All I can say about our recent conference in Austin is that it was remarkable. There were just over 1,200 registered delegates, which I believe represents the highest number we have ever seen west of the Mississippi River. This included a very healthy international contingent; Monica and I were honored to meet the many members of Pilar Luna’s family, who traveled to Austin to help her celebrate receiving the SHA’s highest honor—the J.C. Harrington Medal in Historical Archaeology. We should all be as lucky as Pilar to have such a wonderful family!

Also a very important part of the mix for Austin was amazing student participation. The nearly 300 student registrants represented one-quarter of all in attendance, and they attended with vigor through significant program participation and by taking advantage of opportunities to begin developing a network of colleagues and friends. Student participation speaks highly of the relevance of SHA to archaeology today, and bodes well for a vibrant and healthy society in the future. I had the opportunity to visit with a number of students during the course of the conference, many of them first-time attendees, and enjoyed every one of these conversations immensely.

A high point of my duties, though not one of my presidential responsibilities, was to present the Carol V. Ruppé Distinguished Service Award to my old friend and colleague, Dr. Vergil E. Noble. We have been roaming the halls of SHA conferences since 1976 and it was an honor to help the Society recognize the amazing contribution that he has made to SHA through the years.

I must say, however, that my duties as president kept me extremely busy from Monday afternoon through Saturday evening during my stay in the Lone Star State. The board meetings, committee meetings, and other scheduled and ad hoc meetings that I attended as president were taxing. At every turn I was nonetheless inspired by the commitment of those who choose to volunteer their efforts for the greater good of SHA and our partner the ACUA. There is no question about the wealth of dedication and talent that comes to us through our volunteers who serve on our boards and committees. There is also no question that each one of our committees is welcoming of new ideas and new members, regardless of whether the latter are first-time or veteran conference attendees.

I will say that one of the most inspiring discussions that I have been involved with in SHA actually began prior to the conference. The board was called to discuss how we might make our annual business meeting fit within a tight one-hour window. Talk among the board quickly expanded to how to make our board meetings a more robust think tank for SHA, how to make our board meetings a more user friendly, and new ways for members to become involved. I will say that one of the most inspiring discussions that I have been involved with in SHA actually began prior to the conference. The board was called to discuss how we might make our annual business meeting fit within a tight one-hour window. Talk among the board quickly expanded to how to make our board meetings a more robust think tank for SHA, how to make our board meetings a more user friendly, and new ways for members to become involved.

We are well on our way to revising our approach to board meetings (we hold two at the conference and one mid-year, generally in June). Our intent is to shift from tedious reviews of activities to discussions of issues that require board action or that will benefit from in-depth board deliberations. This may seem a bit self-evident but for us it represents a major periodic correction in the way we do business.
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Perhaps more pertinent to your direct experience as a member was our work to reform the Austin business meeting. We were presented with a very tight Friday evening schedule, which allowed no more than one hour for the business meeting. This, however, was merely the impetus for change—this meeting had become increasingly long, with reports taking up the majority of the time and with no real time left when we got around to calling for new business from the floor.

Perhaps we erred too much the other way in Austin, but change is in the air. We decided to dispense with all but the reports of the President, Secretary, Treasurer, and Conference Committee, so that we would have time for the awarding of the SHA Dissertation Prize, the Student Paper Prize, the Ed and Judy Jelks Student Travel Award, the ACUA George Fischer Student Travel Award, and also have time for business or comment from the floor. Start to finish the Austin business meeting was 38 minutes. I was told afterward that there had been a desire by one of our members to make a comment, but that they were loath to be the one to make the business meeting drag on. We will strike a balance, and as happy as I was that we concluded our business and presented the awards within 38 minutes, this was done in order to allow time for discussion from the floor.

In addition to shortening the agenda, we decided to post all of the year-end board, committee, and headquarters reports on the SHA website so that members could be informed before coming to the business meeting. We will continue this process, and will be using a standardized report format to make it easier to peruse these documents.

