser, had a Latin American consulting editor (Pedro Funari), and several entries were written by Latin American archaeologists (Pedro Funari, Francisco Silva Noelli, Ana Piñon, Gilson Rambelli, Maria Ximena Senatore, and Andrés Zarankin). The Encyclopedia of Archaeology, edited by Tim Murray, also featured contributors from Latin America (Roberto Cobeán, Alba Mastache Flores, Pedro Funari, Marion Popenhoe de Hatch, Leonor Herrera, José Luiz Lanata, Matilde Ivic de Monterosso, and A. Lautaro Nuñez). In his Introducción a la Arqueología Histórica, published in Buenos Aires in 2000, Orser invites readers to use books published by several Latin American historical archaeologists. In 1997, the first journal aimed at a world audience, The International Journal of Historical Archaeology, was launched by Plenum with an editorial board that included two Latin Americans (Pedro Funari and Daniel Schávelzon). As proposed by Latin Americans, the scope of this journal included the study of historical societies in general (cf. Orser 1997:1), leading to publication of articles on subjects such as pre-colonial Southeast Asia and the Ottoman Empire; several articles from Latin American authors have also appeared.

The historical archaeology of the Mediterranean has also resulted in books and numerous scholarly articles written by Latin Americans and published in English, French, Italian, and Spanish. This includes subjects of particular interest to Latin American archaeologists, such as the archaeology of countryside (Chevitarose 1994; Guarinello 1994) and the dialectics between marketplace and command economy (Funari 1996). Such subjects expose Mediterranean archaeology to non-European approaches to classical archaeology. The archaeology of countryside, usually relegated to the periphery of the discipline (e.g., Hingley 2000), has allowed Latin American archaeologists to challenge traditional city-centered discourse and interpretations. For example, the importance of political factors for understanding the distribution of staples in the Roman Empire mirrors similar “out-centered” approaches common in Latin American archaeology.

In leading journals such as Public Archaeology, Journal of European Archaeology, Journal of Social Archaeology, World Archaeological Bulletin, and World Archaeology, articles by Latin American scholars attest to their presence on the world stage, particularly on historical archaeological subjects. Current Anthropology has also invited and published comments by Latin American historical archaeologist to papers written by leading European or U.S. authors, attesting to the growing relevance of Latin American ideas and theoretical viewpoints (e.g., Current Anthropology 39[1]:34–36; 41[5]:764–765).

In Latin America itself, there has been an upsurge of interest in historical archaeology, several research projects have been established, and books have been published in Spanish and Portuguese (making it mostly unknown outside of Latin America, unfortunately). Veteran historical archaeologists have been at work for several years, including Marcos Albuquerque in the...
northeast of Brazil, who is excavating fortresses and the earliest synagogue in the Americas; Arno Kern, who is examining Catholic Missions in Brazil; Juan Roberto Bárcena in Mendoza, Argentina; and Nelsys Fusco and Carmen Cubello in Uruguay. Innovative books and book chapters on historical archaeology have appeared recently, including *Cultura Material e Arqueologia Histórica* (Material Culture and Historical Archaeology), edited by Pedro Funari; *Sed non Satiata, Teoria Social en la Arqueología Latinoamericana Contemporánea* (Social Theory in Latin American Archaeology), edited by Andrés Zarankin and Félix Acuto; and *Arqueologia da Sociedade Moderna na América do Sul* (Archaeology of Modern Society in South America), edited by Andrés Zarankin and Maria Ximena Senatore.

Since 1998, when the First International Meeting on Archaeological Theory was held in Brazil, sessions on historical archaeology have been organized, and contributions were also featured at the Second Meeting in Argentina in 2000 and the Third Meeting in Colombia in 2002. The publication of the *Proceedings of the First Meeting, Anais da Primeira Reunião de Teoria Arqueológica na América do Sul*, edited by P. P. A. Funari, E. G. Neves and I. Podgorny, reveals the growing interest of historical archaeological theory to Latin American archaeologists, with 12 out of 28 chapters dedicated to historical archaeology. Mexican archaeologist Patricia Fournier has spread the so-called Latin American Social Archaeology to historical archaeologists elsewhere in the hemisphere. The study of ethnicity, a subject so important in world archaeology since the 1990s, has attracted the attention of several Latin American archaeologists. Particular attention has been paid to the interaction between Europeans and indigenous peoples (e.g., Tocchetto 1998), as well as to their relations with Africans (Domínguez 1999; Orser and Funari 2001; Schávelzon 2000). The mix of Europeans, Natives, and Africans created a unique material culture that is being studied by historical archaeologists to better understand the dynamics of cultural contact and interaction. These studies are also beginning to be known outside of Latin America, enabling scholars from elsewhere in the world to reexamine interethnic relations in their own research.

Latin America archaeology in general, and historical archaeology in particular, today has a much broader presence in world archaeology than in the past. Worldwide, historical archaeology has been decisively altered in the last few years thanks to Latin American scholars, often in cooperation with leading U.S. and European researchers. In theoretical terms, the shift from an emphasis on historical archaeology as the study of “us” (i.e., white, Anglo-Saxon Protestants) to the study of any past society with written documents is partially a Latin American contribution, even though Europeans and Africans were also instrumental in this intellectual shift. No longer is Latin America simply the provider of data for historical archaeology; it now plays an important role in shaping the epistemology of the discipline itself. This is particularly impressive since historical archaeology is relatively new in Latin America. In fact, the renewal of archaeology within Latin America as a theoretically oriented discipline can not be dissociated from the advances of historical archaeology, particularly in the spread of contextual approaches to archaeological interpretation. Historical archaeology in Latin America has already achieved much, and the outlook for its further development can not be underestimated.

Acknowledgments. I owe thanks to Marcos Albuquerque, Anders Andrén, Juan Roberto Bárcena, André Leonardo Chevitarese, Lourdes Domínguez, Stephen Dyson, Nelsys Fusco, Richard Hingley, Norberto Luiz Guarinello, Martin Hall, Siân Jones, Francisco Silva Noelli, Charles E. Orser, Jr., Ana Piñon, Gilson Rambelli, Daniel Schávelzon, Maria Ximena Senatore, Andrés Zarankin. The ideas are my own and I am solely responsible. I owe thanks also to the institutional support from the Brazilian National Science Foundation (CNPq), São Paulo State Science Foundation (FAPESP), Strategic Studies Center (NEE/UNICAMP), the World Archaeological Congress.
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Traditionally, the archaeological study of Mexico’s rich cultural heritage has emphasized pre-Columbian sites, which are seen as a means to boost the nation’s economy by attracting international tourists curious about the splendors of the time before the Spaniards arrived. As a result, limited funds are available for the investigation of sites that date to the Spanish Colonial (1521–1821) and Mexican Republican (1821–present) periods, which together form the basis of historical archaeology in Mexico.

Historical archaeology is a new field in Mexico. It began with salvage-and-rescue projects in the late 1960s that examined historic ceramics and architectural features recovered during the Metro excavations in Mexico City. These projects were directed by different archaeologists (e.g., Fournier and Miranda 1992; Martínez Muriel 1988; Pérez Castro 1990) who, at that time, had no training in the subject. Although undergraduate courses in historical archaeology have been occasionally offered since 1992, only one graduate program exists and there are very few full-time professional historical archaeologists in Mexico.

Types of Historical Archaeology in Mexico

Since the 1970s, various projects in historical archaeology have been conducted. These generally have fallen into one of two categories: salvage-and-rescue projects that include historical archaeology, more by accident than by design since the main goal is to recover pre-Hispanic features and artifacts; and projects dedicated to the architectural restoration of historic buildings (e.g., Fernández and Gómez 1998). The projects therefore lack theoretical and methodological foundations that could contribute to understanding the historical development of capitalism in the New World under Spanish rule and the rise of national systems and identities.

Since 1972, Mexican law requires that archaeologists be present for salvage-and-rescue projects to protect pre-Columbian and historic remains. Examples of these projects include the demolition and construction of government and private buildings and parking lots, development of the public transportation infrastructure like the subway system in Mexico City, the construction of water and sewage systems, road maintenance and construction, and construction of large dams and water reservoirs within various states of Mexico (e.g., Fournier and Miranda 1992; Martínez Muriel 1988; Pérez Castro 1990). Those projects do result in site reports, but since the economic resources available are limited, the dissemination of results dealing with historical archaeology is limited to a few report copies kept in the archives of the National Institute of Anthropology and History (INAH). Although some research results eventually are published—in Spanish—they are seldom distributed or read abroad, limiting the contributions they could make to the field of historical archaeology. Lack of resources has also resulted in the limited study of collections, which in many cases are discarded after a few years due to lack of storage space or the resources to analyze them. Special studies derived from salvage-and-rescue projects, however, have successfully addressed questions dealing with acculturation and the construction of identity and meaning in the Colonial and Republican social systems.

Programs of architectural restoration have been undertaken during the last 35 years, but they are primarily concerned with the historic districts of urban centers, and any research priorities based on historical archaeology tend to be subordinate to the rehabilitation of buildings by architects. In some cases, recovered artifacts are studied, but the main interest is the reconstruction of architectural histories. Examples of restoration-related projects include the convent of San Jerónimo, palaces of the Spanish Colonial nobility, monumental viceregal and Republican buildings, the Aztec Templo Mayor, and the Palace of Chapultepec, all in Mexico City; the Palace of Hernán Cortés in Cuernavaca, Morelos; the monastery of San Francisco in Puebla; and the monastery of Santo Domingo in Oaxaca.

Issues of Data and Interpretation

While reports from salvage-and-rescue and architectural restoration projects can provide valuable information on exca-
In some cases, regional and site projects are specifically designed as historical archaeology investigations that include surveys, excavations, or both. These projects, undertaken by Mexican and American archaeological teams working individually or in collaboration, are usually guided by scientific research agendas based on explicit theoretical frameworks (e.g., Fernández and Gómez 1998; Gasco et al. 1997). Those projects contribute to a better understanding of landscape and settlement patterns and to the inference of social processes at indigenous towns, missions, forts, haciendas, ranches, and road systems.

Typological studies of historic ceramics, derived from Goggin’s (1968) and López Cervantes’s (1976) seminal works, reveal considerable progress in Mexican historical archaeology. Chronological frameworks have been developed, and inferences about exchange networks, consumption trends, ethnic and social status differences, acculturation, and technological variability and change have been generated (e.g., Charlton and Fournier 1993; Charlton et al. 1995; Fernández and Gómez 1998; Fournier 1990, 1997a, 1997b, 1998; Lister and Lister 1982). Still, much work needs to be done to refine ceramic chronologies based on well-dated archaeological deposits and informed by primary sources from Mexican and foreign archives—particularly those in Spain (Gómez et al. 2001). Typologies also are needed for the non-elite wares—such as those derived from pre-Columbian indigenous traditions—and the Spanish-tradition lead-glazed ceramics, both of which form the bulk of archaeological collections. Compositional analyses also will further our knowledge about socioeconomic processes and material culture in the construction of identity (e.g., Fournier and Monroy 2003).

