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For much of the last two years, both the SHA Board and our members have uneasily watched the rise of television series following metal detectorists. Detectorists on series such as Diggers, Dig Wars, and Savage Family Diggers seek out archaeological material culture in prosaic and historic places alike, nearly always with the sale of such artifacts either implied or acted out on the shows. Every aspect of these series provides its own distinctive style, which television creators think will make the shows compelling: Diggers follows two manic avocational detectorists who spend much of the series making up words to describe artifacts and exulting over the hunt; Dig Wars likewise involves lots of screaming as detectorists compete against each other trying to secure the most valuable artifacts; and former wrestler Ric Savage’s transparently populist and antiarchaeological Savage Family Diggers is metal detecting’s version of the contrived theatricality of professional wrestling. On the one hand, SHA has tried to be a firm voice advocating responsible archaeological preservation and at least encouraging avocational detectorists and amateur excavators to obey the letter of the law or partner with local archaeologists. On the other hand, these series remain wedded to a portrayal of a material heritage that can always be reduced to exchange value at the end of the episode, and the recognition of archaeological law is at best limited to an afterword tacked onto the credits or a Web page that surveys preservation laws. Historical archaeology sites have been the focus of nearly all of these most recent series, but the dilemmas of how society should value an archaeological heritage are familiar in many corners of archaeology and heritage management.

Basic cable series reach an enormous number of people (at least by archaeological standards), and there have been some series, such as Team Time and Team Time America, which have done a sound job representing archaeological research and at least showing the potential of the medium. Yet many of us have worked with media and realize how challenging it can be to shape even the shortest news report: lots of archaeologists have had the experience of watching their narratives reduced on the one hand to a theatricality of professional wrestling. On the other hand, television interest in metal detecting will unleash a wave of amateur detectorists and amateur excavators. The rise of these series is engaging about archaeology are often taken from movies and television shows inevitably reduce historical narratives to an essence and fixate on the aesthetics of materiality. But television shows inevitably reduce historical narratives to an essence and fixate on the aesthetics of materiality.

## SHA Announces A New Category of Membership

Membership renewals for 2014 will begin October 1, and we encourage you to renew and continue to receive the many benefits of membership. This year you’ll find a new category: The New Professional.

This category has been created primarily to help retain recent graduates who joined in the student category ($80 annually) and are challenged by the full cost of membership in the regular category ($135 annually) during a period of personal financial instability. Other new members of the profession may also find it helpful as they first become active in the Society. To qualify, you should join in this membership category within the first five years of graduating and/or gaining employment in historical archaeology, and can select this category of membership for as many as two years to help offset the full cost of dues. If this membership category fits your needs, we encourage you to take advantage of it.
Opinion and Debate

Flowerdew Hundred Plantation
And The 2013 Grand National Relic Shootout
By Charles T. Hodges
Consulting Archaeologist to the William and Mary Center For Archaeological Research Williamsburg, Virginia.

The following article also appears in the Fall CNEHA Newsletter.

On and 2 March 2013 over 200 metal-detector-wielding members of a relic collectors club descended on the historic Flowerdew Plantation and removed 8,961 metal artifacts, dating to between ca. 1590 and 1865. While large, organized groups of relic hunters are not new to Virginia or the United States, their presence seems to be increasing with the aid of modern digital communications. Moreover, they handle ever-more sophisticated metal detector technology, and many are actively promoting this would-be romantic hobby on the Web. Accordingly, their growing capacity to permanently compromise nonrenewable archaeological resources is difficult to overestimate. In this instance, the damage occurred on a very well-known archaeological resource along the south bank of the James River about midway between Richmond and Jamestown, in Prince George County, Virginia. Flowerdew Plantation was listed on the Virginia Landmark Register in May 1975, and was placed on the National Register of Historic Places in August 1975. The full story of the Flowerdew event is presented here as a cautionary case study.

The scale of the recent damage at Flowerdew is only magnified by the long history of archaeological research, preservation, public education, and outreach conducted at the site. First surveyed in 1949, at the base of Windmill Point, Dr. Gilmore Holland and Dr. Benjamin McCarry uncovered a located contact-period Native American sites with very early English occupations directly over them in identical spatial and artifact-density patterns. Following this early work, the College of William and Mary conducted intensive field research from 1971 to 1979 under Dr. Norman Barka and Dr. Theodore Reinhart. This included creating the college’s first Archaeology Field School in 1978. The work rapidly attracted national attention, and was featured in Time magazine in 1972 and National Geographic in 1976. Most of this work was financially supported by the wealthy landowner David A. Harrison III. Among the finds was a fortified area associated with a ca. 1619-1645 settlement building cluster, and the early English manor house—the first known “big house” in colonial Virginia, and the grandfather of all subsequent Virginia plantation houses. This semipermanent building on an interrupted (by half timbers) stonelode foundation was created by the initial tobacco boom, and the latest evidence suggests its construction was begun by the early colonial governor Sir George Yeardley, who gave America its first representative assembly rights in 1619. In 1679, in a lawsuit of national significance, landowner David Harrison sued the colony for breach of faith and contrary to his own law, as he had financed the work on his private property. In 1980 the core collections became the basis of an archaeology museum and public education program, largely masterminded by Harrison and Dr. James Deetz.

Deetz worked at Flowerdew from 1981 to 1995 in association with the University of California at Berkeley and the University of Virginia. Additional funding came from NEH Grants, University Research Expedition Programs, and anthropological field schools. Again, core operating fund—particularly for the museum—came from the landowner. Across both the William and Mary and Deetz-led programs, a remarkable number of archaeologists got their real start at Flowerdew. Deetz was already famous for his innovative museum interpretation work at Plymouth Plantation near Boston, Massachusetts. Flowerdew’s archaeological record provided a unique opportunity for Deetz’s holistic theoretical approach to historic archaeology, as witnessed by his 1993 book, *Flowerdew Hundred – The Archaeology of a Virginia Plantation* 1619-1864. In 1983, the present author, assisted by Tait Kiser, created an active public archaeology program at the site by creating a “virtually wide-open to the public” early-17th-century excavation, which was not under cultivation. Moreover, David Harrison had previously protected the English fort from the James River with a clay dyke and built up a new packed-clay overburden superimposed over the original remains and initial protective backfill. Over the course of the Harrisons’ ownership of Flowerdew, few—if any—families have done more for American archaeology.

Given the importance of the site, both in terms of the archaeological record and the history of North American historical archaeology, the recent metal-detecting activity at the beginning of March 2013 was therefore particularly unfortunate. The “Grand National Relic Shootout” (GNRS) was a contest organized by a website called the Treasure Depot (http://www.thetreasuredepot.com/), run by Larry Cisna. This contest pitted teams against another to see which could find the most artifacts in the shortest period of time using specific brands of metal detectors. Some metal detector manufacturers were at the site to offer spare parts, onsite repairs, or instrument tuning while advertising their wares to prospective buyers. Any metal artifact predating 1865 counted as one point, leading to a total multiple team final count of 8,961 points scored (in turn enabling a rapid estimate of the number of artifacts recovered). It took four archaeologists from four separate organizations—Mike Barber, Tait Kiser, Mary Ellen Hodges, and the present author—to engage with the secret event. This finally occurred on 24 April 2013, when we eventually located the right search keywords from an article on a Shootout find that made an Ohio newspaper.
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Reilly, Mollie 2011 Washington’s Myths, Legends, and Tall Tales— and how to uncover them. DHR funding changed this dynamic. We, as professional archaeologists, can no longer discuss the collections crisis. It is time for the archaeological community to directly address our archaeological collections and work on a united front to ensure that archaeological collections in Virginia and beyond are documented, organized, accessible, and secure.

Funding threats. DHR staff responded, with input from the Regional Coordinator for Archaeology, and other repositories throughout the state. It also served as a catalyst to push forward our efforts to help improve the state of archaeological collections in Virginia.

The issues addressed in the resulting report are not new; archaeologists have long identified a collections “crisis,” a term that was used nearly 30 years ago to detail the concerns involved in caring for the artifacts and supporting documentation recovered from archaeological fieldwork (Marquardt et al. 1982). For three decades, archaeologists have discussed and written about this crisis, mainly with each other. During this time there have been incremental and spotty improvements in the curation of archaeological remains and in the justification for their curation. Archaeological organizations’ ethics statements and federal regulations, including 36 CFR Part 79, specifically address the curation of archaeological remains. The DHR’s guidelines outline treatment and documentation of archaeological collections, specifically those being transferred to their facility in Richmond. These standards are consistent with 36 CFR Part 79 and provide an excellent outline of how to care for archaeological materials (DHR 2011).

The survey was designed with a series of seven questions in regards to the presence of archaeological material, the overall health of current collections, availability and frequency of use, publicizing of collections, collection importance, and a general inventory of archaeological material at the repository. The survey reached at least 171 institutions in all parts of Virginia. Seven different institutional types own, curate, or exhibit archaeological collections: state agencies, universities, ASV chapters, federal agencies, local jurisdictions, CRM firms, and private individuals and organizations. Federal agencies included the U.S. Forest Service and military installations, primarily represented by the regional curation facility at Fort Lee, which houses the 107 that responded, 75 (70%) reported that they have collections, collection importance, and a general inventory of archaeological material at the repository. As of the following spring (2011), we only had a survey

The survey of archaeological repositories is critical for the compilation of data outlining the many issues involved and the potential solutions within the COVA community from more than 100 repositories. This article summarizes those findings. The complete report can be found online at <http://cova-inc.org/resources/COVAcollectionsSurvey.pdf>

Currently Virginia’s archaeological collections, and with this we refer not only to artifacts, but also to ecofacts, field research Support, spatial information, and oral traditions. Everything that provides data about an archaeological site— from various institutions— is thought of as individual, isolated entities which are dealt with in a variety of ways. With this survey, information about Virginia’s fragmented archaeological collections has, for the first time, been collected and collated in a systematic, big-picture manner. The survey of archaeological repositories in Virginia is the first step in shifting the current paradigm away from a repository-focused approach and toward a more philosophical understanding of our tangible, archaeological past as a collective whole.