The board approved a motion to discuss among the board members on reinventing the business meeting led to our consideration of other ways to make the board accessible to the members whom we represent. We talked about open forums during the conference where members could be briefed on key issues, and where we would be available as a board to simply listen to our members. We have also talked about the President and President-Elect holding “office hours” at several times during the conference. These would be times when members would know that they could have the ear of these officers. Look for this to happen, in one form or another, at our next conference, coming up in Baltimore.

What the Board Accomplished in Austin

At the Wednesday board meeting in Austin, a number of important actions occurred. The board was pleased to confirm William Scott as our SHA Executive Director after completion of a period of review since he began working for us this past summer. Bill has been a pleasure to work with and I guarantee you that SHA is benefitting from his careful, insightful, hard work.

In other action on Wednesday, the board approved naming our dissertation prize the “Kathleen Kirk Gilmore Dissertation Award” in recognition of the pioneering work of Dr. Gilmore who helped to found SHA, served as president in 1978, pursued a doctorate later in life because it was personally important, and who was an involved scholar until the very end of her long life.

The board also approved reversing a policy that caused new members joining mid-year and members renewing after the deadline to receive only those publications yet to be printed and mailed. The board believes that this was a disincentive to join or renew mid-year. Not wanting to reward late renewal, however, the board policy does include a requirement that late-renewing members pay a fee to cover extra handling required to process and ship back publications.

The board approved a motion to transfer some of the revenue from the 2010 conference at Amelia Island to help fund the Student Award Endowment established by the board several years ago. This endowment is intended to secure funding for SHA’s student awards, including the Ed and Judy Jelks Travel Award, the Kathleen Kirk Gilmore Dissertation Award, and the Student Paper Award. A total of $10,000 was moved into this account. In other action to help the Society achieve its goal of fully funding this endowment, the board voted to dedicate 50% of the proceeds from...
the silent auction to this fund for the next three years (beginning in Austin). Please know, however, that additional member donations are still being welcomed!

By far the most significant business conducted by the board stretched from Wednesday until the Saturday board meeting and involved revision of the SHA Constitution and Bylaws. The committee charged with reviewing these documents and proposing updates is chaired by Don Weir and includes Charles Cleland and Dan Roberts as members. After presenting a report to the board at the mid-year meeting, the committee was asked to reconsider proposals concerning the appropriate representation of the SHA editorial program on the board—that is, which, if any, of our current editors (currently there are four) should sit as members of our Board of Directors. For a review of this issue, see my column in the summer 2010 Newsletter (Volume 43, Number 2, pp. 1–2). The committee was also asked to add language creating an Executive Committee, which had been approved by the board in 2005 but was never incorporated into our guidance documents.

At mid-year, the committee had strongly recommended that SHA adopt a board structure that had a single appointed editor-in-chief on the board (currently the editor of the journal and the Newsletter editor are appointed board members). For a variety of reasons, related largely to the amount of work that would be placed upon the shoulders of this individual and the broad authority s/he would be given over the various publications programs, the board asked the committee to reconsider. The committee did, and presented two options to us for our Wednesday meeting in Austin: a somewhat modified managing editor option (one appointed editor), and an option that had no editors on the board. The committee presented the no editor option to be in the best interest of SHA. Their position was based on the belief that the board is about governance of the society as a whole and therefore should not include members who represent individual programs of the society (special interests of a sort). The committee also believed that this proposal established equity among the four editors now managing the publications program, and that it clarified the direct relationship between each of the editors and the board of directors.

After a very lively and at times emotional debate, the board declined to approve motions that would have adopted revised constitution and bylaws documents with either the managing editor or the no editor option. A motion was then made to retain two editors on the board, and to have one be appointed to the board from among the research publications editors (journal and co-publications) and one from among the communications publications editors (Newsletter and website), and to develop board policy to define the relationship between the board of directors and the other editors not having a board appointment.

Between Wednesday and the Saturday board meeting, I appointed a small committee (President-Elect Paul Mullins, Editor Joe Joseph, and Treasurer Sara Mascia) to revise the draft constitution and bylaws to reflect this motion, and to develop an accompanying board policy. During a meeting with this committee, joined by SHA Parliamentarian Vergil Noble, we decided to send back to the board a slight revision of what was approved on Wednesday: the two research publications editors (the journal and co-publications editors), both of whom are appointed by the board, would stand for election and have the membership select one of them to sit on the board. The same would be done with the two communications publications editors (the Newsletter and website editors).