**Trends in Mexican Historical Archaeology**

Underwater archaeology, after a boom in the mid-1990s, recently has faced economic limitations, although an ongoing project on the Spanish fleet that sank in the Caribbean in 1631 is providing valuable information (Luna 1998). It includes extensive research at Mexico’s archives and the Archivo General de Indias in Seville. Industrial archaeology in Mexico is still in its embryonic stage. More historians and architects than archaeologists exhibit interest in industrial developments, partially as a result of legal issues preventing the protection of sites from the late 1800s and early 1900s that are not in historic districts or that do not provide important time markers. Because of this problem, historical archaeology of the 1900s will face serious limitations on its future development in Mexico.

Mexican archaeology always has been involved in the national dialogue about the pre-Columbian past, and recently, through historical archaeology, the Colonial and Post-Independence past as well. It has also contributed to the development of a scientific archaeology, although the government does limit and shape the practice of archaeology. Recent globalization trends and international trade treaties are affecting the fragile Mexican economic system, which means that the scientific study of cultural resources are not a priority for the government. The survival of INAH, the federal agency traditionally in charge of this mission, as well as the 1972 Federal Law that protects the cultural heritage, are now at risk. Since 1999, the Mexican Congress has been discussing initiatives to substitute the existing federal legislation with a weaker general law. This may result in private collection, looting, and the illegal traffic of archaeological materials and favor local and municipal political and economic interests to the detriment of national cultural and scientific objectives—most decisions will be left in the hands of politicians (McClung de Tapia 1999). Social scientists, intellectual groups, and non-governmental organizations oppose the privatization of cultural patrimony and are fighting to enforce the protection of the national heritage through both national and local development programs. To pursue this goal, the 1972 Federal Law may need to be modified and updated.

Although the future of archaeological research in Mexico is uncertain due to political and economic interests of the government and the voracious private sector, historical archaeology can take advantage of international collaboration programs and grants. A focus on public outreach can also encourage the flow of economic resources for scientific studies and result in the development of new tourist products associated with the cultural heritage of the Colonial and Republican periods. This will lead to long-term conservation and preservation, the thematic interpretation of sites and historic material, and the scientific study of the recent past.
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EL MAPA DE TEOZACOALCO
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Guided by El Mapa de Teozacoalco, an early Colonial map associated with one of a series of texts known as Relaciones Geográficas, archaeologists are reconstructing the settlement changes that accompanied cultural transformations by the Mixtec people in a 30 x 70 km mountainous area around San Pedro Teozacoalco, Oaxaca, Mexico. The project is addressing interrelated issues: the correlation of Mixtec and Spanish place names on El Mapa with archaeological sites, natural features, and extant settlements and the testing of postulated continuities and discontinuities between settlements during different time periods. This project is one of the first to apply archaeological survey techniques to exploration of a Mixteca Alta mapa.

El Mapa de Teozacoalco

El Mapa de Teozacoalco was drawn about 1580 using conventions of both European map-making and Mixtec codex-painting (Figure 1). It shows natural features, human constructions, and boundary markers related to the Colonial municipality of Teozacoalco and probably also to its precursor Mixtec kingdom. Pictures of churches with Spanish glosses identify towns, while Mixtec toponyms, or place glyphs, identify municipal boundary features. Because it includes detailed genealogical data for rulers of Teozacoalco corresponding to information in the Codices Nuttall and Vindobonensis, El Mapa was of central importance to Alfonso Caso’s (1949) research on Mixtec dynastic histories and writing.

By the end of the 1990s, researchers (Anders et al. 1992; Mundy 1996) had tentatively identified San Pedro Teozacoalco as the cabecera, or capital; seven of 13 estancias, or subject communities; and some geographic features defining the border of the municipality. The remaining estancias had been abandoned during the four centuries since El Mapa was drawn and knowledge of their locations had been lost to students of Mixtec culture.

Exploration of the Area of El Mapa

Balkansky et al. (2000) reviewed archaeological work that had occurred in the Mixteca Alta by the end of the 1990s. Their review demonstrated an absence of work within the region covered by El Mapa de Teozacoalco south of their large Central Mixteca Alta Settlement Pattern Project Survey area.

During February 2000, with funding from the Foundation for the Advancement of Mesoamerican Studies, Inc. (FAMSI), the late David Shoemaker and I undertook preliminary exploration of the area depicted on El Mapa. We visited 29 sites dating from 500 BC

Figure 1: El Mapa de Teozacoalco. Benson Latin American Collection, University of Texas at Austin.
to the Colonial period and defined the northern third of
the old municipality's boundary. The survey made it
clear that many other sites remained to be located and
explored. During April 2002, with funding from FAMSI
and the Selz Foundation, Nancy Gonlin and I led a team
that visited and recorded 35 new sites. We also revisited
11 sites from the 2000 survey and recorded the locations
of 20 sites that we could not visit due to lack of time.
Our archaeological surveys in 2000 and 2002 verified
identifications made by other researchers of Teozacoalco
and some continuously occupied estancias. We also locat-
ed some abandoned estancias and produced data on ear-
lier settlements and border markers. In the process of
searching for communities and features that appear on
El Mapa, we learned the locations of earlier sites that do
not appear on it (Shoemaker 2003; Whittington 2003).

Team members traveled by pickup truck to present-day
towns identified as former estancias, recorded associated archaeological remains, and located abandoned
estancias and other natural and man-made features that define the boundary of the municipality. We
contacted municipal authorities and learned the locations of sites as well as the Mixtec and Spanish
names of settlements and geographic features. In the company of guides, we visited sites described to
us and ones known from the previous season. We recorded the GPS location of each site on topograph-
ic maps and Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia (INAH) site registration forms. We sketched
maps of sites, collected ceramic and obsidian artifacts from the ground surface, and documented each
site photographically. The ceramics found during survey are related to ceramics from other parts of
Oaxaca whose chronologies are well defined, so we used them to determine site antiquity.

Patterns in the location and characteristics of sites within the survey region have begun to emerge,
many of which are similar to those encountered in other survey regions in the Mixteca Alta. Nearly all
of the sites have a Postclassic (A.D. 900–1520) component, so temporal patterns remain difficult to
identify at this time.

Building Relationships with Local Authorities

It quickly became apparent that it was more effective to contact local authorities, discuss the back-
ground and goals of the project, and ask their assistance in locating sites than it was to attempt to find
sites without their active support. Guides assigned by the authorities led the team directly to important
sites by safe routes and intervened with landholders who otherwise would object to trespassers. Munici-
pal authorities were generally interested in the project, accepted letters of introduction provided by
INAH at face value, and trusted the archaeologists, at least eventually. In the case of the town of San
Miguel Piedras, David Shoemaker had to earn that trust by presenting an impromptu outdoor lecture
about El Mapa to the entire adult male population, which was engaged in building a road as part of an
annual communal work project.

In 2000, the President of San Pedro Teozacoalco expressed the desire of the approximately 1,500 towns-
persons to have a community museum to teach school children and adults about their past and to attract
tourists. In late 1999, the town completed construction of a centrally located bandstand with space that
could be used for that purpose (Figure 2). The core collection of the museum would be the many
ancient ceramics, sculptures, and adornments that townspeople encounter in their agricultural fields
and house lots and turn over to the authorities.

Figure 2: Two-thirds of the ground floor of the yellow bandstand in the center of San Pedro
Teozacoalco’s plaza could become a community museum.
Objects recovered by townspeople lay unwashed in decaying cardboard boxes in a back room of the Municipal Palace. In 2002, a grant from the Mudge Foundation allowed objects conservator Ron Harvey of Tuckerbrook Conservation to visit Teozacoalco for two weeks. During that time he worked with archaeologists, lab director Christine Whittington, and the town's authorities to install metal shelves in a room in the municipal palace newly set aside as protected artifact storage (Figure 3); create supports and trays for long-term artifact storage; and begin to wash, reconstruct, and mark identification numbers on the objects.

Harvey's visit had positive effects in two ways. It demonstrated to the townspeople that we plan to give something back and not just take away knowledge and objects. We see the creation of a community museum as an opportunity to make the results of the archaeological project accessible to the public. We can have a significant impact by working with authorities to provide an educational resource for primary and secondary schools and a focal point for both community pride and cultural tourism.

Harvey's visit also provided us access to the town's artifact collection. Artifacts recovered during survey are typically small, eroded, fragmentary, and hard to interpret. Artifacts that the townspeople have turned over are more complete, in better condition, and from contexts not encountered during survey, such as burials and ceremonial deposits. Thus, the town's collection can provide another dimension to our understanding of Teozacoalco's past. After treatment, team members will analyze the objects to determine age and function through comparison with artifacts from other areas of Oaxaca. The conservator's treatment of these objects so that they can be studied is an essential part of the project.

All activities associated with the conservator's work are according to American Institute for the Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works standards. Harvey uses nondestructive and reversible methods to clean and reconstruct objects. As part of his work, he is providing advice to authorities about care for their collection and is helping to develop the town's capability to run a museum in a professional manner.

Our Approach to Exploring El Mapa

We do not claim that the surveys undertaken in 2000 and 2002 were either systematic or complete. Nancy Gonlin has described them as "emic" surveys. They were focused on exploring and verifying an exceptional Colonial mapa, in which a Mixtec artist and a Colonial administrator apparently collaborated to produce a detailed, first-hand picture of the locations of human settlements, geographic and cultural features, and the boundaries of a municipality, as they existed around 1580. Project goals were to verify the existence of these features within the municipality and to determine the correspondence of geographic and cultural landmarks with Mixtec toponyms and other pictures on El Mapa. We encountered rich archaeological remains of a Postclassic Mixtec kingdom and its Classic and Formative antecedents while pursuing these goals.

We plan to return in March 2004 to verify the locations of the remaining estancias and boundary features. We will also explore the 20 known but unvisited pre-Hispanic sites. We anticipate that municipal authorities will identify additional pre-Hispanic sites for which we have no knowledge. Ron Harvey will return to continue his conservation efforts. In coming years, we intend to request permission to open test-pits in a selection of sites to determine if they are single or multiple component. Eventually, we hope to undertake both a full-coverage survey modeled on the neighboring Central Mixteca Alta Settlement Pattern Project and extensive excavations of a large mountaintop site above San Pedro Teozacoalco.

Our project based on El Mapa de Teozacoalco most obviously has potential to provide insights into the Postclassic-Colonial cultural transition. We can already see that Spanish administrators placed Colonial settlements in carefully selected locations either on top of or adjacent to Postclassic Mixtec settlements.
During the last two decades, studies of Mexico’s past have witnessed the expansion of historical archaeology as a new field that parallels and connects with archaeology’s traditional focus on the rich pre-Columbian heritage (Fernández and Gómez 1998; Fournier and Miranda 1992). This has in some ways mirrored similar developments in other world areas, as historical archaeology has been incorporated into CRM projects in Mexico (called rescate and salvamento) and in programs of architectural restoration. The perspectives afforded by historical archaeologists have been integrated into research designs that go beyond Contact-period studies and embrace the Colonial period, the 19th century, and rural and urban projects with various emphases, including ethnoarchaeology (Gasco et al. 1997). Recently, the archaeology of haciendas has been increasing, signaling the beginning of a new subfield in which empirical study can be connected to emerging interests in theory and public archaeology within a Mexican context.