Survey Methodology

Following consultations with collections experts and fellow COVA members and background research on other statewide collections survey initiatives, the Collections Committee developed a survey and accompanying cover letter to be sent to 135 institutions in late September 2010 based on those listed in the Eigoff Atlas of Virginia Archaeology (DHR 2012). This provided an excellent starting point in identifying smaller institutions that might own, curate, or exhibit archaeological collections. The survey was also sent to the Archeological Society of Virginia (ASV), chapters, local governments with preservation programs, universities, CRM firms with offices in Virginia, and military installations. By the end of the study, 100% of the institutions that exhibit, curate, or own archaeological collections, we consider that the survey provides a representative sample of all the different types of institutions that do.

The survey form itself was a quest for simplicity; with the intention of gleaning as much information as possible without overwhelming individual repositories. The survey was designed to focus on collections located in the state rather than outside Virginia, and likewise to focus on collections from Virginia. We know that many of Virginia’s archaeological collections, especially from earlier excavations, are housed outside the state. The survey form was sent to all 171 institutions, but we did our best to increase through repeated email campaigns and targeted follow-up phone calls. We received a response, but we know definitively that the institution at least has archaeological collections, we recorded them as not responded, but as a “yes” as to having archaeological collections. Generally speaking, our return rate was fairly high after this renewed effort, better than 60%, with a few glaring exceptions (including some COVA members who represent their institutions on a professional level). We embarked on this second survey phase in response to a question asked by a fellow archaeologist: “Why don’t you just use the site survey forms to figure out where collections are located?” We suspected site forms are not recorded consistently or updated often enough to serve as a resource to locate collections. As detailed in Appendix D of the completed report, our suspicions proved accurate (White and Bocci 2012).

Survey Results

Our survey reached at least 171 institutions in all parts of Virginia. Seven different institutional types own, curate, or exhibit archaeological collections: state agencies, universities, ASV chapters, federal agencies, local jurisdictions, CRM firms, and private individuals and organizations. Federal agencies included the U.S. Forest Service and military installations, primarily represented by the regional curation facility at Fort Lee, which houses local jurisdictions included county and city archaeology programs, and county and city museums and historical societies; state agencies included the DHR and state parks; and private individuals and organizations. Most of the institutions surveyed were private organizations (Table 1).

Out of the 171 institutions, 107 (63%) responded, 64 (37%) did not. We credit this high rate of survey return to our dogged Collections Committee members, who individually contacted most of the people on the list. Of the 171, 107 (63%) responded, and of those 107, we received information on 101 (94%) archaeological collections and 32 (30%) indicated that they did not respond. Two institutions did not respond, but we are positive that they house collections and therefore this information was included in Table 2. What these data show

Table 2: What these data show...
is that (a) archaeological collections are distributed in a wide variety of repository types, but that (b) individual private organizations house the majority of collections. However, the range of archaeological collections curated by these institutions is large, with a thousand institutions reporting.

The rest of the survey questions, which could be answered with a “yes/no” response, are summarized in Table 3. These responses are from institutions with archaeological collections. A surprising number of institutions do not have collections policies, including 1 federal agency, 1 state agency, 3 local jurisdictions, 5 universities, and 10 private institutions. Out of the 78 institutions that have collections, 43 accept new collections and 12 do not. These data suggest that there are more active repositories than we assumed before this undertaking. Problematically, of those institutions that accept new collections, 10 do not have collections policies. Most of the places that have archaeological collections do make them available to researchers and/or the public. Of those whose collections are available to researchers or the public, an appointment is usually required. In breaking down the frequency with which collections are used, 12 said never, 20 said rarely (1 to 6 times a year), 6 said occasionally, and 9 said frequently (daily or weekly).

In terms of publishing collections, though some institutions do not advertise, others get out the word on many fronts including exhibits, websites, research and publications, events (e.g., Archaeology Month), and public outreach (including Elderhostels, school group tours, summer camps, etc.). Some are venturing into the world of social networking with Facebook, Twitter, and WordPress. Perhaps the most difficult question on the survey was number 6, “Which collections do you believe contribute to important research about Virginia history? What supporting documentation is available, the condition of the artifacts and supporting documentation, what processing and analyses have occurred, and what still could be accomplished. The fact that this question proved difficult for institutions of all types and sizes to answer is cause for major concern.

Recommendations
This report details the fragmented nature which underlies the paradigm currently guiding the management of the Commonwealth’s archaeological collections. From the most basic level of how an archaeological collection is defined to more-theoretical discussions of value and significance, the report points out there needs to be done within the professional community to ensure that the tangible remains of our archaeological research are preserved for the future.

Our primary recommendation is that we need a paradigm shift that puts in the past our fragmented and ill-defined mindset towards collections and begins to view Virginia’s archaeological collections as a collective whole, just as we spell out the mission and goals for curating archaeological collections as a collective whole, just as we do with our archaeological sites. In an ideal world, one collection should be the foundation of a repository’s procedures. The collections policy spells out the mission and goals for curating archaeological collections and provides a long-term framework for their care. It serves as a road map, not only for what to collect, but also for how to curate and maintain it. Further, it spells out the policy for inventories, processing materials, loans, and research. A collections policy is a critical document that should be the foundation of a repository’s procedures. The committee recommends that curatorial facilities should adopt a collections policy and the committee will discuss ways to provide models and help in crafting this document.

Inventories (Not Artifact Catalogs)
When the committee began the survey, we did not anticipate that this would be an arduous or difficult task. While we state we are overall very positive about the return rate for survey forms, we acknowledge that this exercise was challenging for many institutions. Some of these situations are discussed in this report, but the committee feels that an inventory of collections described by specific criteria would be baseline data – easily accessible and available. Knowing where specific archaeological collections are housed is important for continuing research, as well as for providing access to important archaeological remains for educational purposes or exhibits. An inventory of archaeological collections also provides a foundation for identifying items that may be lost or missing. The committee recommends that all repositories should make an effort to produce an inventory of the archaeological collections they house. This inventory should document site name and number, in addition to which part of the archaeological collection they have in their possession.

This survey took many hours of work to compile complete tables and figures. It is hoped that the information collected will prove useful for both institutional shortcomings and for institutions in need of additional resources.

Table 1. Numbers of types of repositories surveyed and response rates for each type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Repository</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Agency</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASV Chapter</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Agency</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Jurisdiction</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRM Firm</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Repository</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASV Chapter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Agency</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRM Firm</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Agency</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Jurisdiction</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
<td><strong>78%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Repositories with archaeological collections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Repositories with Archaeological Collections</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASV Chapter</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Agency</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRM Firm</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Agency</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Jurisdiction</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>78%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Answers to yes/no survey questions from those that reported having collections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does your repository have a collections policy?</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your repository accept new collections?</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the collections available to the public or for the public outside the institution?</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Are the site collections located, who owns them, what supporting documentation is available, the condition of the artifacts and supporting documentation, what processing and analyses have occurred, and what still could be accomplished. The fact that this question proved difficult for institutions of all types and sizes to answer is cause for major concern.

Recommendations
This report details the fragmented nature which underlies the paradigm currently guiding the management of the Commonwealth’s archaeological collections. From the most basic level of how an archaeological collection is defined to more-theoretical discussions of value and significance, the report points out there needs to be done within the professional community to ensure that the tangible remains of our archaeological research are preserved for the future.

Our primary recommendation is that we need a paradigm shift that puts in the past our fragmented and ill-defined mindset towards collections and begins to view Virginia’s archaeological collections as a collective whole, just as we spell out the mission and goals for curating archaeological collections. From this perspective, we acknowledge that this exercise was challenging for many institutions. Some of these situations are discussed in this report, but the committee feels that an inventory of collections described by specific criteria would be baseline data – easily accessible and available. Knowing where specific archaeological collections are housed is important for continuing research, as well as for providing access to important archaeological remains for educational purposes or exhibits. An inventory of archaeological collections also provides a foundation for identifying items that may be lost or missing. The committee recommends that all repositories should make an effort to produce an inventory of the archaeological collections they house. This inventory should document site name and number, in addition to which part of the archaeological collection they

Table 4. How do repositories accept new collections?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis for Collections Acceptance</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>According to collections policy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space and significance</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derived from related institutions or activities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association with institution</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case-by-case</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Answers to yes/no survey questions from those that reported having collections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does your repository have a collections policy?</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your repository accept new collections?</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Are the site collections located, who owns them, what supporting documentation is available, the condition of the artifacts and supporting documentation, what processing and analyses have occurred, and what still could be accomplished. The fact that this question proved difficult for institutions of all types and sizes to answer is cause for major concern.

Recommendations
This report details the fragmented nature which underlies the paradigm currently guiding the management of the Commonwealth’s archaeological collections. From the most basic level of how an archaeological collection is defined to more-theoretical discussions of value and significance, the report points out there needs to be done within the professional community to ensure that the tangible remains of our archaeological research are preserved for the future.

Our primary recommendation is that we need a paradigm shift that puts in the past our fragmented and ill-defined mindset towards collections and begins to view Virginia’s archaeological collections as a collective whole, just as we spell out the mission and goals for curating archaeological collections. From this perspective, we acknowledge that this exercise was challenging for many institutions. Some of these situations are discussed in this report, but the committee feels that an inventory of collections described by specific criteria would be baseline data – easily accessible and available. Knowing where specific archaeological collections are housed is important for continuing research, as well as for providing access to important archaeological remains for educational purposes or exhibits. An inventory of archaeological collections also provides a foundation for identifying items that may be lost or missing. The committee recommends that all repositories should make an effort to produce an inventory of the archaeological collections they house. This inventory should document site name and number, in addition to which part of the archaeological collection they

Table 6. How do repositories accept new collections?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis for Collections Acceptance</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>According to collections policy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space and significance</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derived from related institutions or activities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association with institution</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case-by-case</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
have—artifacts, field notes, photographs, or reports, and the potential contribution of the site to research, exhibition, or other functions. An inventory should also detail the status of each collection and whether it needs attention in the form of, for example, basic processing, cataloging, or additional research.