Although the board would still conduct a search and make appointments to fill an editorial vacancy, this approach gives the membership some choice in who will occupy the two board positions that are to be occupied by editors. Put simply, two positions on the board that have heretofore been appointed by the board (the Editor and the Newsletter Editor) would become elected positions charged with representing the broad publications programs of the society.

At the Saturday board meeting, after consideration of this proposal, and reviewing the revised constitution and bylaws documents and accompanying board policy (SHA Policy and Procedures for the Appointment of Editors), the board adopted a motion approving the proposed language in these documents. This was done with the caveat that some minor editing was still needed before these documents were forwarded to the membership for approval. The SHA Policy and Procedures for the Appointment of Editors was also approved at the Saturday board meeting and is now SHA policy.

Finally, a proposal that had been discussed on Wednesday was brought before the board for the creation of a standing ethics committee. A motion was offered by board member Mark Warner to include language creating such a committee in the constitution and bylaws. The motion, including specific language, was approved.

The action of the board during the Austin conference made it clear to everyone present just how dearly we all hold the best interests of SHA. We all went into the Wednesday meeting to confront, again, an issue that we have been debating for years and which was a major focus for the board during 2010. I doubt anyone on the board would say the decision we reached is not a compromise. It was a compromise for me, but it is one that I do support because it addresses and resolves the core issues that were on the table and leaves the board a more representative body. Just as important, in my opinion, is the accompanying board policy that clarifies the roles of each of our editors in society governance.

The long-overdue revisions in our constitution and bylaws will be coming to you for approval later this year. You will have a chance to vote up or down on individual major revisions, of which there are several. I urge you to consider the changes carefully, and hope you will join me and the rest of the board of directors in endorsing these changes for SHA.
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Canada-Québec
Stéphane Noël, Université Laval; Email: stephane.noel.2@ulaval.ca
69th Annual Plains Anthropological Conference

The 69th Annual Plains Anthropological Conference will be held in Tucson, Arizona at the Marriott University Hotel on October 26–29, 2011.

For more information contact: María Nieves Zedeño (University of Arizona) by email at:
<  mzedeno@email.arizona.edu>

Or visit the conference website at:
<  www.u.arizona.edu/~mzedeno/plains/>
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Student Awards

Dissertation Prize winner Gerard Chouin (in absentia)
(L to R: Jim Ayres, Chris DeCorse [accepting on behalf of Gerard Chouin] and Bill Lees)

Jelks Award winners Rebecca Graff and Angela Jaillet
(L to R: Bill Lees, Angela Jaillet, Rebecca Graff, and Ed Jelks)

Student Paper Prize winner Linda Zaginbin
(L to R: Jamie Brandon, Linda Zaginbin, and Bill Lees)

ACUA Student travel award winner Samantha Bell
(L to R: Bill Lees, Samantha Bell, and Matthew Russell)

SHA Awards at the 2011 Annual Conference

By Jim Bruseth, Donald Hardesty, Julia A. King, and Teresita Majewski

In addition to the four student awards, six awards were presented at the 2011 annual conference, in two different venues. On the opening night of the conference, immediately before the plenary session, two Awards of Merit were presented to Nellie Longsworth and John L. Nau III. Later in the week, following the annual awards banquet, the James Deetz Book Award was presented to James P. Delgado, the John L. Cotter Award to Cheryl Janifer LaRoche, the Carol V. Ruppé Distinguished Service Award to Vergil E. Noble, and the J.C. Harrington Medal in Historical Archaeology to Pilar Luna Erreguerena. Profiles of the recipients of the Cotter and Ruppé Awards and of the Harrington Medal will appear in a 2011 issue of Historical Archaeology. As summaries for the other awards do not appear in the journal, they will be presented here. SHA President William B. Lees officially presented the awards to each of the recipients, together with other SHA members who nominated the awardees and prepared presentation text for the ceremonies.