Background

The “hacienda” is well-known through historical literature and cultural stereotypes associated with wealthy landowners from the Colonial through Revolutionary periods. This historically important settlement type has been the focus of an immense body of documentary research in Mexico that has approached the hacienda as both an economic and social institution (e.g., Jarquín et al. 1990; Nickel 1988). Commonly considered a large estate, haciendas were operated by a dominant landowner and a dependent labor force, organized to supply a small-scale market by means of scarce capital accumulation but also to support the status aspirations of the owner” (Wolf and Mintz 1957:380).

When Mexico’s 16th-century mining economy declined, the hacienda developed as an important rural institution and producer of commodities linked to regional resources. Haciendas were one among many economic forms in non-urban areas until the 20th century, although they were the dominant rural institutions and played a significant role in national life (Chevalier 1963). Some were enormous landholding fiefdoms whose structure and labor force paralleled New World plantations, although hacienda workers were not legally slaves (González 1997). Due to many factors, however, including debt peonage, peasants did lead lives similar to those of plantation slaves in the Caribbean and southern United States (Meyers and Carlson 2002).

Extensive hacienda historical research (Alexander 2003) has suggested the question: What are the potential contributions of Mexican hacienda archaeology as an emerging field? Below I address this question and characterize the current state of hacienda archaeology.

Studies in Hacienda Archaeology

As this subfield enters its definitional stage, it is producing a growing number of archaeological or archaeologically related studies with a strong anthropological problem-orientation (Alexander 1997; Fournier and Mondragón 2003; Meyers and Carlson 2002). This research can be grouped into three types: 1) studies that describe processes of hacienda development with linkages to broader cultural patterns; 2) studies of settlement patterns; and 3) studies with an excavation focus.

Jones’s article (1981) on 19th-century Otumba and Opan haciendas is an example of an archaeologically relevant documentary study that explores the relationship of haciendas to a variety of rural settlement types in Central Mexico. Another example is Fournier and Mondragón’s study (2003) of haciendas and ranchos in Hidalgo’s Mezquital Valley, which also uses documentary information and ethnoarchaeology to understand the indigenous Otomi response to the development of haciendas. With archival data, the inclusion of ethnoarchaeology as a research strategy anticipates an emerging direction in hacienda research designs (Juli 2003).

The second type of research on the Mexican hacienda focuses on settlement patterns and their relationship to historical processes, as well as on surveys of the physical features and preservation of haciendas. A fine example is Charlton’s (1986) project in the Teotihuacan Valley, especially his study of haciendas, rural settlement types, and issues of land tenure. The excellent work by Alexander (1997) in Yucatan also uses an archaeological model of rural settlements, including haciendas, to
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understand the dynamics of indigenous population shifts prior to the Caste War of 1847.

The third type is excavation-based research. An ongoing project in Yucatan at the hacienda Tabi (Meyers 2001) is analyzing hacienda worker houses and landscapes to understand power relations and social inequality between hacendados, managers, and peons (Meyers and Carlson 2002). These studies, and others, provide the background for the growth of hacienda archaeology.

An Evolving Project

I am developing a project on the archaeology of San Miguel Aco-cotla, Puebla, a central Mexican hacienda occupied from 1565–1938. I have surveyed a sample of the region’s haciendas, initiated archival research, and begun an ethnoarchaeological study (Juli 2003). In the survey, I was interested in the state of preservation and the research potential of ten sites situated on largely intact tracts. In several, peasant architecture is well preserved, while the principal hacienda structures are often in an advanced state of decay. This contrasts with the Accocotta archival data that predictably focuses on economic activities, land tenure, and the lives and affairs of the hacendados. Workers are largely invisible in the documents but visible in their preserved architecture, artifacts, and landscapes, as well as in the oral traditions of campeños who now own and farm the site. I realized that a descendant peasant community with strong historical ties to hacienda workers of the early 20th century survived in a nearby village, La Soledad Morelos, where the potential for an ethnoarchaeological study was confirmed by the strong continuities in the documents but visible in their preserved architecture, for example, provides a thematic blueprint for hacienda archaeology. Some of these questions are already being addressed, such as studies of hacienda-worker living conditions, status differences within the hacienda community, and the relationship between hacendado dominance and worker resistance (Meyers and Carlson 2002). One of the major themes identified by Singleton—the role of slavery in the formation of African-American identity—presents an interesting challenge for hacienda archaeology. Considered in the Mexican context, this theme relates to the historical changes from indigenous to campesino identity within the world of the hacienda and corresponding connections to mestizo identity in modern Mexico.

Such issues articulate with a corpus of theoretical writings called “social archaeology” (Politis 2003), which is concerned with the manner in which archaeological interpretation should be conducted (Fournier 1999; Gándara et al. 1985). While social archaeology can be controversial, one aspect of its agenda is to include the views of non-archaeologists in interpretation (Patterson 1994). This proposition is intriguing, because due to the dissolution of haciendas after the Mexican Revolution of 1910, descendant campesino communities are common features in rural regions today, and they likely retain much knowledge about their ancestors who worked on the estates. This situation not only suggests that ethnoarchaeology would be a productive pursuit, but that descendants can profitably be included in hacienda archaeological interpretations. Such an approach articulates with post-processual agendas and subaltern studies in other regions (Rodríguez 2001).

Finally, I see one other potential, albeit controversial, direction for hacienda archaeology. In North America, historical archaeology often is included as a research strategy for living history museums (Noel Hume 1982). In Mexico, the government interprets pre-Columbian sites as expressions not only of past national grandeur, but also as a way to define modern Mexico as a combination of indigenous and European ethnicities (Fournier and Miranda 1992). However, I know of no post-Contact historic site in Mexico that is interpreted for the public in a living-history museum context. The hacienda, as an institution expressing a particular ideology of Mexico’s past, is an ideal candidate. If such a vision were to develop among scholars, museum specialists, and entrepreneurs, surely archaeology would play an important role in the creation of exhibits designed to educate the public about the hacienda, its economy, its social structure, and its contribution to our understanding of Mexico’s recent past.

Future Directions

Although hacienda archaeology has not developed a singular theoretical orientation, it has tended to focus on the lives of peons, their architecture, and their relations to managers and haciendados (Meyers and Carlson 2002). Another potential contribution is the material perspective it provides on documentary sources and interpretations that have defined hacienda studies for so long (Charlton 2003)—archaeological work permits reassessment of historical interpretations (Alexander 1997) and affords us new views of hacienda conditions and the lives of peons often invisible in written sources (Juli 2003).

As hacienda archaeology develops, it should consider comparative materials provided by plantation archaeology (Orser 1988). Comparisons between hacienda peons and plantation slaves can define features of servitude in similar institutions. Singleton’s (1995) synthetic treatment of North American slave archaeology, for example, provides a thematic blueprint for hacienda archaeology. Some of these questions are already being addressed, such as studies of hacienda-worker living conditions, status differences within the hacienda community, and the relationship between hacendado dominance and worker resistance (Meyers and Carlson 2002). One of the major themes identified by Singleton—the role of slavery in the formation of African-American identity—presents an interesting challenge for hacienda archaeology. Considered in the Mexican context, this theme relates to the historical changes from indigenous to campesino identity within the world of the hacienda and corresponding connections to mestizo identity in modern Mexico.
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Many Postclassic settlements seem to have been abandoned, probably because of population concentration for administrative purposes, depopulation due to the effects of European infectious diseases, or both. Pre-Hispanic settlements in the area of El Mapa can also provide insights into earlier cultural transitions by revealing the changing importance of defensive locations and constructions, the concentration and dispersal of population, and the expansion and contraction of trade networks. These insights about cultural transitions will not necessarily be new or unique to the area of El Mapa, but will complement insights from other areas and provide a more complete picture of the history and prehistory of the Mixteca Alta and Mesoamerica as a whole.
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Writing and Material Culture

The utility of data from written sources for historical archaeological research has been widely recognized and discussed since 1970, first from the processual paradigm and more recently with the arrival of a critical epistemology. Since 1990, when this discussion began at the Rio de la Plata academy, we have recognized two major tendencies: one in which archaeological research begins and ends in the written record, and the second in which the questions and answers come mainly from the archaeological record that is supplemented with written documents. This second approach envisions artifacts as cultural, nonverbal symbols. I include myself in this group. Written documents are an information source that cannot be ignored, because they are part of contextual knowledge. From the hermeneutical interpretive perspective, the written document articulates with the archaeological record to generate knowledge about cultural material.

On the other hand, both the archaeological record and the written document belong to humankind and they exist within the same contextual parameters: time, space, and sociocultural environment. The written material must be understood through its intentional creation: it is produced "by someone" for "someone" who can read it. Not all social groups, however, produce written records. The archaeological record, in contrast, is not created intentionally; it is not directly biased by any social group but rather reflects their daily life. It can be understood both through the symbolic meanings represented in the archaeological record and by the site formation processes that created that record. In both cases, however, the researcher is always subjective because he or she is operating from within their particular historical context.

Inferential Reasoning in Historical Archaeology

The use of analogy in archaeology has been widely discussed, generating both positive and negative assessments. Throughout the development of archaeology, regardless of specialty and the theoretical paradigm, the use of analogy—including ethnographic analogy and ethnoarchaeology—has been used, whether or not explicitly. Analogical reasoning appears frequently in prehistoric archaeology, but it has not been as openly considered in historical Latin American archaeology.

Two types of inferential reasoning are commonly used in archaeological research: induction and deduction. However, there are an additional two, analogy and abduction, that may be more appropriate for interpreting particular behaviors. Our interpretations are made from knowledge of similar situations, objects, and ideas regarding any kind of phenomena we have in our memories: we naturally start with analogical reasoning. Our own experience tells us that the artifacts and space that we use today reflect the dynamic processes of our daily lives.

Abduction, however, does not suppose an inferential connection between general and particular knowledge. Instead, it interprets only the unique object. Abduction does not assign an object to a specified set of similar objects, or analogs; rather, it defines the relationship between the object as a component of a totality and the totality itself. It does not place the object into a category of things that share the same attributes; it itself is interpreted as an attribute that belongs to other different ones that together comprise an organic whole. Analogy can initiate the research process, but it can never generate results, just hypotheses. Starting with an analogy, however, we can then employ abductive reasoning. Analogy puts an interpretation in the place of an object; abduction, however, infers the object as a part of a whole.

To augment the inferential processes of analogy and abduction, historical archaeologists can use the written record to interpret how past sociocultural systems worked, what drove their rational thought, and how the cultural material reflects that rationality. Analogies can emerge from a hermeneutical analysis of the written record or from ethnoarchaeological research.