Ownership and its Place in a Collections Policy

Because archaeological collections have the potential to provide information about the past and because they possess many different values, not all of which can be known at this time, it is imperative that ownership of our archaeological collections be clear and documented. One of the issues that this survey has uncovered is the uncertain ownership of many archaeological collections curated within the state in all types and sizes of repositories. Clear ownership of the artifacts and associated documentation and a plan for their long-term curation should be spelled out before excavation takes place. Likewise, facilities should not accept collections without clear ownership documentation. Repositories should work to clear title to their archaeological collections of their highest profile sites, so that issues do not arise when researchers, publishers, or museums seek to use these artifacts.

University-Related Recommendations

Another issue this survey details is the individualized nature of professors and graduate students at universities and colleges in Virginia. Consequently, none of the survey respondents oriented the work of their university as a whole. None of Virginia’s universities have a centralized or departmental collections manager, and it is unclear if any have a formal collections policy. Without a collections policy or centralized departmental manager, the collections generated through professor and graduate student excavations have the potential to become “orphaned” by the university upon the retirement or death of the archaeologist. This survey documented cases of “orphaned” archaeological collections at both the College of William & Mary and Virginia Commonwealth University, and the committee is aware of additional examples. Virginia’s academicians should make every effort to ensure the long-term care of the collections under their responsibility.

This includes making sure that sites are reported, noted, maps and photographs are in order and digitized, and that a repository is identified to provide access to and care for these data.

Means to Update DSS to Reflect True Repositories

The committee recommends that an effort should be made to update depository data on the state site forms, especially those that have had Phase III excavations. The jointly administered ASV/COVA certification program could help in this endeavor because “updating” a site form is already an approved task in the certification program. In addition, the program could also incorporate this procedure as it develops more advanced requirements for certification graduates seeking additional training.

Help for Smaller Institutions

Many of the survey respondents were historical societies and other smaller institutions, often with no professional archaeologist on staff. The people in this category repeatedly asked for assistance in managing, processing, and making sense of their collections. The committee recommends that the professional archaeological community and the certification committee help these organizations in a variety of ways. One recommendation of this report is to help these smaller institutions craft a collections policy to outline basic care of and understanding about archaeological collections. The jointly administered certification committee could incorporate assistance to these institutions, nonarchaeological repositories into future curricula that they write, especially for advanced certification work. The survey documents a clear need and desire for assistance on the part of many of these institutions and it would be a shame for the archaeological community not to respond to this plea.

Others?

With this recommendation, we leave it up to you and your organization to think creatively about how the results of this report might inspire better curation and stewardship of the archaeological record. Two survey respondents offered examples of how this exercise had pushed them to think more critically about the treatment of their archaeological collections. In one instance, a professional archaeologist used the survey’s methodology to begin advocating for a larger and more organized curation facility that would protect the various collections, and also facilitate undergraduate research on those old collections. In another example, a professional archaeologist responded that the survey had motivated him to develop a new graduate special topics course on archaeological collections management, which would educate future professionals on the challenges they will face while simultaneously utilizing the man power of those enrolled to tackle some of the specific collections issues faced by that institution. We are encouraged by these creative steps and hope others will be, too.

Conclusion

“We are actively working on the collection at this time to catalogue over 1000 artifacts. Your advice on addressing the collections policy to accommodate archaeological collections would be very helpful. This survey is a very worthy effort.” (Collections survey respondent)

The Survey of Archaeological Repositories in Virginia undertaken by COVA’s Collections Committee proved to be both enlightening and a worthwhile effort. We have begun to assemble an inventory of where archaeological collections are housed and who is using these materials—and that it provides some information that can be used by Virginia’s archaeologists.
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AFRICA
Kenneth G. Kelly, University of South Carolina, <kenneth.kelly@csc.edu>

ASIA
Ruth Young, University of Leicester, <rly@le.ac.uk>

AUSTRALASIA & ANTARCTICA
Sarah Hayes, La Trobe University, <s.hayes@latrobe.edu.au>

CANADA-ATLANTIC (New Brunswick, Newfoundland and Labrador, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island)
Amanda Crompton, Memorial University of Newfoundland, <acrompt@mun.ca>

CANADA-ARCTIC (Northwest Territories, Yukon, and Nunavut)
Vacant – contact the Newsletter editor for more information

CANADA-Ontario
Jon K. Jouppten, <jonjo02@niagara.com>

CANADA-PRAIRIE (Manitoba, Saskatchewan)
Tim Panas, <tpanas@lauselans.net>

CANADA-QUEBEC
Stephane Noel, Université Laval, <stephanie.noel2@ulaval.ca>

CANADA-WEST (Alberta, British Columbia)
Doug Ross, Simon Fraser University, <douglass.e.ross@gmail.com>

CARIBBEAN AND BERMUDA
Frederick H. Smith, College of William and Mary, <fsmith@wm.edu>

CONTINENTAL EUROPE
Natascha Mebier, University of Vienna, <natascha.mebier@univie.ac.at>

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND
James Symonds, University of York, <james.symonds@york.ac.uk>

LATIN AMERICA
Pedro Paulo Funari, <ppfunari@uol.com.br>

MIDDLE EAST
Uzi Baram, New College of Florida, <ubaram@ncf.edu>

SUBWATER (Worldwide)
Toni L. Carroll, Ships of Discovery, <tlcarroll@shpsofdiscovery.org>

USA-ALASKA
Robin O. Mills, Bureau of Land Management, <rmills@blm.gov>

USA-CENTRAL PLAINS (Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska)
Jay Sturdevant, National Park Service, <jay_sturdevant@nps.gov>

USA-GULF STATES (Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Texas)
Kathleen H. Canale, Arkasas Archaeological Survey, <kcanale@arkasas.edu>

USA-MID-ATLANTIC (Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia)
Ben Resnick, GAI Consultants, <b.resnick@gaiconsultants.com>

USA-MIDWEST (Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin)
Lynn L.M. Evans, Mackinac State Historic Parks, <EvansL8@michigan.gov>

USA-NORTHEAST (Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Rhode Island, Vermont)
David Starbeck, <dstarbeck@frontiernet.net>

USA-NORTHERN PLAINS AND MOUNTAIN STATES (Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming)
Steven G. Baker, Centers for Research, <sbbaker@montrose.net>

USA-PACIFIC NORTHWEST (Idaho, Oregon, Washington)
Robert Cromwell, Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, <Bob_Cromwell@nps.gov>

USA-PACIFIC WEST (California, Hawaii, Nevada)
Kimberly Woolen, <kimberly.woolon@dot.ca.gov>

USA-SOUTHEAST (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee)
Gifford Waters, Florida Museum of Natural History, <gwaters@flmnh.ufl.edu>

USA-SOUTHWEST (Arizona, New Mexico, Utah)
Michael R. Polk, Sagebrush Consultants, <sage@sagebrushconsultants.com>

USA-SOUTHEAST (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee)
Steven G. Baker, Centuries Research, <sbaker@montrose.net>

USA-ALASKA
Robin O. Mills, Bureau of Land Management, <rmills@blm.gov>

South Australia
The Archaeology of Saints and Sinners: Excavations at St John’s, Kapunda (submitted by Cherrie De Leisien, Flinders University, <cl.deleisien@flinders.edu.au>.) As part of a research project into discourses on gender in archaeological landscapes and literature, excavation was undertaken at the site of St John’s, near Kapunda in South Australia. This was the site of one of the earliest Catholic parishes established in the state, and the church and presbytery were later used as a school and a girl’s reformatory. It was occupied by religious men and women, and has distinct phases of residence that can be seen as primarily male (the priest), then female (nuns), the latter also including children. The site thus displayed strong potential for exploring how the materiality of gender might differ archaeologically through the nuances of alterations to structures and the landscape to engage with and cater to either gender. South Australia differs from other states of Australia in that it was a freely settled and planned British province, not a convict settlement. It was proclaimed a colony of the British Crown in 1836, and land was surveyed and sold to a few wealthy immigrants. Land in the mid-north of the state, occupied by the Indigenous Ngadju nation, was acquired in 1841 for pastoral use and soon afterwards the township of Kapunda was established, named from the local word for “water holes.” Copper was discovered there in 1843, and the potential for employment and profits to be gained from mining generated a spate of migration to the area. The population also included a substantial number of Irish Catholics and their families who had left their homeland due to the Great Famine, and who became employed primarily as mine laborers. There had been few Catholics in the colony prior to this, and there had likewise been few wealthy Irish Catholic landowners or government officials; this was in keeping with social structures back in the United Kingdom, where the Roman Catholic Relief Act removing most restrictions on Catholic participation in the British state had only been passed in 1829. A Catholic church, school, and cemetery were established to meet the needs of this growing community on ten hectares of glebe land that had been granted by the colonial government under the state Act to Religion Act. The first church, built in 1849, was a slab hut named the Church of St John the Evangelist, which also gave its name to the surrounding area, Johnstown (Charlton 1971). Parishioners are said to have numbered in the hundreds, and it was perhaps the largest Catholic community in South Australia or indeed, the country, at that time (Nicol 1977). After the completion of a substantial bluestone church on the site in 1854, the original slab hut was run as a school until 1861 by both lay teachers and the Sisters of St. Joseph. In 1869 the presbytery was converted to a convent and school for the Sisters, and in 1874 the Catholic Church Endowment Society took over the property. A decline in population due to mine closures and relative isolation of St John’s saw the site abandoned. In 1895 an act allowing the State Children’s Council to send state wards from particular religious denominations to private reformatories was enacted. As a result, the Catholic Church returned to the St John’s site, using the structures as a reformatory for Catholic girls, and the site was officially designated as an industrial school. Sister Helena O’Brien was appointed matron and she, along with four other sisters, moved to Kapunda to prepare the residence. MacKillop (now Australia’s first and only saint) supervised the alterations and lived for a short time at St John’s. The first group of 10 girls arrived in June 1897. Newspapers document that the church was divided in half, with one side being used as a chapel and the other as a dining room and workroom. It also records the girls, aged between 13 and 17, as undertaking tasks ranging from gardening, laundering, milking, corset and shirt making (for sale in town), to wood chopping. The arrangements were very similar to those of the infamous “Magdalen Laundries”, which were contemporary with the site’s use. Due to a combination of lack of government funding, problems associated with a resident priest, and political issues, St John’s Reformatory was closed abruptly in 1909. The 11 girls resident at that time were transferred to a nearby prison, which was also

Fig. 1. Excavated bluestone structure, said to be a block of three cells to isolate uncooperative girls from the reformatory, which is more likely to be a shower block, cistern, washrooms, or a storage facility. The palm tree in the background was planted when the presbytery was established.
emerged include a consideration of whether girls suffered welfare. To date, there has been little archaeology directed at juvenile crime and punishment and social outcomes, as the site has merit in terms of its architectural heritage. The recording of this site has been important to the local community, regardless of the religious beliefs of local people. The collection of buildings represents the “bridge” between the early history of the site.

During the 12 years of its existence a total of 85 girls were accommodated at St John’s, 59 of whom were readmitted for a second term, and there were between 12 and 21 girls living there at any one time. There were also five nuns resident on the site throughout the life of the institution.

Initial surveys, followed by an excavation, were undertaken at St John’s in April 2013. In light of disturbance and the demarcation of all structures, the primary value of the excavation lay in the identification of the layout of the buildings from potential foundations remaining in situ and the recovery of any artifacts. The excavation focused on two main goals, one being to locate the church foundations and the other to find a structure documented as three detached cells associated with the reformatory. The eastern external wall and internal footing of the church were located, and a small number of artifacts were recovered, including coins and a holy medal of St. Jude. While locating the church was rewarding, it has been the supposed external cells that have proven to be most surprising. The excavation found a large square bluestone two-level structure with the upper ground level half divided into three cubicles. Each cubicle was identical and contained two rectangular features and a chute that opened into the lower half of the structure, which formed a rectangular 1.55 m deep stone-walled pit. The sloping sides were lined with a sheet of glass, angled at 70°. The pit was fully lined with plaster and the foundations sealed with bitumen.

No staining, damp, or organic layers at the bottom of the plaster were a series of clock faces with roman numerals, depicting the dress and a cross. To the right of the image (not shown) also etched into a sheet of glass, angled at 70°. The pit was fully lined with plaster and the foundations sealed with bitumen.

No staining, damp, or organic layers at the bottom of the plaster were a series of clock faces with roman numerals, depicting the dress and a cross. To the right of the image (not shown) also etched into a sheet of glass, angled at 70°. The pit was fully lined with plaster and the foundations sealed with bitumen.

FIGURE 2. Graffiti found in an internal cell in the reformatory building, prior to its demolition. The image is likely to have been made by a girl from the reformatory and shows a man and woman in contemporary dress and a cross. To the right of the image (not shown) also etched into a sheet of glass, angled at 70°. The pit was fully lined with plaster and the foundations sealed with bitumen.

No staining, damp, or organic layers at the bottom of the plaster were a series of clock faces with roman numerals, depicting the dress and a cross. To the right of the image (not shown) also etched into a sheet of glass, angled at 70°. The pit was fully lined with plaster and the foundations sealed with bitumen.

No staining, damp, or organic layers at the bottom of the plaster were a series of clock faces with roman numerals, depicting the dress and a cross. To the right of the image (not shown) also etched into a sheet of glass, angled at 70°. The pit was fully lined with plaster and the foundations sealed with bitumen.

The cubicles certainly do not appear to be cells as had been previously thought by historians and locals. The pit was fully lined with plaster and the foundations sealed with bitumen.
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The most surprising object we found during the excavation was a small bottle of Grenville French perfume (no. 6). According to the researchers at the Perfume Museum in Milan, the bottle contained a perfume named Oellet Fané, which was produced until the mid-1940s; the factory closed soon after the ending of World War II, when the firm was accused of collaboration with the Vichy Regime. This perfume, a real status symbol at the time, is either the result of one of Castrin's robberies or a gift made to him by one of his several lovers.

The main outcome of the research concerns methodology; in this case, historical archaeology has demonstrated its potential for the reconstruction of a single individual’s biography during a specific period. In Italy this task has been considered the purview of other disciplines (e.g., anthropology and history), which are usually—and incorrectly—considered as the most appropriate academic disciplines for the study of the recent past in much of Italy.

A second contribution concerns the mechanisms of memory construction and elaboration, which vary with the social rank of an individual or a group. We thus have a level which we can define as “popular,” where the bandit is a sort of Robin Hood. The memory of Castrin emerging from the songs by the local rock band and the anarchists’ association, which focused on aspects of social revolt, demonstrates political and social connections. Lastly, among the bourgeois we find the image of Castrin as a “noble bandit,” a memory which has been created by the victims of his robberies and recalls the “noble savage” myth.
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FIGURE 1. Sector I transect survey using metal detectors.

FIGURE 2. Remington .43 cal. cartridges and lead projectiles.

Identification and analyses of cartridges, projectiles, and metallic artifacts were performed in the Laboratorio de Materiales de la Facultad de Ingeniería of the Universidad de Buenos Aires (Materials Laboratory of the University of Buenos Aires’ engineering department), where the university’s Archaeometallurgy Group (AG) is currently undertaking research. Cartridges were first morphologically classified, according to their visual characteristics, and then a microstructural study was carried out through a metallographic analysis of different fragments. Scanning electron microscope (SEM) images were obtained and the chemical composition of defined portions of the artifacts was determined by energy dispersive spectroscopy (EDS). Many of the cartridges were deformed, and presented macroscopically longitudinal branched and nonbranched cracks. The cartridges’ bases showed different morphologies, presenting either one or two concentric circles, as can be seen in Figure 2.

EDS analysis of the cartridges’ bodies and inner head walls—employed as reinforcement—revealed that they were made of a brass composed of 70.78% wt Cu and 29.22% wt Zn (commonly known as 70-30 brass). Their microstructure presents areas of highly deformed material with distorted twinning crystals and shear bands and others with equiaxed unreformed grains and growth twins. The presence of inclusions, or gray precipitates, of lead was also observed. These cartridges suffered from a degradation process that altered their microstructure, causing several of them to malfunction. A high percentage of the cartridges sampled shows these flaws. Cracks which run through the body have also been observed. In most cases, it was observed that the cracks had begun to rust on the interior. According to EDS analysis, this rust contained copper, zinc, and traces of lead.

The location and distribution of projectiles, cartridges, and materials related to the battle

Materials related to the battle

Sector I Sector II Sector III Sector IV Sector V
out fieldwork at a 19th-century site at Tapalqué, Buenos Aires Province. The 19th century witnessed the “conquest” of the Argentinean Pampas and Patagonia, this was therefore a frontier area in the 19th century, and is remembered as having been at the forefront of the struggle to bring indigenous areas under the control of the government in Buenos Aires. Between 1831 and 1860 a fort was manned at Tapalqué. The settlement of the area was thus linked to local frontier dynamics but is also relevant to the broader field of international frontier studies. Archaeological fieldwork is the result of cooperation between the universit y and Tapalqué municipality, which has been ongoing since the mid-1990s. Methodologically, the archaeologists have stressed a multidisciplinary approach, and have collaborated with scholars from different backgrounds. In theoretical terms, the team uses processual middle-range theory largely based on quantitative analysis. The site is in the so-called “lowlands of Río Salado,” a wetlands area, and was declared a national heritage site as early as 1945. So far, artifacts and ecofacts recovered from the site include faunal remains (bovine, equine, ovine, porcine), pottery, ceramics, glass, metal, necklace beads (chaquiras), coins, and bottles. Underwater excavation has revealed a wooden post. Archaeological analysis in conjunction with the documentary evidence has demonstrated that this frontier fort was a key strategic post in a particularly important period of nation building in the new republic. The Buenos Aires region was the economic and political center of the early Argentine state, and the conquest of the far south—and the fort system—were significant components of the nation-building project. The Tapalque Viejo canton fort was part of this national strategy and this archaeological fieldwork has contributed to a better understanding of this process.

### Middle East

#### Israel

**Crusader Stones, Bedouin Sheikhs, and Butchers: Zahir al-`Umar al-Zaydānî’s Wall and the Siege of Akko (Acre) of 1799 (submitted by Michael Waas, Saving the Stones)**: The saving the stones program is an intensive conservation training and research internship in the Old City of Akko (Acre), on Israel’s Mediterranean coast. The internship trains students in various aspects of practical conservation, as they have the opportunity to visit sites and meet and work alongside professionals from all around the country. Saving the stones is housed in the International Conservation Center, the result of a partnership between the Israel Antiquities Authority, the Old Acre Development Company, the Municipality of Akko, and the City of Rome.

During the summer of 2010, the defining characteristics of the Old City of Akko—its walls—were documented. The old walled city of the old city, constructed at the beginning of the 19th century during the last years of Ahmad al-Jezzar “Pasha’s” reign, exists today primarily because of the events of the spring of 1799, when Napoleon Bonaparte made his furthest advance to the north during his campaign in Egypt and the Ottoman provinces of Palestine and Syria. Conquering Akko was the key to Napoleon’s plan of pushing all the way through to the imperial capital of the Ottoman Empire.

During the 60-day siege, Napoleon’s army, without heavy artillery due to British warships aiding the Ottoman Navy, attempted to mine and blow up the outer wall at the point of the northeastern assault tower of the city seven separate times during the siege, finally succeeding on the seventh attempt. With the breach opened, Napoleon sent his men on two assaults into the city and each time they were repelled by the city’s defenders. Ahmad Pasha realized, following his army’s success in resisting Napoleon, that the outer wall of the city was inadequate, at only a meter thick, and that to cope with the continuing advances in artillery and to protect the city’s power, he needed to have a significantly stronger wall constructed, leading to today’s outer wall and moat that surrounds the eastern and northern parts of the old city and the construction of the current seawall.

The inner wall that defied Napoleon is still a prominent feature in the landscape of the Old City of Akko; its history starts before 1517. The Bedouin Sheikh Zahir al-‘Umar al-Zaydānî built today’s inner wall in the years 1750–1751. It is 7 meters tall and 1 meter wide, and was constructed not only to protect the port, but also the city, which had been unfortified since the Crusader kingdom collapsed in 1291. The stones Zahir utilized were smaller stones, as was typical in Ottoman masonry. The wall was constructed on top of the remains of the inner wall of the Crusader city, giving the comparatively weak, earthworks. The Crusader masonry ended up playing a key role in repulsing Napoleon’s forces, because the mines they used in their breach attempts were insufficient against the large Crusader stones.