Our research is guided by social theory and we use the hermeneutics as the interpretative tool. We assume that materi-
al culture has an intrinsic symbolic meaning that we can understand and that we will be able to interpret the whole society that generated the archaeological record. Time and space become the interpretative tools for peering inside the sociocultural system, since we assume that both are perceived, built, and organized in a particular way by each sociocultural system. Therefore, analogical sources can answer the question: how does a particular group think about itself? And, how can we see the deep structures represented in the archaeological record?

Our Case Study

The San Francisco de Borja del Yí village (1833–1864) was mainly occupied by Guaraní Indians, who were originally from destroyed villages that were part of the Misiones Jesuíticas during the 17th and 18th centuries. The main goal of the archaeological project at this village is to reconstruct the “cultural border” between the “Guaraní-Misioneros” society and the larger, national society. Prior to this project, we knew nothing about village spatial order. We only knew from written sources the characteristic social behaviors of the two main groups—the Guaraní-Misioneros and the individuals who belonged to the national society—that lived in the village. We exhaustively surveyed the area and targeted identified activity areas for excavation, including refuse areas, dwellings, the church, and a brick oven.

In the end, we were able to define the basic village plan, which was centered on a plaza surrounded by six structures, one of which was the church. Adjoining the plaza complex was what we call the “nuclear area,” in which we found a high density of dwelling structures made of stone and brick. A peripheral area featured a lower density of houses primarily built of fascine. Cultural materials reveal a wide range of domestic, military, trading, hygienic, and entertainment activities. Notable was the presence of locally manufactured utility ceramics exhibiting Guaraní technological and stylistic features.

Interpretation focused on the meaning of the symbolic content of the archaeological record. On one hand, we considered spatial organization under the assumption that the way in which individuals organize time and space reflects the deep structure of the whole society. On the other hand, we assumed that material culture has general and individual meanings related to social reproduction. Based on observations of other urban sites, we proposed that San Borja must have had a similar organization, including a central place—in its symbolic, not geometric sense—featuring the most important communal structures—in this case, public and ritual meeting places such as the plaza and church. This central place was predicted to be associated with the most important individuals’ dwellings, while more common dwellings were anticipated to be situated farther away.

The reasoning we employed in this case, as in other interpretive propositions in the research, was founded on analogy and abduction. Our inferences derived through abduction were based on the following rule: the space where a human group is established reflects cultural attributes that can be interpreted through changes produced by the physical and sociocultural contexts. In San Borja’s case, the place where the village was established was culturally modified by a human group, so we would expect that the cultural landscape would exhibit a suite of attributes with symbolic meanings that allow us to interpret the fundamental structure of the society that modified this landscape.

To check our inferences, we generated analogies based on the understanding that the national society was hegemonic over the Guaraní-Misioneros, and this produced a hierarchically structured society with important socioeconomic differences between individuals. The dominant society—the national one—accordingly organized its urban spaces to reflect hierarchy. Likewise, the associated material culture was expected to exhibit different symbolic meanings in its social uses. For example, costly houses built with stone and brick were associated with metal, refined wares, and gold and silver jewelry.

As an analogical tool, we focused on persistent suites of behavioral features—meanings—that are directly related to corresponding material features—symbols—that appear in the archaeological record. In our case, the relevant links emerge from an understanding of the historic context and its related behavioral qualities. We present the logic formulation:

Where: A = hierarchical social organization; B = hierarchical spatial organization

If A is present, then there will exist a mechanism or a “relevant relationship” confirming that B is present too.

Therefore: If B is present in the archaeological context, there will be an A that produced it.

We must demonstrate that the archaeological B is identical to the source’s B—in our case, we are referring to the symbolic meanings of the cultural material—and that the same relevant relationships (i.e., the A) exist for both of them.

Demonstration: The association between public and sacred spaces, in which high dwelling density is found in an area with a material culture that is symbolically representative of a dominant socioeconomic group. Another space, far away from the nuclear area,
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Buenos Aires, the capital of Argentina, is a politically autonomous city of about 3 million inhabitants located within the country’s largest metropolitan area, in which 11 million people live. Covering an area of 200 km$^2$, Buenos Aires has a population density of nearly 14,000 inhabitants/km$^2$ and receives millions of visitors, all within a space that has been used for more than four centuries. Unfortunately, the city has no law protecting its archaeological heritage, no comprehensive decree to guard and regulate its vast cultural heritage. The existing regulations are fragmentary, providing minimal protection. As a result, finding archaeologists in Buenos Aires is like finding needles in a haystack.

This situation is due to the many years when citizens could not exercise democratic civil rights and provide rational management of resources. This has resulted in a social situation in which access to cultural identity is compromised, leaving the construction of identity in the hands of hegemonic groups for whom efforts that do not produce money are of no interest. One could argue that archaeological heritage is an effective way to assign significance to memories and enhance people’s sense of place. In Buenos Aires, however, this value to preservation—and its associated contribution to the achievement of basic human rights—is only now being realized. The importance of preservation is increasingly apparent to many social groups that use urban space, including archaeologists. The significance of the memories it evokes, however, differs among these social groups, who variously see the past as a way to express ignorance, pain, pride, membership, political vindication, judicial claims, and more. Nevertheless, the assignment of priorities in preservation are gradually being discussed.

In contrast to the use of cultural heritage to achieve the ends of social and political groups, the growth of academic archaeology in Buenos Aires during the recent years has created an “ivory tower” style of scientific research for constructing the meaning of the past. From this perspective, academic archaeologists are intentionally not taking responsibility for interpreting the past in ways that address local social and political issues. Historic social groups are discursive voices whose heritage is difficult to recognize as contributing to a current social memory in general. This lack of recognition of how historical groups contribute to today’s social setting is disturbing. As archaeologists, we need to question the value of archaeology in the urban setting. This paper will illustrate where and how archaeology and archaeologists are becoming involved in community affairs in Buenos Aires and include two examples of archaeological practice and the construction of a new legal framework for archaeology. The examples show theoretical uncertainties over practical problems, one concerning the reworking of the meaning of history and the cultural value of a mental hospital, and the other concerning an archaeological dig in a downtown concentration center that evokes terrible memories from the last military dictatorship.

Archaeological Practice as an Extension of the Self

Our life goals shape our professional activity. Guided by different values and concerns, archaeologists focus on particular aspects of city history, constructing new cultural information that is justified with internationally accepted theoretical frameworks. We are taught models of thought that make it difficult to situate individual subjectivity within the context of social continuity. From an anthropological point of view, knowledge is constituted by an influential subjective dimension, since it tries to understand social relations that are themselves subjective. When this is not acknowledged, subjectivity is implicitly treated as something that can be separated from the archaeologist, as if the concept need not require reflexivity. One’s personal history, which creates specific areas of interest and becomes irreversibly implicated in the construction of knowledge, is thereby denied as relevant. Reflexivity should, however, be regarded as a useful tool for describing a world whose existence simply can not be regarded as completely separate from the researcher (Bourdieu et al. 1999).

In Argentina, as in other countries, theoretical frameworks give support and significance to archaeological interpretations. The-
ory thereby guides practice by identifying a limited number of study objects and defining their relevant community relationships. Unfortunately, local academia consumes theories without producing its own social criticism—without reflecting on archaeological practice and theory. Because of this, archaeological interpretation is not being developed, and the large national academic institutions such as the University of Buenos Aires, the National Council of Science and Technology (CONICET) and the National Institute of Anthropology are producing virtually no archaeologists interested in working on local development projects. Instead, newly trained scholars pursue traditional research and teaching, and only a handful of professionals are hired by different areas of the city government and the Urban Archaeology Center (CAU), located at the Architecture and Urbanism College of the University of Buenos Aires. This seriously impacts the social visibility of archaeology, and with it, the social responsibility to build citizenship. This also affects what we consider relevant archaeological heritage and what is worthy of preservation.

A Law for the Archaeological Heritage of Buenos Aires

In August 2002, the first Buenos Aires Archaeological Heritage Seminar assembled 200 people interested in creating a new heritage preservation law. The meeting drafted legislation for the regulation and management of archaeological heritage in which conservation and maintenance are considered from the perspective of social development while also serving both the interests of science and the construction and preservation of urban history, memory, and identity. Science and preservation are regarded as the means to use urban archaeology for social, educational, recreational, and interpretative use (APN 2003; Schávelzon 2002). Archaeology is seen as the means for integrating the cultural heritage of the city, focusing on building people’s identity, and recognizing rights and duties in heritage management. Public outreach is important, for material culture reflects local history, and the population needs to be involved since it is their heritage. Participation is especially needed to achieve consensus in deciding the best heritage management practices. Unfortunately, this ideal is not easy to achieve. On the contrary, community work involves the willingness of social actors who deal with issues of the past and concerns with present land and budget use.

Is This Archaeology? Examples of Practical Problems in Historical Archaeology

This question was posed by a lawyer, a specialist in cultural heritage, during a volunteer working day to rescue materials from the Pathologic Anatomy wing of the Braulio A. Moyano Women’s Mental Hospital. At the time, we were recovering thousands of late 19th-century photographic glass-negatives of brain cuts, which lay on the floor in very bad condition. This activity started days earlier with a project mandated by the Historical Protection Law and the discovery of sealed tunnels.

The hospital is an example of the golden age of hygienism, supported by paradigmatic local figures who wished to conform to 19th-century ideals of European public health. When entering the wing, one has the sensation of stepping 100 years back in time. Chemical vests confined the poorest people, the ones that did not have a home, family, or work. Local psychiatry condemned idleness, elevating reason to a hegemonic level. During the final decades of the 1800s, medicine, public health, and criminology worked together to confront the demographic flood, attacking the perceived evils in the urban immigrant way of life. Social control became part of the physician’s role. The medical doctor carried a philanthropic aura of prestige, and they taught students and examined the deceased side by side—the sick person was not as important. Technical toolkits where designed to record abnormalities, and the clinical anatomy method, analyzing corpse’s brains, was central in learning and diagnosis. As a big stone sign says in Latin, the Pathologic Anatomy wing was the place where “death comes to rescue life,” where human bodies went through a sequence of observation reflected in the layout of space: auditorium, morgue, chapel, and basements with dark tunnels. Today, health care in Buenos Aires is state-funded, and budgets for maintenance are low, so we became involved in situating the cultural value of the place, reworking historical meaning alongside the current health care authorities.

A second example of historical archaeological practice in Buenos Aires concerns the launch of fieldwork and public outreach by city and human rights organizations to investigate the Clandestine Center of Detention and Torture Club Atlético used by the 1976–1983 military dictatorship. Built in 1977 in the cellar of a former warehouse in the San Telmo district, the center is about a mile from the Casa Rosada—the seat of the national government. This was one of numerous clandestine detention centers established across the country, in which the military government illegally detained, interrogated, and tortured people. Prisoners were then killed. Some 30,000 people were in this way “disappeared” during the 1970s and early 1980s, of which about 1,800 passed through the Club Atlético. The center’s remains were buried below the freeway finished in 1980 to connect the city center with the international airport (Figures 1 and 2).