In Akko, as elsewhere in the eastern Mediterranean, there has been comparatively little work done on the archaeology of the Ottoman period. Almost all of this work has focused on Napoleonic trenches on the nearby ancient mount (Tel Akko) and the fortifications of the city. Uzi Baram has written on the archaeology of the Ottoman Empire. Danny Syon of the Israel Antiquities Authority worked two separate field seasons along al-‘Umar’s wall, but came away with having discovered only Crusader remains and Ottoman remains post-1840 (Danny Syon August 2010, pers. comm.). This is likely because of the destruction of the ammunition depot, located along the eastern portion of the inner wall, during the Egyptian siege of Akko in 1840.

Since 2010, historical archaeology has been growing in relevance in Akko. In Israel, legally, the Conservation Department of the IAA is in charge of anything that is not defined as an antiquity (pre-1700). In no small part, therefore, to the work and research opportunities provided by the International Conservation Center for Saving the Stones participants, opportunities for work in historical archaeology are expanding in Akko.

Since 2010, historical archaeology has been growing in relevance in Akko. In Israel, legally, the Conservation Department of the IAA is in charge of anything that is not defined as an antiquity (pre-1700). In no small part, therefore, to the work and research opportunities provided by the International Conservation Center for Saving the Stones participants, opportunities for work in historical archaeology are expanding in Akko.

Since 2010, historical archaeology has been growing in relevance in Akko. In Israel, legally, the Conservation Department of the IAA is in charge of anything that is not defined as an antiquity (pre-1700). In no small part, therefore, to the work and research opportunities provided by the International Conservation Center for Saving the Stones participants, opportunities for work in historical archaeology are expanding in Akko.
USA - Midwest

Michigan

Excavations at Roosevelt Park, Detroit, Michigan (submitted by Brenna Moloney, Ph.D. student, Wayne State University):

FIGURE 1. The Roosevelt Park team in front of the Michigan Central Railroad Station.

Dr. Krysta Ryzewski’s Field Methods in Archaeology class at Wayne State University recently conducted an archaeological excavation at Roosevelt Park in Detroit, Michigan. The park lies at the foot of Detroit’s Beaux Arts Michigan Central Railroad Station, an abandoned building whose image has become the emblem of Detroit’s decline. The park was designed in the City Beautiful tradition and was constructed between 1919 and 1921 over the former site of a residential neighborhood, whose homes, shops, alleys, and roads were removed to make way for the esplanade. Homes in the area cleared for the park dated to the mid-to late 19th century. Though the site is located in the heart of Detroit’s Corktown neighborhood, residents of the neighborhood were ethnically diverse and most of them were working-class. A large portion of the building material was sold for salvage at a public auction in 1917, but much remains in the archaeological record that can offer insight into the everyday lives of Detroiters in a period of sweeping social and economic change.

The fall 2012 excavation followed a field survey conducted by Dr. Thomas Killian of Wayne State the previous year. Both the 2011 survey and the 2012 excavation yielded significant amounts of material, including domestic refuse, which is currently being processed and analyzed in Wayne State University’s Museum of Anthropology archaeology lab. The excavation also yielded important information about the layout and spatial organization of the neighborhood. There were a total of four excavation units opened during the 2012 season: two were 1 x 1 m units and two were 1 x 2 m units. In total there were 30 contexts and 8 features uncovered in the course of the excavation. Thousands of artifacts were retrieved, ranging from the mainly domestic glass, ceramics, and metal items, 19th-century children’s toys, to the very rare landscape features were revealed, including two postholes, which may help confirm the layout and location of the historic alleyway.

Analysis of the Roosevelt Park site material has continued after the fall 2012 excavation, with many students in Wayne State’s archaeology program completing multiple biographies of the most unusual items and historical research, such as a list of known artifacts and their dates. The location is on the university’s larger “Anthropology of the City” initiative.

USA - Northeast

New York

Crailo State Historic Site and Walt Whitman Birthplace State Historic Site (submitted by Paul Huyer):

Two excavation reports on work at New York State Historic Sites have been submitted by coauthors Lois Feister and Paul Huyer in 2012 and 2013 for the Division for Historic Preservation in the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation. One report, The History and Archeology, published in 1974, describes the Crailo State Historic Site, Rensselaer, New York, as the prehistoric and historic record of the N.B.G.M. company site. In 2011, a California State Parks archaeologist discovered and excavated the area.

Bloomfield Gravel Mining Company (N.B.G.M. Co.) was the first major environmental decision in the United States and is part of the university’s larger “Anthropology of the City” initiative.
and North Bloomfield, a significant percentage of miners developing the area during this time were of French or French-Canadian nationality.

The connection is evident when we examine original mining claim maps (Figure 3) and associated records. Identity is critical to a sense of place for people, and the French miners memorialized the surrounding landscape by naming their claims Malakoff, Mamelon, and Independence— all landmarks of the Crimean War. The name Malakoff persisted through time because it was the claim that was eventually developed when North Bloomfield Gravel Mining Company built their mine headquarters in the late 1860s.

In 2011, Malakoff Diggins State Historic Park was listed as 1 of 70 parks slated for closure due to budget deficits. The park is located in a remote area of Northern California and lacked permanent staff, causing serious preservation and protection concerns. Since that time a steering committee has been organized to look into funding opportunities and building collaborative partnerships to help record, monitor, and protect valued heritage resources that define Malakoff’s cultural landscape. Projects underway include: (1) a volunteer arborist team conducting condition assessments on unique varietal fruit and nut trees (Figure 4); (2) California State Parks and Sonoma State University ASC specialists developing an Interactive Master Plan to identify strategies to help the park visitor become aware of, understand, and embrace a unifying message and theme specific to Malakoff; and (3) Mark Selverston, funded by the Sierra Fund, compiling a GIS database file comprised of 203 cultural resources (170 historic, 21 prehistoric, and 12 multicomponent sites) located within the Malakoff Diggins Historic District. Selverston’s archival research, in conjunction with our archaeological investigation at Malakoff Settlement Site, has revealed noteworthy historical elements that will work well to update and highlight various aspects not previously incorporated into the Malakoff story. We hope to craft a story that forges an emotional, as well as intellectual, connection with the visitor. The ruins of Malakoff Village and overview of the Malakoff Pit are tangible resources that link the visitor to the intangible meaning of the cultural landscape. As we publish and interpret our findings, we hope there will be support to keep this historic mining park open and preserved for future generations.

Market Street Chinatown (submitted by Barbara L. Voss and Rebecca Allen) The Market Street Chinatown Archaeology Project is a Stanford University-based research and education program. Now celebrating its 10-year anniversary, the project has released several new technical reports and student projects from the 2012–2013 project year. All these can be downloaded from our project website, <http://marketstreet.stanford.edu> just look on the right-hand sidebar for download links to progress reports, technical reports, and student papers.

New reports and papers:

There were four student projects this year that can be downloaded at <http://marketstreet.stanford.edu/2013/08/student-research-projects-2012-2013/>:
• Meghan E. Gower <Events and Exhibits: Ethnographic Observations of the Market Street Chinatown Archaeology Project>
• Kyle Lee-Crossett <The Image of the City: Art, fracture and reunification of the Market Street Chinatown archaeological collection> 
• Allison Mickel <Evidence of Heat Affection in 19th Century Ceramic Wares: An Experimental Study> 
• Meredith Reifsneider <Experimental Archaeology Project: Determining the Effects of High Heat on Ceramics from Market Street Chinatown> 

SHA 2014 Quebec City Preliminary Program

The SHA conference is returning to Quebec City nearly 15 years after it was held here at the start of the new millennium. If you weren’t able to be here in 2000, come and discover this fascinating place in 2014 along with your colleagues from the Society for Historical Archaeology and the Advisory Council on Underwater Archaeology. The conference will take place at the newly renovated Quebec City Convention Centre.

The birthplace of French North America and the only walled city north of Mexico, Quebec City is an open-air treasure chest that will delight history and culture buffs alike. Its European backdrop and modern North American character are set off by a heady blend of history, traditional and contemporary art, and French language culture, all of which make Quebec City a destination like no other. Visitors flock to Old Quebec. This fortified part of the city exudes old-world charm, with its winding streets and a profusion of boutiques, museums, and attractions. From timeless Grande Allee to the trendy Saint-Roch neighborhood, Quebec City is a place to slow down and savor the finer things in life. No matter what your plans are for your stay in the Quebec City area, you’ll love the safe surroundings and warm hospitality.

Quebec City has been showered with all kinds of awards from the tourism industry. The November 2011 issue of Conde Nast Traveler ranked it the sixth-best destination in the world, as well as the third-best destination in in North America, and the first in Canada! Meanwhile the August 2011 edition of Travel + Leisure magazine placed it 10th in its list of the best cities in the United States and Canada. announcing its World’s Best Awards 2011. Quebec City is renowned for the quality of its fine dining and has a little black book’s worth of local and European-style restaurants and cool bars where you can enjoy local produce, fine cuisine, and innovative global fare. The historic old city alone has no fewer than 100 memorable restaurants.
**TRAVEL PLANNING**

### Accommodation Details: The Hotel Hilton Québec

The main conference hotel, and venue for the Conference Dinner and Awards, is the Hilton Québec, in the city center near the Conference Centre. SHA has reserved a limited number of rooms at a very special rate at the host hotel. You will be able to book your hotel room through the online conference registration Web page. The room rate is CAD $129 per night (plus tax) for single or double occupancy and CAD $179 for Executive Floor single-occupancy accommodation, plus applicable taxes. This rate will be available from January 2 to January 14, 2014.

Hilton renovated, welcomes you in a sophisticated and contemporary décor. All rooms offer spectacular views of the Old Town, “Vieux-Québec,” the majestic St. Lawrence River, the Parliament, or the Laurentian Mountains. Hilton Québec is just steps away from all major tourist attractions — and a 20-minute drive from the airport or 5 minutes from the train or bus stations.