Archaeological work at Club Atlético started with a political decision, after years of work by human rights organizations and individuals. The first goal was to determine which underground installations survived the freeway construction. The first day of fieldwork was filled with emotion as bulldozers “opened” the ground and revealed walls like those on the architectural plans of the original building. The material remains of such a terrible
place revealed how deep the wounds were as we analyzed and displayed the traumatic heritage left by the last Argentinean military dictatorship (Dolff-Bonekaemper 2002). The project revealed the initial results to local and international media in May 2002, providing important recognition of Argentina’s recent history. At the end of the same year, about 10% of the basement was opened, revealing walls and floors, graffiti of desperate prisoners, and police uniforms, sticks, and other unspeakable artifacts. More than 7,000 items have been classified; a few personal belongings were found, but no individual identification recovered. Archaeological research focused on understanding the formation processes, such as demolition and filling, so that the use of the cellar could be reconstructed.

Today, the project continues under shared direction with the city’s human rights office. Members of the office ask people in the neighborhood what they remember about the place, what they saw and heard. Survivors who testified after the end of the military government are asked now to participate in management decisions, such as how they would approach public outreach. Although this is a memory that many common people do not want resurrected, its moral and human rights value is unquestionable. This research encourages memory and reflection on what happened in the Club Atlético, thereby demonstrating how far the repressive system of Argentinean state terrorism went during the military regime. This memory must be clear so that it never happens again. The challenge is to reach out to society through every means possible to discuss what makes justice possible and stops government impunity.

Concluding Comments

There are not many other examples of projects such as these, designed to recover memories of the recent past, except for the work of the Equipo Argentino de Antropología Forense (EAAF, Argentine Forensic Anthropology Team, http://www.eaaf.org.ar/index_esp.html). At the same time that the Club Atlético project started, other projects also began, such as the Mansión Seré, Atila, in the province of Buenos Aires; the Central Police Station in the city of Rosario; and Vargas Hole in the state of Tucumán. At this point, the need to remember and share the political past can not wait any longer. Archaeology and archaeologists should look inside to describe the world and look around to see where this knowledge can be useful.
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“The capitalist spirit must have existed in an embryonic state sometime in the remote past before any capitalist enterprise could become a reality.”
–Werner Sombart, The Quintessence of Capitalism

Although historical archaeology, in contrast with other disciplines, is recognized as the archaeology of capitalism, historical archaeologists have thus far dedicated little effort to analyzing its most intensified stage: globalization. The most spectacular social phenomenon in the history of mankind has not yet become the subject of our attention despite the unprecedented transformation that it is causing on a planetary scale.

The Historical Roots of Globalization

Globalization, generally and mistakenly viewed as a recent, inevitable, and inexorable phenomenon triggered by the information technology revolution of the 1970s, is in fact a long-lasting historical process, as stressed by Mennell, Friedman, Knutsson, Robertson, and Godelier, among others. As such, its temporal depth needs to be acknowledged and its total development must be examined, as only in this way can the forces involved in its emergence be fully understood. The belief that it is an inevitable natural phenomenon leaves dependent nations with a feeling of impotence against the spread of its overwhelming forces. As Appadurai (1990:31) has said, however, if power structures create ideologies to legitimize existing power relationships as natural, universal, and inevitable, it should be demonstrated that they are artificial, specific, and constructed. In this case, the forces behind this naturalization and what they gain through its legitimization should be identified.

Looking at the two cornerstones of human existence, nature and culture, from a broader historical perspective, Castells (2000:477) notes that, from the birth of humanity, nature prevailed over culture in the struggle for survival. This relationship was only reversed during the Modern Age, particularly with the Industrial Revolution and the triumph of “Reason,” when nature became dominated by culture and the human species was released from the forces of nature by producing machines that could generate similar forces. In today’s world, culture has replaced nature to the point that nature needs to be artificially revived, “preserved,” and conserved by environmental movements. In my opinion, attempts to naturalize cultural processes such as globalization are using culture as a substitute for nature.

Economists, sociologists, and historians have adopted varying positions on this issue, grounded in distinct concepts of capitalism and its origins. In his idealistic conception, Sombart believes that capitalism results from the capitalistic spirit, a blend of the spirit of enterprise or venture with the bourgeois spirit of calculation and rationality, and whose genesis must be explained before attempting to define the origin of capitalism itself. According to this view, the capitalistic spirit existed in an embryonic state long before any capitalistic enterprise became a reality. The same idealistic concept is found in Weber’s approach to capitalism as an attitude that seeks profit rationally and systematically. For him, acquisition as the ultimate purpose of life is the guiding principle of capitalism. This mental state seems to have existed from remote times, long before the development of capitalism itself.

The Marxist approach, in contrast, views the essence of the capitalistic system as the use of capital to subdue the labor force and boost output through a system in which workers become merchandise bought and sold in the market like any other item of exchange (Dobb 1963). Thus, the capitalist mode of production emerged only during the 18th century, when capital began to penetrate the production sector to a significant extent, radically transforming structures through the transfer of capital from commerce to incipient industry.

Capitalism is thus described in different ways, which can be summarized in what Tomlinson (1992:134) has called the “dual nature” of capitalism: it is simultaneously an economic system and a cultural system. As an economic system, it is a phenome-
non that appeared with the Industrial Revolution. As a cultural system, however, its principles and logic are apparent in much of recorded history. The drive to expand is a natural human tendency in terms of biological behavior, dating back to the time when early humans emerged in Africa and spread throughout the world. The expansion of capitalism, by contrast, is completely cultural. It is a product of this system’s major contradiction: the capacity to produce more than is consumed. This constant mismatch requires a constant search for new markets. This inherent drive towards dissemination and the resulting increasing sphere of exchange is a force that should not be confused with the natural expansion of our highly successful species. This clarification removes any basis for considering this phenomenon as natural, particularly since capitalism was not the only alternative open to humankind.

The origins of globalization are clearly entwined with the roots of capitalism. Knutsson identifies movements toward globalization since the earliest days of our existence on this planet. Robertson believes this process dates back at least 2,000 years, while acknowledging the acceleration that began in 1870 and culminated in interdependence on a global scale during the 20th century. Godelier places its inception before 1492, but considers that it was fueled by the discovery and conquest of the Americas. Wallerstein recognizes the world capitalist economy as the principal mode of production since the 16th century. Economists such as Zevin, Rodrik, Sachs, and Warner believe that global markets date back at least 100 years (see Bordo et al. 1999–2000), but the prevailing opinion is that the expansionist enterprise set in motion by the maritime commerce of Western Europe during the 15th and 16th centuries triggered the globalization process. This expansion produced European colonization, which delineates the field of operations for historical archaeology in the Americas.

Working directly with material culture and grounded solidly on the study of production and distribution, historical archaeology has much to offer. The logic of capitalism penetrated deeply into societies and the daily lives of their citizens and their bodies, hearts, and minds, even interconnecting them globally. This requires that the phenomenon be analyzed from the standpoint of its impact on the logic ruling minor actions of daily life. Major changes have been and continue to be introduced not only into relationships of production, but also into interperson- nal links, social bonds, ties to nature, family structure, and the organization of work, reshaping the way we think about ourselves and the way we create links with others. As these relationships are actively and intensively used by individuals and societies within this web, the material foundations are important transmitters of messages, making them exceptionally qualified to shed light on the process. Archaeology is undoubtedly the discipline best qualified to investigate this private domain.

The Archaeology of Globalization in Brazil

By studying the routine behavior of 19th-century daily life during the past ten years, I have tried to show the way in which Colonial minds were seduced by industrial consumer goods that poured into Brazilian society, which previously had been limited by the monopolistic practices of Portugal. The expansion of centers of production over peripheral nations in search of markets employed any strategy—even the most subtle, such as persuasion and seduction—for the massive introduction of goods into the Colonial world. This introduction of products was preceded by the infiltration of ideas and values that paved the way for their unconditional acceptance, ensuring subordination and both economic and cultural dependence since these goods were in most cases irresistible to non-industrialized societies.

I have attempted to reveal the subliminal ways in which industrial nations domesticated Colonial societies, preparing them for the adoption of alien practices and capitalistic values (Lima 2000). These new values did not arise naturally by the realignment of the internal conditions of Brazilian society, but were introduced by external pressures exercised by already internationalized capitalist interests. Investigation of this larval state of capitalism in Brazil seems crucial for understanding the trajectory of expansionist activities of the major production centers over Colonial societies. Such activities culminated in the globalization of markets and ensured continuing cultural, economic, and political domination.

The historical archaeology we practice aspires to contribute to understanding this process but also to heighten awareness of the ways in which hegemonic nations continue to dump products on us in vast quantities—even if now they are manufactured locally. Seductive and almost imperceptible strategies of domination are still employed through the infiltration of ideas and values that ensure our subordination and both economic and cultural dependence, just as they did in the past. Latin American historical archaeology has powerful methods for telling the story of this process; the strength of its penetration; the rapid adoption of commodities by cultures unprepared to accept them; and their incorporation into architecture, engineering, and the reorganization of social relations. By analyzing its roots, identifying its strategies of domination, and pointing out the transformations that have enmeshed us in a chronic state of dependence, we will acquire the insight necessary to reverse our disadvantageous position in the global arena today.
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Intercultural Contact

Since the last decade of the 20th century, visible change has taken place in most of Colombia’s larger cities and in some smaller ones too. A significant rural population migration, escaping from poverty or political violence, has had to adapt to urban settings. Urban administration politics and the ideologies that govern them also have changed due to a new political constitution in 1991 that recognizes the Colombian nation as “pluriethnic and multicultural.” In the cities, this has brought about transformations in the meaning of public space and its uses; the organization of new and established urban areas; and the renovation of deteriorated environments to turn them into sustainable habitats. The inclusion of a larger portion of the population, especially those historically marginalized, is anticipated to be part of these new urban development plans.

The changes also have affected the Colombian cultural heritage that remains within cities and has triggered debates on how and what to preserve. Although they are not the most important reason that historical archaeology in Colombia has developed, they have supported this research through both funding and participation in interdisciplinary studies. A more important impetus for historical archaeology’s emergence is the academic debate in which notions of acculturation and cultural devastation of native populations after European Contact gave way to notions of resistance, symbolic construction, and dynamic identities. Initially this focus relied on economic interactions between different social and ethnic groups. More recently, however, there has been a shift in emphasis towards understanding the cultural dimensions of these relationships and how difference was construed and inequality naturalized during daily practice in the course of intercultural contact in different periods and places (Grimson 2002).

Lifestyles in Conflict

In this shift of perspectives, lifestyle has emerged as a significant concept for interpreting the process through which cultural variability—and with it, discrimination, imposition, and exclusion—is socialized, reproduced, and institutionalized. While it is possible to find cases of wealth or poverty in the territory of Nueva Granada (what is now Colombia, Ecuador, and Venezuela) during historical periods, this was not the rule. In contrast with viceroyalties like Nueva España and Peru, Nueva Granada was not a commercial tour de force, even though Cartagena de Indias, one of the most important ports in America, was located within its territory. Much gold left from there but primarily basic produce and African slaves entered through the port. Luxurious imported goods were rare, a favored archaeological indicator for identifying Hispanic or white populations living in opulent economic conditions; instead, the majority of people led lives without the ostentatious commodities identified by Latin American archaeologists as status-conferring. This did not, however, preclude the use of other strategies to establish certain
lifestyles as legitimate and morally correct, and hence dominant, over others considered immoral and improp-er. Lifestyles of dominance therefore revolved around very similar goods and generally took place in the same settings as those of the majority.

Given these characteristics of Nueva Granada’s material culture and spatial dispositions, a comparative approach has been needed to understand how various groups confronted each other, resolved their conflicts, and configured social structures. Important for examining these interactions are the roles and identities assumed by each individual or group and the structuring of their different lifestyles through which meaning was assigned to their possessions and locations, thereby dictating daily practice. Emphasis has been put on the study of local processes. For example, ceramics obtained from several archaeological excavations (Therrien et al. 2002) identify the use of a wide variety of local wares to make distinctive ways of daily living possible. The use of land deeds, parish archives, and cadastral surveys and plans also help to reconstruct urban land-use patterns, the social and kinship relations reflected by them, and the different meanings that public and private spaces had for their inhabitants.

Sense and Sensibility: Jesuit and Dominican Convents

The comparison of two particular convents at Cartagena de Indias, one Dominican and the other Jesuit, has proven to be an interesting setting for examining those values that arise from cultural interaction—through education, indoctrination, or slavery. It also has given sense to daily routines and particular lifestyles, a focus that extends beyond economic or religious aspects, and contributes to an understanding of intercultural contact.

At the Jesuit school, which ran between 1618 and 1767, young Spanish and criollo (those born in America from Spanish parents) students were educated, and priests baptized African slaves that entered through this port. The Dominicans, in addition to serving as Inquisitors, also took charge of Christianizing the native population from different encomiendas (native social units entrusted to the Spaniards as work forces) and resguardos or reducciones (territorial units imposed by the Spaniards where native populations were settled).

For the Jesuits, the main purpose of education was to preserve Catholic morals, especially in an environment where illicit relations were not uncommon. Another goal, however, was to teach traditional Spanish practices to the Spanish students, such as eating, cleaning, reading, and writing, all necessary both for social and cultural recognition within the diverse population as well as for their anticipated return to Spain. The Jesuits were prolific writers and had access to an extensive library focused on grammar and sciences. To discipline the youngsters in European table manners, they depended on a ménage of plates, cups, and escudillas, in which stews and broths consisting of cow meat—provided by their haciendas—was always served. As for hygiene, they depended on chamber pots and lebrillos (Figure 1). This ceramic assemblage was manufactured in their own locería, located at the island of Tierra Bomba, near Cartagena. As such, the Jesuit ware was used to define and reproduce certain habits as a mark of social differentiation without having to depend on scarce imported goods.

This ware was manufactured and also used by the Jesuits’ African slaves. Obtaining clay and producing the vessels were men’s tasks, while women decorated them. It imitated the Spanish majolica tradition,
although its decorative styles (Figure 2), when present, were as distinctive as the ways these slaves put them to use when consuming their own food. These practices differentiated the Jesuit’s slaves from those working in mines or plantations.

A quite different archaeological context characterized the Dominican convent, due probably to their distinct functions in Cartagena. The Dominican order often held the Bishop’s seat, with the indoctrination and protection of the natives its principal mission and a source of conflict with the encomenderos and local authorities. They also contributed to the Inquisitorial tribunes that condemned immoral and demoniacal conduct. Rather than texts on grammar and science, the Dominicans favored theological ones.

Dominican domestic trash from the 17th and first half of the 18th centuries reveals a lifestyle quite different from that of the Jesuits. The refuse deposits consist primarily of native wares. Earlier ceramics are consistent with local prehispanic traditions, while later ones present some variation in form and decorative style, similar to what Meyers (1999) reports for Jamaican slaves (Figure 3). Although Jesuit ware was popular in Cartagena, it is rarely present in the Dominican convent, further evidence of the ongoing rivalry between the religious communities.

Christian indoctrination and direct interaction between natives and priests resulted in a wide selection of vessels forms and decorative styles (Figure 4), such as rounded pots, pitchers, and small bowls, as well as flat budares, often used to prepare cazabe, a yuca bread. Faunal remains also included a variety of species, many of them from wild animals such as turtles, birds, and fish, demonstrating that in daily routines such as food preparation and consumption, indigenous habits and tastes prevailed. What made these practices legitimate, however, was their acceptance into the lifestyles of the priests, who held high social and moral positions in Cartagena.

Pride and Prejudice: La Casa in the Urban Setting

Spatial organization and social and kinship relations can also reflect how change and variability occur within different lifestyles. Using a diachronic perspective, it is possible to examine the significance of space and the house—la casa, a concept underutilized in urban history and architecture—especially concerning intimacy, privacy, family and households, and sociability in urban lifeways. A focus on the house can overcome views in which the European urban model is simply transplanted to America, and instead provide an understanding of how the house was made “familiar” in unfamiliar conditions for both natives and foreigners and how a variety of house forms vied for acceptability during the Colonial period.

Archival research using cadastral and parish documents and deeds has helped the interpretation of complex urban plots, different structural remains, and material goods found in the historical area of Bogotá, a city that, instead of expanding, tended to crowd its growing population into the same area almost until the 20th century. Two factors were identified as having influenced the ways urban plots were subdivided: their kinship significance and their commercial value.

Kinship relations produced a particular spatial organization as parents subdivided their plots into smaller ones that were passed on to their children. While
paternal spaces consisted of the larger sections at the back of a plot, they appeared to be equally divided when looked at from outside, thereby signifying familiar relations in different ways publicly and privately. In contrast, commercial space was organized according to a strict geometrical plan with no visible difference from within or outside of the property (Figure 5).

Archaeologically, these patterns pose a challenge when identifying stratigraphic relationships—such as structuring and reading a Harris matrix—between a property and its neighbors or in the division of a single plot. It also challenges the interpretation of material culture and its use in social identification between neighbors and different tenants. Kinship relations, shared lifestyles, and issues of exclusion and distinction of relatives from non-kin must be examined.

An example of this comes from one of the corner houses at the central plaza of Bogotá. In the early Colonial period, it was inhabited by a mestiza, the daughter of an Indian and a Spaniard, who tried to give her casa a preeminent position by building a two-story structure, maintaining Indian servants, and using local glazed wares that were distinct from the indigenous wares. A Spanish noble later bought her property and completely changed it, explicitly establishing his European lifestyle as distinct from that of the former mestiza owner. Mulatos, the offspring of Africans and Spaniards, and not Indians served his dinners using Spanish majólica. He required that his family follow European dining conventions while eating, after which they would enjoy reading one of his 300 books in a large salon decorated with native artifacts. Surrounding this private existence were the servant quarters, chicken yard, stables, and latrines—spaces that were all regarded as equal to one another but segregated from the main house, a distinction that subsequently was used to divide the property when it was sold for commercial purposes.

Conclusion

Cultural practices that give meaning to everyday activities become more visible during intercultural contact, often turning them into “weapons” that promote discrimination and stigmatization. Today, political violence and economic crisis is revealing the deep social inequality that exists between different groups in Colombia’s major cities. As such, an understanding of how some lifestyles have come to be naturalized as legitimate, and the conflict that is then provoked, is providing renewed importance for research in Colombian historical archaeology.
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NEWS & NOTES

Online Catalog of Modified Bones Images. The Red Iberoamericana de Arqueozoología (RIA, or Ibero-American Net of Zooarchaeology) calls zooarchaeologists to participate in the Image Bank of Modified Archaeological Bones. This database, available at http://www.mdp.edu.ar/productos/bancoimg/, consists of images contributed voluntarily. The objective is easy access to images of natural and cultural alterations of bones from archaeological sites. The database has the following categories: 1) modifications of cultural origin, 2) modifications of natural origin, and 3) cases for consultation. Also available is the RIA forum (http://www.rediris.es/list/info/riarqzoo.es.html), where viewers can comment or request opinions on the images. To post images, consult the standards at http://www.mdp.edu.ar/productos/bancoimg/page10.html.

Research Fellow Program in Southwestern Archaeology. The New Mexico Bureau of Land Management (BLM), in cooperation with the Museum of Indian Arts & Culture, has established a Fellowship program with a research stipend to encourage research and analysis of BLM collections curated by the Museum. The BLM’s collections at the Museum include materials from every period of New Mexico’s rich history, beginning with initial peopling of the Southwest and continuing through the ancestral Pueblo, Navajo, Apache, Comanche, Ute, Spanish, Mexican, and American occupations of this region. With this program, the BLM and Museum seek to create and foster interest in research projects that focus on archaeological collections made from public lands and housed in public curatorial institutions. The fellowship will provide an award of $7,500 and access to the research facilities and existing archaeological collections at the Museum. Candidates for this fellowship should hold a B.A. in anthropology or a related field, be familiar with the archaeology of the Southwestern United States, and be enrolled in good standing in a graduate degree program in anthropology, archaeology, or a related field. Applicants will be asked to provide a proposal for a research project involving collections from public lands curated by the Museum, in addition to demonstrating previous accomplishment in independent research. The BLM Fellow will be required to present at least 2 public programs on their research: a program introducing their research topic when research is initiated, and a program describing the results of their research at the conclusion. A written report for the BLM and the Museum will be required at the conclusion of the fellowship in September 2004. For an application packet, contact Julia Clifton, MIAC/LOA, Museum of New Mexico, P.O. Box 2087, Santa Fe, NM 87504-2087; email: jclifton@miaclab.org; tel: (505) 476-1268. Applications for the fellowship beginning January 2004 are due by October 15, 2003.

Spring 2004 Field School in Arizona. The University of Hawaii and University of Arizona are collaborating to offer a unique format for field instruction during the Spring semester of 2004. A jointly convened field school in Tucson combines a 6- to 12-credit excavation program on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays with an optional opportunity to enroll in additional U of Arizona courses on Tuesdays and Thursdays for a full semester of transferable graduate or undergraduate credit. National Science Foundation-sponsored research at a Hohokam center with a platform mound north of Tucson is the context for investigating competitive strategies among resident social groups during the dynamic early Classic period (A.D. 1150–1300). The joint field school, based at the Arizona State Museum, is directed by James Bayman (Hawaii) and Suzanne and Paul Fish (Arizona). The field school also includes field trips to archaeological sites in the U.S. Southwest and northern Mexico. Partial scholarships are available on a competitive basis. Applications are due on November 1, 2003. Further information is available by contacting James Bayman at jbayman@hawaii.edu or by consulting http://www.anthropology.hawaii.edu/projects/arizona/index.html.