### Connecting Flights

A letter of invitation will be sent upon request to help participants obtain a visa, should the need arise. However, this invitation implies no obligation, financial, visa, or otherwise to the SHA 2014 conference.

Participants must first register for SHA 2014 before requesting a letter of invitation; should the visa be refused, the registration fee will be reimbursed upon presentation of the visa rejection letter. Your invitation letter request must include the following information: Participant’s full name, Nationality, Name of the Institute/University, Department, Address of the Institute/University (street, zip or postal code, town, country). You may email your request to conference@conferium.com.

### Restaurants and Bars

Hilton Québec and the Convention Centre are in the cultural and historic heart of the city. There are countless restaurants, bistros, cafés, pubs, and clubs to discover within walking distance of the conference venue. Quebec City enjoys a reputation for fine food, varied cuisines, gourmet ingredients, and talented chefs. Don’t take our word for it; find out for yourself! More information will be available in your registration package, but you can have an advance look here: www.quebecregion.com/en/where-to-eat-restaurants!

### Useful Information

**Can you get a refund for sales tax?** How can you contact your consulate? Where are local churches and houses of worship? What are the shopping hours in Quebec City? What is the speed limit on the roads? Whom do I contact in case of emergency? This is where you will find these answers and more: www.quebecregion.com/en/useful-information

### Average Precipitation in January

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Snow</th>
<th>Rain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average Temperature in January**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F 18</td>
<td>C 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VIsas

You will, of course, need a valid passport. Most United States, European Union, and many Commonwealth citizens do not require a visa to enter Canada. If you are unsure as to whether you need a visa, additional information is available on the Citizenship and Immigration Canada website: www.cic.gc.ca/english/information/offices/apply-where.asp.

A letter of invitation will be sent upon request to help participants obtain a visa, should the need arise. However, this invitation implies no obligation, financial, visa, or otherwise, to the SHA 2014 conference. Participants must first register for SHA 2014 before requesting a letter of invitation; should the visa be refused, the registration fee will be reimbursed upon presentation of the visa rejection letter. Your invitation letter request must include the following information: Participant’s full name, Nationality, Name of the Institute/University, Department, Address of the Institute/University (street, zip or postal code, town, country). You may email your request to conference@conferium.com.

### Preconference Workshops

**Art History Meet Archaeometry**

#### Hosts: Karlis Karklins (Society of Bead Researchers), Jean-François Morneau (University of Quebec in Chicoutimi), Dalphine Bussières (University of Quebec in Montreal), Ron Hanum (McMaster University)

#### Length: Half-day workshop, 8:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.

**Participants:** Maximum enrollment of 20

**Cost:** $60 for members, $70 for student members, $35 for student nonmembers. NB: Participants will pay shared taxi fare to and from the workshop location.

**Location:** Laval University Main Campus, Pavilion Charles-de-Koninck (DKN 5172)

**Abstract:** The aim of this workshop is to offer a large spectrum of key concepts on glass beads studies from different points of view and using multidisciplinary approaches. Markers of exchanges, glass beads are often abundant on archaeological sites. Their study provides both important information and underlines questions to be considered. In this workshop, we investigate the use of methods from archaeology, art history, and archaeometry. We will discuss both the limits and the complementary aspects of these approaches.

### French Fatigue: Styles, Fabrication Techniques, and History

#### Host: Laetitia Métére (CELAT, Laval University)

#### Length: Full-day workshop, 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

**Participants:** Maximum attendance is 20

**Cost:** $80 for members, $100 for nonmembers, $50 for student members, and $70 for student nonmembers

**Location:** Laval University Archaeology Laboratories, 3 rue de la Vieille-Université

**Abstract:** The raw materials used, as well as the shapes and decorations of tin-glazed earthenwares or faïence, reflect the economic and social conditions of the societies that produced them. These productions are considered both an historical document and a socioeconomic marker. The aim of this workshop is to provide a comprehensive study of French fatigue, combining the various techniques and styles.
written sources and archaeological and archeometric data. The theoretical part of the workshop will focus on techniques, historical, and stylistic aspects of these wares. It will be followed by a practical session consisting of case studies and identification exercises. The workshop will end with a guided tour of the Musée de la place Royale.

**[W-05] French Glass Tableware, From Production to Consumption**

Host: Agnès Gédé (CELAT, Laval University)

Location: Burke Centre for International Studies, 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Participants: Maximum enrollment of 5

Cost: $80 for members, $100 for nonmembers, $50 for student members, and $35 for student nonmembers

Abstract: Glass tableware is an excellent example of the juxtaposition of ancient techniques and modern equipment. The purpose of this workshop is to provide participants with a synthesis of up-to-date research on French glass tableware. The theoretical sections of the workshop examine the production of glass tableware, via a literature review and a discussion of a production process and vocabulary in use. This will be followed by a practical demonstration of the production of glass tableware. Identification exercises will use the collections from the Maisons Estére and Perhuis, which were part of Place-Royale in Quebec City. The workshop will conclude with a guided tour of the Musée de la place Royale.

**[W-06] Principles of Provenance Control and Underwater Hand Mapping in Underwater Archaeological Excavations**

Hosts: Robert J. A. Vallat (Parks Canada, retired) and James Ringer (Parks Canada, retired)

Location: Full-day workshop, 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Participants: Maximum attendance is 25

Cost: $80 for members, $100 for nonmembers, $50 for student members, and $70 for student nonmembers

Abstract: In a world where technology plays a growing role in the recording process of underwater excavation, it is sometimes easy to forget the importance of fundamental techniques of provenance control and hand mapping and recording underwater. The objective of this workshop is to provide participants with a walk-through of principles and techniques to establish a provenance record for an excavation and to develop a grid system and a complementary recording method. During this very practical workshop, the participants will see the establishment of a real aluminium grid system in the classroom, learning step-by-step how to make the system. The system used will be based on the grid system developed during the Red Bay excavation and still used by Parks Canada today. The hosts have worked for Parks Canada their entire careers and were part of the complete excavation of the Basque whaling ships in Red Bay, Labrador.

**[W-07] Examining the Image: The MUA Photoshop Workshop**

Host: T. Kurt Knorr (The Museum of Underwater Archaeology)

Location: Full-day workshop, 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Participants: Maximum enrollment of 25

Cost: $80 for members, $100 for nonmembers, $50 for student members, and $35 for student nonmembers

Abstract: Photoshop is an excellent tool to cover basic photogrammetry techniques useful to historians and archaeologists. The workshop will cover techniques for using the software for still images taken underwater and on land, including techniques to describe the discovery of images for publications. Students will also be encouraged to make their own images such as handwritten letters. No previous Photoshop experience is required, but you must bring your own laptop with Photoshop already installed on it (version 7 or newer). While images used for the workshop are provided by me, feel free to bring an image you’re interested in working on. Warning – restoring historic images can be addictive!

**[W-08] Underwater Cultural Heritage Resources Awareness Workshop**

Host: The Advisory Council for Underwater Archaeology

Location: Hilton Quebec

Length: Full-day workshop, 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Participants: Maximum enrollment of 25

Cost: $80 for members, $100 for nonmembers, $50 for student members, and $70 for student nonmembers

Abstract: Cultural resource managers, land managers, and archaeologists are often tasked with managing and reviewing assessments for underwater cultural heritage (UCH) resources. This workshop will introduce non-UCH resource managers specific to underwater archaeology and assist nonspecialists in recognizing the potential for UCH resources, budgeting for UCH assessments, reviewing UCH assessments, and making informed decisions regarding UCH resources. Participants will learn about different types of UCH resources and the techniques used in Phase I and II equivalent surveys. This workshop will introduce different investigative techniques, international best practices, and existing legislation. Full-day (interactive lectures, demonstrations), presentation notes and other materials provided.

**[W-09] An Introduction to Cultural Property Protection:** Historical and Post-Medieval Archaeological Sites during Military Operations

Hosts: Christopher McDaid (Fort Eustis) and Duane Quottes (U.S. Army)

Location: Full-day workshop, 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Participants: Maximum attendance is 25

Cost: $80 for members, $100 for nonmembers, $50 for student members, and $70 for student nonmembers

Abstract: Sites of interest to SHA members, which frequently deal with the expansion of global capitalism, the recorded and unrecorded movement of populations, from the forced relocation of people, are not the kinds of sites that routinely appear on the World Heritage list, and often do not receive official heritage recognition. This workshop introduces the international framework for cultural property protection during military operations, and the ways in which recent sites challenge the system. Attendees will receive an overview of the international framework for cultural property protection, and how scholars can communicate information to military planners effectively, and gives reviews of several case studies involving military operations and cultural property protection.

**[W-10] Oral History**

Host: Eduardo Gonzalez-Tennent (Monmouth University)

Location: Full-day workshop, 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Participants: Maximum enrollment of 25

Cost: $80 for members, $100 for nonmembers, $25 for student members, and $35 for student nonmembers

Abstract: The recording of personal histories is increasingly viewed by researchers and members of the public as a vital source of information regarding the past. Everyone has a story to tell and oral history recognizes the importance of people’s experiences in understanding our shared past. Historical archaeology has a long history of valuing personal testimony. Oral histories strengthen archaeologists’ interpretations by speaking directly to issues of memory, identity, and sharing power. This workshop will introduce participants to standard methods of oral history. The workshop will begin with a discussion of interviewing techniques. We will provide pointers for collecting personal stories, and discuss the use of digital recorders in oral history. Then, an overview of the transcription process will be briefly presented. The final hour will be reserved for the collection of oral history interviews.

**[W-11] Documentary Filmmaking for Archaeologists**

Hosts: Joseph W. Zarzycki, RPA (Independent Scholar) and Peter J. Pepe (Pepe Productions)

Location: Hilton Quebec

Length: Full-day workshop, 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Participants: Maximum enrollment of 30

Cost: $80 for members, $100 for nonmembers, $50 for student members, and $70 for student nonmembers

Abstract: The documentary is an unparalleled storytelling medium. Advances in digital media and documentary filmmaking make it possible for archaeologists to collaborate with video production companies to create quality documentaries on a microbudget. The workshop, taught by award-winning documentarians, will guide participants through the documentary filmmaking process. Learn about research, scriptwriting, pitching a proposal, funding, interview techniques, acquiring and storing images, manipulating video, editing, selecting music, film festivals, markets, distribution, and promotion. Whether your goal is to create a television feature, a DVD or a digital exhibit on a museum website, this workshop, introducing an understanding of “doc” filmmaking is required.