Alexander Lindsay Receives Lifetime Achievement Award. On November 1, 2002, Dr. Alexander J. Lindsay was awarded the Arizona Archaeological Council’s (AAC) first Lifetime Achievement Award. This award was presented on the 25th anniversary of the Council, in honor of Dr. Lindsay’s dedication to the founding of the AAC. Dr. Lindsay’s role in instituting Arizona’s professional archaeological organization is not surprising in light of his other achievements. Themes that repeat themselves throughout his career are his commitment to archaeological resources, professional responsibility, and public education. As a researcher and Curator of Archaeology at the Museum of Northern Arizona, and a research archaeologist at the Arizona State Museum, Lindsay directed the Glen Canyon project and pursued research on the Kayenta region, Point of Pines, ceramics, and population movements into southern Arizona. In the 1970s, he championed the conservation ethic in archaeology, and in 1982 he was recognized for his pioneering role by the American Society for Conservation Archaeology.
NEWS & NOTES

He has taught at Northern Arizona University and the University of Arizona and has provided educational opportunities for students on the northern Arizona reservations. He edited and advised *Kiva, the Journal of Southwestern Anthropology and History*, for which the Arizona Archaeological and Historical Society gave him the Victor Stoner Award in 1992. Retirement in 1993 turned Dr. Lindsay from staff member to volunteer, and he continues to be a researcher, mentor, and role model to many students and young professionals.

**Call for Donations for the Davis Internship in Public Archeology.** When Hester Davis retired in 1999 from her position as State Archaeologist with the Arkansas Archeological Survey—and as a Professor of Anthropology at the University of Arkansas—she established the Davis Internship in Public Archeology with an initial donation of $10,000. Her life’s work was in educating not only scholars but also amateurs in the field. The purpose of her donation is therefore fitting: to support student work in the field and to offer the necessary experience to worthy students beginning their careers who are offered the opportunity to contribute to projects with the Arkansas Archeological Survey. Many of Hester’s former students and the membership of the Arkansas Archeological Society brought in almost another $10,000. Hester has since made additions to the fund, which is administered through the Department of Anthropology and supervised by the Arkansas Archeological Survey. It has been awarded to one graduate student for one semester each since 2000. In the hope of bringing the fund to an amount that will allow the endowment to award an internship for a full year, the Department appeals to the membership of SAA to honor Hester Davis and her contributions to the profession by doubling the amount available. Donations should be made to The University of Arkansas Foundation, Inc., with an indication that the funds are contributed for the Davis Internship, and mailed to the Office of Development, Fulbright College of Arts and Sciences, 525 Old Main, Fayetteville, AR 72701.

**New National Register Listings.** The following archaeological properties were listed in the National Register of Historic Places during the first quarter of 2003. For a full list of National Register listings every week, check “Recent Listings” at [http://www.cr.nps.gov/nr/nrlist.htm](http://www.cr.nps.gov/nr/nrlist.htm)

- California, Fresno County. Birdwell Rock Petroglyph Site. Listed 3/12/03.
- California, Inyo County. Archeological Site CA-INY-134. Listed 3/12/03.
- California, Riverside County. Archaeological Sites CA-RIV-504 and CA-RIV-773. Listed 3/12/03.
- California, Riverside County. Lederer, Gus. Site. Listed 3/12/03.
- California, San Bernardino County. Fossil Canyon Petroglyph Site. Listed 3/03/03.
- California, Shasta County. Swasey Discontiguous Archeological District. Listed 3/12/03.
- Connecticut, Windham County. Fort Camp of Rochambeau’s Army. Listed 1/08/03 (Rochambeau’s Army in Connecticut, 1780–1782 MPS).
- Florida, Pinellas County. Jungle Prada Site. Listed 2/04/03.
- Guam, Guam County. Guam Legislative Building Site. Listed 1/23/03.
- Illinois, Jo Daviess County. Millville Town Site. Listed 3/03/03.
- Oregon, Wasco County. Mosier Mounds Complex. Listed 2/24/03.
- Puerto Rico, Jayuya Municipality. La Piedra Escrita. Listed 1/15/03 (Prehistoric Rock Art of Puerto Rico MPS).
- South Carolina, Berkeley County. Cooper River Historic District. Listed 2/05/03 (Cooper River MPS).

**New Program in Evolutionary Anthropology.** The Department of Anthropology at Washington State University has developed a new graduate program with an emphasis in evolutionary anthropology, offering both the M.A. and Ph.D. degrees. The program builds upon faculty strengths to provide graduate students with training and coursework that combines theoretical sophistication with analytical rigor. The interests and expertise of the WSU faculty offer a uniquely broad range of courses, covering important strains of evolutionary anthropological research including evolutionary psychology, behavioral ecology, evolutionary cultural anthropology, evolutionary archaeology, and paleoanthropology. Current faculty research examines important questions about hominid phylogeny and the evolution of human behaviors such as cooperation and food-sharing, hunting, warfare and aggression, parental investment and the development of material culture. The M.A. and Ph.D. programs aim to train professional anthropologists and archaeologists with a strong sense of how evolutionary theory articulates with different questions about human genes, anatomy, and behavior. Both programs stress the importance of fieldwork to generate original research and the use of a scientific framework to analyze data. For additional information, please see the department website (http://libarts.wsu.edu/anthro) or contact Mark Collard (email: collard@wsu.edu).

**Clements Center–DeGolyer Library Research 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 (http://www.smu.edu/cul/degolyer). The library consists of almost 90,000 volumes.
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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 $500 a week grant is awarded for periods of 1-4 weeks to help to defray costs of travel, lodging, and research materials. Applicants should provide an outline of the project and explain how work in the DeGolyer Library’s collections will enhance it. Please specify the length of research time needed at the library. Applicants should also include curriculum vitae and two letters of reference from persons who can assess the significance of their project and their scholarship record. Applicants who have doubts about the appropriateness of the DeGolyer collections to their research project should consult Russell Martin, director of the DeGolyer Library, at rlmartin@mail.smu.edu or (214) 768-3214. 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, Executive Director, at (214) 768-1233 or at swcenter@mail.smu.edu. Our website address is http://www.smu.edu/swcenter.
Position: Archaeologist, Senior
(30445): $31,358–$47,543
Location: Montgomery, AL
Graduate of a four-year college or university with a Master’s degree in Archaeology, Anthropology, History, or American Studies with a specialization in archaeology. Some experience in archaeological survey or excavation. See the Personnel Department’s web page, http://www.personnel.state.al.us/ for application details. We are looking for an individual with field and analytical experience and the ability to do fieldwork. Hiring immediately. For details, contact: Thomas Maher, Ph.D., Alabama Historical Commission, 468 S. Perry St., Montgomery, AL 36130, tel: 334-242-3184; email: tmaher@mail.preserveala.org. The Alabama Historical Commission is an Equal Opportunity Employer.

Position: Tenure track—Assistant Professor in Archaeology
Location: Provo, Utah
Brigham Young University Department of Anthropology invites applications for a tenure-track position beginning Fall 2004. We seek a candidate specializing in the archaeology of small-scale societies of western North America and with research experience in the Great Basin and American Southwest. The successful candidate will be expected to teach undergraduate and graduate courses in archaeology and anthropology (including an archaeological field school), mentor students, participate in department activities, and pursue field research and scholarly publication. We would prefer a candidate with the ability to teach quantitative methods in archaeology and heritage resource management. The archaeology program at Brigham Young University is diverse and vigorous with ongoing research on the complex societies of Mesoamerica and the Near East as well as the pre-European hunter-gatherers and farmers of the Great Basin/Southwest. Brigham Young University is primarily an undergraduate institution, but the department offers an M.A. in archaeology. We seek a scholar with Ph.D. in hand and academic publications. Applications should include a letter describing teaching qualifications and research interests, a full curriculum vita, and the names and addresses (including telephone and email) of at least three academic references. Please include at least two examples of publications. Brigham Young University, an equal opportunity employer, is sponsored by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and requires observance of Church standards. Preference is given to members of the sponsoring church. Send application by October 15, 2003 to Search Committee, Department of Anthropology, Rm 946 SWKT, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT 84602. For further information, contact Joel Janetski at joel_janetski@byu.edu or (801) 422-6111.

Position: Research Fellow In Historical Archaeology
Location: Denver, Colorado
The Colorado Historical Society invites scholars in historical archaeology, mining history, or cultural geography to apply for a seven-month fellowship to prepare a dissertation or monograph, utilizing site information collected in 1994 from the historic Cripple Creek gold mining district. Select the specific topic, within the material culture, mining technology, and settlement patterns of nineteenth-century mining life; prepare monthly progress reports; deliver a professional conference paper; and submit a near-final draft report. Qualifications: Pre-doctoral or postdoctoral status. Proficiency in Arcview. Valid driver’s license. A background check will be part of the selection process. Complete job description available at http://www.coloradolhistory-oahp.org. This position is funded by a grant from the Cripple Creek & Victor Gold Mining Company. Application Process: Submit a letter of interest, vita, and three references. Finalists will be asked to provide research plans by November 10, 2003. Contact: Susan Collins, Colorado Historical Society/OAHP, 1300 Broadway, Denver CO 80203. Email applications unacceptable. Finalists will be asked to provide research plans by November 10, 2003. Contact: Susan Collins, Colorado Historical Society/OAHP, 1300 Broadway, Denver CO 80203. Email applications unacceptable.

Position: Research Associate
Location: Chicago, IL
The Oriental Institute at the University of Chicago invites applications for an academic research position on the Research Associate track to coordinate the Center for the Archaeology of the Middle Eastern Landscape (CAMEL) and develop research in the field of regional analysis in archaeology. Applicants must have expertise and field experience directing archaeological surface surveys in the Near East/Egypt. In addition, applicants should have expertise in one or more of the following areas: Geographic Information Systems (GIS), geomorphology, remote sensing, geography, or quantitative modeling of settlement systems. The Research Associate will be expected to develop his or her own field project while working in collaboration with existing faculty and graduate student projects. The Research Associate will also develop and teach up to 3 courses per year on survey and other aspects of landscape archaeology. Experience in grant writing is highly desirable. Ph.D. required. The position of Research Associate at the Oriental Institute is one year, renewable for up to three years. After three years, Research
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Positions Open

**Position: Director**

**Location: Philadelphia, PA**

The University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology & Anthropology seeks candidates interested in the post of Director. We are soliciting applications from individuals with academic qualifications that would allow them to be appointed to the tenured rank of Full Professor at the University of Pennsylvania. Candidates will have demonstrated significant experience in dealing with the kinds of national and international research and educational programs, both public and university level, that the University Museum has conducted and will continue to pursue, as well as experience in administration. The new Director will possess the institutional vision and interpersonal skills necessary for the well-being of the Museum. The successful candidate will also demonstrate significant fundraising achievements and planning abilities. The University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology & Anthropology is a major institution of research, education and preservation with a full-time staff of 120 and over 200 volunteers. It has a distinguished history of archaeological and anthropological fieldwork which is reflected in collections of holdings in New World archaeology and ethnography, Near Eastern archaeology and ethnography, Egyptology, Classical archaeology, Asian archaeology and fine arts, and the ethnography and archaeology of Africa and the Pacific. The Museum currently sponsors active research in eighteen countries. Many of the Museum's galleries have been recently renovated, although the task is not yet completed. The University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology & Anthropology also has a long and distinguished record of community education and public outreach. Our Education Department offers extensive programming for schoolchildren. The Museum's traveling exhibits and innovative website enable the museum to share its collections and research both nationally and internationally. Closing date for application is September 15, 2003. Candidates should submit a letter of application along with an academic vita to: Chair, Director of Museum Search Committee, University of Pennsylvania, Office of the Provost, 122 College Hall, Philadelphia, PA 19104-6303. The University of Pennsylvania Museum is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer and is strongly and actively committed to diversity within its community. Women and minority candidates are encouraged to apply.
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exhibits different spatial organization and “cheap” material culture.