**[W-12] Archaeological Illustration**

Host: Jack Scott

Location: Hilton Quebec

Abstract: The diagram is a unique storytelling vehicle. Advances in digital media and documentary filmmaking make it possible for archaeologists to collaborate with video production companies to create quality documentaries on a microbudget. The workshop, taught by award-winning documentarians, will guide participants through the documentary filmmaking process. Learn about research, scriptwriting, pitching a proposal, funding, interview techniques, acquiring and storing images, manipulating video, editing, selecting music, film festivals, markets, distribution, and promotion. Whether your goal is to create a television feature, a DVD or a digital exhibit on a museum website, this workshop, introducing an understanding of “doc” filmmaking is required.
Discovering the seigneurial system of New France

**Location:** Hilton Québec

**Abstract:** Want your pen-and-ink drawings to look like the good ones? Pen and ink is all basically a matter of skill and technique, which can be easily taught, and the results can be done faster, cheaper, and are considerably more attractive than the Lewis-white illustrations done on computer. Workshop participants will learn about materials and techniques, page layout and design, maps, lettering, scientific illustration conventions, problems posed by different kinds of artwork, ways to work around excruciating computerization, and dealing with authors and publishers. A reading list and pen and paper (tracing vellum) will be provided, but feel free to bring your own pens, tools, books, and, of course, questions. Be ready to work!

**Tours**

Enhance your 2014 SHA Conference experience by attending one of our in-depth tours highlighting the rich historical and archaeological record of Québec City. Eminent specialists on the visited sites and their research subjects will be on hand at each stop on the tour. Space is limited, so please register early to reserve your spot. All tours depart from the Hotel Hilton Québec and will be held snow or shine. Any tour that fails to register at least 25 participants will be canceled, and any fees paid will be refunded to the registrant.

**Participants**

Must wear appropriate footwear and cloths, including gloves, for walking outdoors in cold and snowy conditions.

**Wednesday, January 8, 2014**

**[T-1] A morning to discover the fortifications**

**Length:** Half-day walking tour, 8:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

**Cost:** $35, lunch included

**Participants:** Minimum number of participants: 10

If you are interested in ancient colonial fortifications but only have half a day to spare, this tour is for you. Participants will learn about the fortifications of Québec National Historical Site of Canada by visiting the Citadelle. This is a walking tour, so be sure to dress appropriately.

**[T-2] Discovering the seigneurial system of New France**

**Length:** Full-day bus tour, 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.

**Cost:** $65, lunch included

**Participants:** Minimum number of participants: 25

This tour will show you the landscape shaped by the seigneurial system in Québec’s countryside. Participants will visit the Manoir Mauvide-Genest National Historic Site on the remarkable Cartier-Roberval site, one of the most significant archaeological sites in Canada. They will also visit the museum in the Ursuline Monastery, a provincially designated heritage site, where generations of young girls have been taught since 1639. The tour includes a Huron-Wendat National Historic Site of Canada. A Huron-Wendat guide will accompany participants during this fascinating tour. This is a bus tour, but there will be some walking, so be sure to dress appropriately.

**[T-3] A day with the founders of New France**

**Length:** Full-day walking tour, 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.

**Cost:** $45, lunch included

**Participants:** Minimum number of participants: 10

This tour will visit the founding sites of New France in Québec City’s historic Upper Town, which is part of a UNESCO World Heritage Site. Participants will visit the 17th- to 19th-century governor’s residence at the Saint-Louis Forts and Châteaux National Historic Site of Canada and descend into the crypts of the Notre-Dame Roman Catholic Basilica National Historic Site. They will also visit the museum in the Ursuline Monastery, a provincially designated heritage site, where generations of young girls have been taught since 1639. The tour includes the exhibition La colonie retrouvée: première France d’Amérique, 1541-1543 on the remarkable Cartier-Roberval site, one of the oldest European and contact sites in North America. Lunch will be served at Café Budaque, which may say is built on the tomb of Samuel de Champlain himself, the founder of Québec City in 1608! This is a walking tour, so be sure to dress appropriately.

**[T-4] A full-day visit to the fortified town**

**Length:** Full-day walking tour, 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.

**Cost:** $55, lunch included

**Participants:** Minimum number of participants: 10

This tour combines two half-day tours of the fortified city to provide participants with an in-depth look at this UNESCO World Heritage Site. It visits the Citadelle, which can be easily taught, and the results can be done faster, cheaper, and are considerably more attractive than the Lewis-white illustrations done on computer. Workshop participants will learn about materials and techniques, page layout and design, maps, lettering, scientific illustration conventions, problems posed by different kinds of artwork, ways to work around excruciating computerization, and dealing with authors and publishers. A reading list and pen and paper (tracing vellum) will be provided, but feel free to bring your own pens, tools, books, and, of course, questions. Be ready to work!

**[T-5] An afternoon at the Citadel**

**Length:** Half-day walking tour, 1:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

**Cost:** $15

**Participants:** Minimum number of participants: 10

If you only have an afternoon to discover the military heritage of Québec City, don’t miss this tour of the Québec Citadel National Historic Site of Canada. Construction of the Citadel, the most important British fortress in North America, was undertaken in 1820. The tour explores the evolution of the numerous works forming this impressive defensive complex, as well as the history of American attacks on the city. It also provides participants with stunning views of the Old City and its extremely picturesque environs. The Citadel, which is still an active military base, houses a recently renovated museum on the history of the Royal 22nd Regiment. This is a walking tour, so be sure to dress appropriately.

**[T-6] The Huron-Wendat Nation: The historic village of Wendake**

**Length:** Half-day bus and walking tour, 1:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

**Cost:** $45

**Participants:** Minimum number of participants: 25

Old Wendake Historic District National Historic Site of Canada is an excellent example of coexisting cultural influences. Rather than following a geometric pattern, the district was originally created as a result of local elements. For example, the main entrances to its buildings generally face southeast, regardless of which side of the lot faces the street. The district’s layout is thus similar to that of traditional Huron villages, although many of its buildings were constructed in post-1730 European-influenced styles. Participants will visit the Huron-Wendat Museum, where they will learn about the history of this First Nation, and tour the Manoir Mauvide-Genest, which was occupied by Tsawenhohi House, occupied by successive chiefs from the early 19th century onwards, and see Notre-Dame-de-l’Assomption National Historic Site of Canada. A Huron-Wendat guide will accompany participants during this fascinating tour. This is a bus AND walking tour, so be sure to dress appropriately.

**[T-7] Half-day tour for guests, Siléria Spa**

**Length:** Half-day activity, 8:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

**Cost:** $50

**Participants:** Minimum number of participants: 15

The Siléria Spa is an oasis of relaxation set in the heart of the Montmorency waterfall. Then, enjoy a comforting meal at Café Bistro Kent House. The package includes a guided snowshoe excursion for beginners, equipment (snowshoes), a welcome cocktail (gluhwine), a 3-course meal menu, and a cable car ride (round trip).

**Roundtable Luncheons**

All roundtable luncheons cost $30.00. They are scheduled from 1:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m. in the Quebec City Convention Centre. A minimum of six participants per table applies to all roundtables.

**Thursday, January 9, 2014**

**[RL-1] Class in the Privy Pit—Considering Social Distinction in the Urban Environment**

**Participants:** Maximum number of participants: 11

**Abstract:** Urbanism tends to result in denser and more-crowded living conditions, yet paradoxically, such conditions also tend to result in increased social mobility and distinction, culminating in unequal social relations generally referred to as social class. This roundtable will present and discuss the concept of class as a form of social distinction in the archaeological inquiry in urban areas. How are complex social structures such as class operationalized in day-to-day life? Is class an identity in the same sense as ethnicity? Can it be discerned in the archaeological record? Is class a useful analytical construct in a postsocialist world?


**Participants:** Maximum number of participants: 9

**Abstract:** Language can be cumbersome and often unintentionally offensive. Words, while static in definition, transcend geographic, cultural, generational, and social
boundaries, expressing a variety of meanings depending on the interaction. The discourse of race, gender, class, and sexuality are brought into play; to such discourses create and provide not just an historiography of rhetoric, but a delicate framework to navigate. This roundtable is dedicated to discussing the politics of language specifically, but not limited to the following terms: slave, enslaved, master, master-enslaver, Black, African American, and captive African.

[RL-3] Publishing for Students

Leaders: Rebecca Allen (Environmental Science Associates) and Richard Schafer (Historical Perspectives)

Participants: Maxime de la Rochefoucauld (University of South Alabama)

Abstract: In a relaxed lunch setting, join Rebecca Allen and Richard Schafer from the Editorial Advisory Committee to discuss opportunities for publishing in SHA-sponsored journals and co-publications. Other topics to possibly discuss include how to navigate the world of peer-reviewed journals, how to decide where to publish, how to structure articles, and how to write effectively. The Schuldschein is key. Please bring your questions, writing samples if you like, and badinage (since we are meeting in Québec).

[RL-4] Grab a Chair and Meet the Chairs: What is the ACAU?

Leaders: The newly elected ACUA Chair and Vice-Chair

Participants: Maximum number of participants: 10

Abstract: The Underwater Archaeology (ACAU) is an organization affiliated with SHA that serves as an international advisory body on issues relating to underwater archaeology and cultural resources management. Composed of 12 members elected from the SHA membership, it is working to educate scholars, governments, sport divers, and the general public about underwater archaeology and the potential synergy; as well as preservation of underwater resources. This roundtable will give you an opportunity to meet the newly elected Chair and Vice-Chair of ACUA (just a few days into their new functions), learn about the organization and what it does, and express any concerns and ideas on the eve of their new mandate.