**Conclusions**

From this application of the critical-interpretive theoretical framework, we believe that analogy and abduction are useful inferential processes for recognizing the social behaviors that emerge from each social structure inside a particular historic context. The propositions must emerge from a hermeneutical analysis to identify analogical sources, which can then be subjected to either the analysis of the written documentary record or ethnoarchaeological study to associate symbolic meaning with material culture.

In historical archaeology, analogical reasoning most often relies on our own colloquial knowledge because, as we stated earlier, a close relationship exists between the phenomenological aspects of material culture. The mistake comes when we apply this knowledge to reconstruct the symbolic meanings of past archaeological records without demonstrating the necessary linkages between source and object. Symbolic meaning depends on the historical context particular to each social situation. The archaeologist must read this context from the archaeological record, and reasoning through analogy and abduction is required. However, both of these inferential methods can only generate hypotheses. They must never become the final interpretation. Instead, they allow us to generate unbiased interpretations that acknowledge the peculiarities of the cultural behaviors of different social groups.

Acknowledgments. In the epistemological themes we were assisted by Professor Armando Zabert (UNNE, Corrientes-Argentina). The application in archaeological research is my responsibility.
CALENDAR

2003–2004

SEPTEMBER 20
The Pre-Columbian Society of Washington, DC will hold their 10th annual symposium, “Riches Revealed: Discoveries Beyond the Ruta Maya,” at the U.S. Navy Memorial and Naval Heritage Center in Washington, DC. Participants include David Stuart, Marc Zender, Richard Hansen, Geoffrey Braswell, Alfonso Lacadena, and Stanley Guenter. For more information, please contact P. Atwood, Vice-President, at patwood@erols.com.

SEPTEMBER 25–27
Exploring Malta’s Prehistoric Temple Culture will be held at the DePorres Cultural Center in Sliema, Malta. The purpose is to encourage a broad examination of the megalithic monuments and related artifacts of Malta and Gozo. For more information, contact The OTS Foundation, P.O. Box 17166, Sarasota, FL 34276; tel: (941) 918-9215; fax: (941) 918-0265; email: EMPTC@aol.com; web: http://www.otsf.org/EMPTC-conference.html.

OCTOBER 6–11
The 14a Rassegna Internazionale del Cinema Archeologico held in Rovereto, Italy is an annual festival of recent production about archaeology and associated fields. Its main theme for 2003 is “Artistic Expression in Ancient Times.” Submissions produced since 2000 are eligible for consideration for the 6th Paolo Orsi Prize. Contact Dario Di Blasi, Artistic Director. Museo Civico, Largo S. Caterina 43, 38068, Rovereto (TN), Italy; tel: +39(0464) 439.055; fax: +39(0464) 439.487; email: rassegna@museocivico.rovereto.tn.it or diblasidario@museocivico.rovereto.tn.it; web: http://www.museocivico.rovereto.tn.it (select icon for Eventi, then Rassegna).

OCTOBER 10–12
The 10th Annual Maya Weekend at UCLA will consider the topic “Maya-Teotihuacan Connections: New Finds and New Views.” Each new discovery of Teotihuacan-style ceramics, art, monumental sculpture, and architecture at Maya sites rekindles spirited debate about contact. Speakers include Oswaldo Chinchilla, Cynthia Conides, George Cowgill, William Fash, Claudia García-Des Lauriers, Richard Leventhal, Linda Manzanilla, David Stuart, Saburo Sugiyama, and Karl Taube. For more information, contact the Cotsen Institute of Archaeology at UCLA at (310) 206-8934, (310) 825-8064, or via the web at http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/ioa.

OCTOBER 11–15
The XIII International Meeting: “The Researchers of the Maya Culture” will be held at Universidad Autónoma de Campeche, México. For more information, contact Ricardo Encalada Argáez, Dirección de Difusión Cultural, Universidad Autónoma de Campeche, Av. Agustín Melgar sin número, C.P. 24030 Campeche, Campeche, México; tel: (981) 811-98-00 x58000; fax: (981) 811-98-00 x58099; email: recanal@mail.uacam.mx.

OCTOBER 12–16
The 36th Annual Chacmool Conference will be held at the University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada. The conference topic is “Flowing Through Time: Explore Archaeology Through Humans and their Aquatic Environment” and...
will deal with all aspects of how humans used water in the past, lived in wetland environments, moved on water, excavate under water, etc. For more information, contact chacmool@ucalgary.ca.

**NOVEMBER 14–16**
The 5e Festival International du Film Archéologique held in Brussels, Belgium is a biennial festival focused on recent production about archaeology with an emphasis on good cinematography. Special sections on Belgian archaeology and ethnoarchaeology will be featured. Screenings at Fortis Banque’s Grand Auditorium, 1 rue de la Chancellerie. Contact Serge Lemaître, President or Bénédicte Van Schoute, Secretary at Asbl Kineon, 55, rue du Croissant, B-1190 Brussels, Belgium; tel/fax: +32(2) 672.82.91; email: asblkineon@swing.be; web: http://users.swing.be/asblkineon.

**2004**

**JANUARY 7–11**
The Conference on Historical and Underwater Archaeology will be held at the Hyatt Regency Hotel-Union Station, St. Louis, Missouri. Representing the 37th Annual Meeting of the Society for Historical Archaeology, the conference theme will be “Lewis and Clark: Legacy and Consequences.” For updated information, contact tel: (856) 224-0995; email: lsq@sha.org; or web: http://www.sha.org.

**JANUARY 9–10**
The Ninth Biennial Southwest Symposium will be held in Chihuahua City, Mexico, on the topic “Archaeology Without Borders: Contact, Commerce and Change in the U.S. Southwest and Northwestern Mexico.” Posters are encouraged, either in English or Spanish. Titles and a 50-word description should be sent by November 30 to Michael E. Whalen, Southwest Symposium Board Chairman, Dept. of Anthropology, University of Tulsa, Tulsa, OK 74104-3189; email: michaelwhalen@utulsa.edu. For more information, visit http://www.smu.edu/anthro/faculty/mAdler/southwest%20symposium%202004%20web%20page/swsymp04.htm.

**FEBRUARY 14–15**
The Midwestern Conference on Andean and Amazonian Archaeology and Ethnohistory will be held at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. To present a paper, please submit a title and 100–200 word abstract no later than November 15th. Direct all inquiries to Helaine Silverman (email: helaine@uiuc.edu). A website will soon be mounted at http://www.anthro.uiuc.edu/faculty/silverman, so please check back. Hotel reservations may be made prior to January 14 at the Illini Union Guest Rooms, tel: (217) 333-1241.

**JUNE 18–24**
The Third International Conference of the Center for Civilizational and Regional Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences will be held in Moscow on the topic “Hierarchy and Power in the History of Civilizations.” The deadline for 300-word paper abstracts is November 1. For more information, contact Prof. Dmitri M. Bordarenko, Dr. Igor L. Alexeev, and Mr. Oleg Kavykin, preferably by email (conf2004@hotmail.com) or fax + (7 095) 202 0786. Postal mail can be sent to the Center for Civilizational and Regional Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences, 30/1 Spiridonovka St., 123001 Moscow, Russia; tel: + (7 095) 291 4119.

**SEPTEMBER 14–19**
The 4th Iberian Archaeological Congress (IV Congresso de Arqueologia Peninsular) will be held at the University of Algarve, located in Faro, Portugal. Full details can be found at http://www.ualg.pt/fchs/IVCAP or through email to cap@ualg.pt or nbiacho@ualg.pt.

**APRIL 14–17**
The 73rd Annual Meeting of the American Association of Physical Anthropologists will be held in Tampa, Florida. The call for papers is available at http://www.physanth.org/annmeet/aap/a2004/aapa2004call.pdf. For more information, contact John Relethford, Department of Anthropology, State University of New York College at Oneonta, Oneonta, NY 13820; tel: (607) 436-2017; fax: (607) 436-2653; email: relethjh@oneonta.edu. For local arrangements information, contact Lorena Madrigal, Department of Anthropology, University of South Florida, Tampa, FL 33620; tel: (813) 974-0817; fax: (813) 974-2668; email: madrigal@cas.usf.edu.
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Over 60 Years of *American Antiquity* Are Now Available in JSTOR!

The Society for American Archaeology is pleased to announce the full-text, online version of *American Antiquity* 1935-1998. To find out whether your library is a JSTOR participant, please email jstor-info@umich.edu. If you are not at a participating institution, as a current member you can now access the *American Antiquity* archive for just $25 per calendar year.

To be able to search over 60 years of *American Antiquity* in full-text format, **print out** this form and **fax** +1 (202) 789-0284 or **mail** the following information with payment to:

The Society for American Archaeology  
Manager, Information Services  
900 Second Street NE #12  
Washington DC 20002-3557

Name: ____________________________  Member ID #: ________________
Address: _________________________ City: ___________________ Zip: ______________
Country: ___________ Phone: ___________________ Email: _____________________

Payment Type (Check one):  
☐ Check enclosed made out to SAA  
☐ Credit Card (circle type): AMEX  Visa  Mastercard

Card #: _________________________ Expiration Date: _________________

Signature: ____________________________

*Upon processing of payment, SAA will send you an email message with your password and instructions of how to access the archive. You will have access only to *American Antiquity*.

*Agreement with SAA:

*I agree that I will use the database for my personal use only and will not share my user name, password, or access with other individuals or institutions.*

Signature: ____________________________

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization with a mission to create a trusted archive of scholarly journals and to increase access to those journals as widely as possible. The JSTOR database consists of the complete backfiles of over 240 scholarly journals and is available to researchers through libraries.

For additional information on JSTOR, please visit www.jstor.org.
VOLUNTEERS: SAA NEEDS YOU NEXT MARCH!

Would you like the opportunity to meet people interested in archaeology, have fun, and save money? Then apply to be an SAA volunteer!

Volunteers are crucial to all on-site meeting services, and we are currently looking for people to assist the SAA staff at the 69th Annual Meeting in Montréal, Canada, on March 31–April 4, 2004.

In return for just 12 hours of your time, you will receive:
- complimentary meeting registration,
- a free copy of the Abstracts of the 69th Annual Meeting,
- a $5 stipend per shift.

For details and a volunteer application, please go to SAAweb (www.saa.org) or contact Jennie Simpson at SAA (900 Second St. NE #12, Washington, DC, 20002-3557, phone (202) 789-8200, fax (202) 789-0284, e-mail jennie_simpson@saa.org). Applications are accepted on a first-come, first-serve basis through February 1, 2004, so contact us soon to take advantage of this great opportunity. See you in Montréal!