Friday, January 10, 2014

[RL-5] Archaeology’s Ethics and TV’s Reality: SHA and the Metal-Detecting Debate

Leader: Christina Hodge (Peabody Museum, Harvard University)

Participants: Maximum number of participants: 11

Abstract: Maximum number of participants: 10

Abstract: Join us in a casual setting to discuss the current state of research on the archaeology of New France in its broadest sense. The last three decades have greatly advanced our knowledge of French colonists and their descendants not only in Québec, but in the southern United States and farther afield. How do we know what we know? How have we learned about these communities and the material culture of their daily lives? What are future avenues of research? All those who share an interest in French colonial archaeology are welcome to attend.

[RL-6] What’s New in New France Archaeology?

Leader: Participants: (University of South Alabama)

Participants: Maximum number of participants: 11

Abstract: Abstract: Join us in a relaxed lunch setting to discuss the current state of research on the archaeology of New France in its broadest sense. The last three decades have greatly advanced our knowledge of French colonists and their descendants not only in Québec, but in the southern United States and farther afield. How do we know what we know? How have we learned about these communities and the material culture of their daily lives? What are future avenues of research? All those who share an interest in French colonial archaeology are welcome to attend.

[RL-7] Teaching and Learning CRM in the University

Leaders: Adrian Pratchett (Department of Anthropology, University of California at Santa Barbara) and Loren Langley (Anthropological Studies Center, Sonoma State University)

Participants: Maximum number of participants: 10

Abstract: Join us in a casual setting to discuss the current state of research on the archaeology of New France in its broadest sense. The last three decades have greatly advanced our knowledge of French colonists and their descendants not only in Québec, but in the southern United States and farther afield. How do we know what we know? How have we learned about these communities and the material culture of their daily lives? What are future avenues of research? All those who share an interest in French colonial archaeology are welcome to attend.

[RL-8] Everything You Ever Wanted to Know about the UNESCO Convention on the Protection of Underwater Heritage

Leaders: Heather Gavronski (University of South Alabama) and Mary Praetzellis (Sonoma State University)

Participants: Maximum number of participants: 10

Abstract: Join us in a relaxed lunch setting to discuss the current state of research on the archaeology of New France in its broadest sense. The last three decades have greatly advanced our knowledge of French colonists and their descendants not only in Québec, but in the southern United States and farther afield. How do we know what we know? How have we learned about these communities and the material culture of their daily lives? What are future avenues of research? All those who share an interest in French colonial archaeology are welcome to attend.

Tuesday, January 14, 2014

Public Archaeology Session

Public Archaeology in Québec City: Pleins feux sur l'archéologie!

Leader: Felicity Jones (University of Amsterdam), Allison Bain (Laval University) and ACUA Board Member)

Participants: Maximum number of participants: 11

Abstract: In January 2009, the 2001 UNESCO Convention on the Protection of Underwater Heritage came into force when it was ratified by a 20th country. To date, 45 countries have ratified the 2001 Convention and the number keeps growing. SHA and ACUA have both now been fully accredited as nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) in the Scientific and Technical Advisory Body to the State Parties who have ratified. This roundtable will give you an opportunity to ask questions about this crucial international convention for the protection of submerged heritage and to hear what an NGO signifies for SHA and ACUA, as well as to propose ideas for collaborations. The hosts are the past and present chairs of the SHA UNESCO Committee.

Plenary Session

What Were the Questions That Counted in Maritime Cities? The SHA 2014 Plenary Session

Wednesday, January 9, 2014, 7:10 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.

Location: Hilton Québec

Chair: Allison Bain (Laval University)

Participants: Jerzy Gawronski (University of Amsterdam), Marc Grigon (Laval University), and Mark Leone (University of South Alabama)

The 2014 SHA plenary session explores the conference theme of Questions That Count: A Critical Evaluation of Historical Archaeology in the 21st Century from a specific point of view, that of maritime cities. Three speakers explore the development, on both land and sea, of maritime cities, and the myriad of social, economic, and political factors involved in their histories. The presentations will draw on examples from terrestrial and underwater archaeology and art history.

Drawing on his study of the city of Amsterdam, Jerzy Gawronski will analyze the urban development of the city from 1580 to 1660, when the monumental inner city with its rings of canals was created. By expanding a traditional art historical approach to include the concept of maritime landscapes, he will present an alternative view of the city and show how this historical perspective is needed to understand the development of this major commercial center.

Marc Grigon will examine the development of the city of Québec from the 17th to the 19th centuries from an art historical perspective, and will show the importance of the visual relations between water and land in the development of the city. In his analysis of Québec City, Marc Grignon suggests that the archaeology of Québec City reveals the origin of its modern conditions. Contrary to the works of some authors who deny authenticity to Québec City history, other approaches can be combined to show that archaeology says clearly where Québec City comes from and where it is going. These three 20-minute presentations will be followed by a short discussion and question period.

Public Archaeology Session

Public Archaeology in Québec City: Pleins feux sur l'archéologie!

Leader: Felicity Jones (University of Amsterdam), Allison Bain (Laval University) and ACUA Board Member)

Participants: Maximum number of participants: 10

Abstract: The UNESCO Committee Past Chair and ACUA emeritus (SHA UNESCO Committee Chair past Chair and ACUA emeritus)

Abstract: In January 2009, the 2001 UNESCO Convention on the Protection of Underwater Heritage came into force when it was ratified by a 20th country. To date, 45 countries have ratified the 2001 Convention and the number keeps growing. SHA and ACUA have both now been fully accredited as nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) in the Scientific and Technical Advisory Body to the State Parties who have ratified. This roundtable will give you an opportunity to ask questions about this crucial international convention for the
CONFERENCE AGENDA

Full Schedule of Events
This year the Newsletter is only carrying the outline schedule of conference event scheduling. For detailed information on specific scheduling of sessions, papers, panels, and posters, please consult the conference website at: <www.sha2014.com/preprog.html>.

Outline Schedule of Events
The following schedule is preliminary and is subject to change.

Tuesday, January 7, 2014
8:30 a.m. – 5:30 p.m. ACUA Board of Directors Meeting
1:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. Volunteer Orientation
5:30 p.m. – 6:00 p.m. Registration Open (Hilton Québec)
6:30 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. President’s Reception (invitation only)

Friday, January 10, 2014
7:30 a.m. – 5:00 p.m. Registration Open
Committee meetings: Gender & Minority Affairs, Nominations and Elections, Journal & Co-

Wednesday, January 8, 2014
7:30 a.m. – 9:00 p.m. Registration Open (Hilton Québec)
Morning Half-day Preconference Workshops [W-01]
Tour: A morning to discover the fortifications [T-1]
SHA Board of Directors Meeting
Register of Professional Archaeologists (RPA) Board of Directors Meeting
Tour: Discovering the seigneurial system of New France [T-2]
Tour: A day with the founders of New France [T-3]
Tour: A full-day visit to the fortified town [T-4]
Day-long Preconference Workshops [W-02, W-04, W-05, W-06, W-07, W-08, W-09, W-11, W-12]
Tour: An afternoon at the Citadel [T-5]

8:00 a.m. – 9:00 a.m. Committee Meetings: UNESCO, Development, Conference, Newsletter & Website, Inter-Society Relations, Membership
Tour for guests: Sibéria Spa [T-7]
Morning Sessions
Awards Committee Meeting
Roundtable Luncheons: [RL-1, RL-2, RL-3, RL-4]
Poster Session
Afternoon Sessions
Fast Presidents’ Student Reception
Museum Reception: Musée de l’Amérique francophone

8:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
8:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
12:00 p.m. – 1:30 p.m.
12:00 p.m. – 1:50 p.m.
12:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
1:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.
4:30 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.
6:30 p.m. – 10:00 p.m.

8:00 a.m. – 9:00 a.m.

Conference Preregistration
You may register online through the website: <www.sha2014.com/register.html>. You have until December 1st, 2013 to benefit from preferential rates for conference registration.

Basic registration rates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registration</th>
<th>SHA Member</th>
<th>Nonmember</th>
<th>SHA Student Member</th>
<th>Student Nonmember</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On/Before Dec. 1</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$340</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Dec. 1</td>
<td>$230</td>
<td>$370</td>
<td>$135</td>
<td>$185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You may register for all associated activities (tours, workshops, roundtable luncheons, Museum reception, Awards banquet, etc.) through the website: <www.sha2014.com/events.html>.

Hotel Preregistration
SHA has reserved a limited number of rooms at a very special rate at the host hotel. You will be able to book your hotel room through the online conference registration website.

Applicable taxes: 5% federal, 9.975% provincial, and 3% city.

Reservations at the Hilton Québec MUST be made through the conference online registration page in order to benefit from the reduced conference rate: <www.sha2014.com/hotel.html>. You will not benefit from the reduced conference rate if you reserve directly with the hotel.

Conference and Hotel Registration by Post or Fax
You may register for the conference, for all conference activities, and for the Hilton Québec by mail or fax if you prefer. For further information please contact:

SHA Québec 2014
Conferium Inc.
580 Grande Allée Est, #140
Québec (Québec)
Canada G1R 2K2

Phone: 418.522.8182, x 24, or toll-free within North America: 800.618.8182, x 24
Fax: 418.529.7548 or toll-free within North America: 800.889.1126

<registration.sha2014@conferium.com>

Onsite Registration
The 2014 Conference Headquarters will be located in the Québec City Convention Centre. The Volunteer/Help Desk will also be here.

Onsite registration and collection of advance registration materials will be open:

Tuesday, January 7, 2014: 8:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m. (Hilton Québec)
Tuesday, January 8, 2014: 7:30 a.m. – 9:00 a.m. (Hilton Québec)
Thursday, January 9, 2014: 7:30 a.m. – 6:00 p.m.
Friday, January 10, 2014: 7:30 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Saturday, January 11, 2014: 7:30 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.
Please note the deadlines for submissions of news for UP COMING ISSUES of the SHA Newsletter:

Winter 2013 . . . . 1 December 2013
Spring 2014 . . . . 1 March 2014
Summer 2014 . . . . 1 June 2014
Fall 2014 . . . . 1 September 2014

Society for Historical Archaeology
13017 Wisteria Drive #395
Germantown, MD  20874
Phone: 301.972.9684
Fax: 866.285.3512
Email: <hq@sha.org>

Newsletter Editor Alasdair Brooks: <amb72@le.ac.uk>