Legendary preservationist Nellie Longsworth was presented with an Award of Merit for her tireless efforts and leadership on Capitol Hill to bring the voice and concerns of historical archaeologists to our nation’s leaders. During the years she has advised SHA on government affairs issues of concern to the organization, she has mentored our leaders and helped them learn how to make a real difference in legislative circles where historical archaeological resources are concerned. Award presenter SHA Past President Judy Bense noted that Nellie was instrumental in the founding of the nonprofit organization Preservation Action in 1974, and she served as president for 22 years. Preservation Action advocates to all branches of the federal government for sound preservation policy and programs through a grassroots constituency empowered with information, training, and direct contact with elected
representatives. During Judy’s presidency, she and Nellie worked together closely on behalf of SHA to help ensure passage of the farm bill with wording that was favorable to historical resources.

Texas businessman and preservationist John L. Nau III, who served as chairman of the Texas Historical Commission (THC) from 1993 until 2009 and as the chairman of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) from 2002 until 2010, received an Award of Merit for his contributions to the advancement of archaeological and preservation goals both at the state and federal levels. The award presentation was made by Jim Bruseth and Julia A. King. Mr. Nau’s tenure at the THC was nothing short of transformational for the agency. Staffing more than tripled as new programs were added to support marketing, communication, heritage tourism, and new historic sites initiatives. He was a staunch supporter of the THC’s archaeology programs. He led the commission team to oversee with staff the 1996–1997 excavation of the Belle shipwreck, a vessel lost by the French explorer La Salle in 1684 along the Texas coast. The ship was found in 1995 and, with Mr. Nau’s executive-level leadership, was excavated in a dry environment inside a cofferdam, the first such type of excavation ever attempted in North America. He continued to support the project throughout his tenure at the agency, garnering public support to complete several million dollars of artifacts conservation. Soon after his appointment by President George W. Bush as chairman of the ACHP, Mr. Nau worked with the White House to have an archaeologist appointed as an ACHP Expert Member for the first time in the Council’s decades-long history. Mr. Nau then appointed an Archaeology Task Force to begin addressing matters of pressing concern regarding archaeological issues as they related to the National Historic Preservation Act. One of these issues, confronting an outdated burial policy, was last considered in the late 1980s. In 2007, through Mr. Nau’s leadership, the ACHP formally adopted its “Policy Statement Regarding Treatment of Burial Sites, Human Remains and Funerary Objects.” This Policy Statement, which took nearly three years to develop, is remarkable for the broad effort undertaken to solicit input and views from a broad range of interested parties, including federally recognized Indian tribes consulted through a government-to-government process.

With Mr. Nau’s leadership and support, the Archaeology Task Force also developed the Council’s “Policy Statement: Archaeology, Heritage Tourism, and Education” (adopted August 2008). This document contains a set of principles for participants in the Section 106 process to consider when involving and educating the public about archaeology and its benefits. Mr. Nau is also credited with the implementation of the “Preserve America” initiative, created in 2003 through Executive Order 13287. Among many activities, the initiative also includes Preserve America grants to further awareness of archaeological resources from Mesa Verde to the development of archaeological exhibits in counties in Maryland.

The James Deetz Book Award was presented by Don Hardesty to James P. Delgado for his book Khubilai Khan’s Lost Fleet: In Search of a Legendary Armada (2008), published by the University of California Press. The award recognizes books and monographs that are engaging and well written, as well as accessible to all potential readers. The book is about Mongol ruler Khubilai Khan’s navy and its disappearance during the Khan’s attempted invasion of Japan in the 13th century. *Khubilai Khan’s Lost Fleet* tells the story of the search for and discovery of the remains of the invasive Mongol navy on the Japanese island of Takashima. The quality of the competition for the 2011 award was extremely high. This book was chosen over the other submissions because of its potential to make a substantial and lasting contribution to the discipline of historical archaeology; because of its potential for professional crossover that will engender great interest in history, preservation, museums, and public education; because of its potential for public crossover; and especially because the book tells such a well-written and fascinating story.

SHA offers its congratulations to all of the recipients of the 2011 awards, and sincerely thanks them for their contributions to our discipline.
James Deetz Book Award
James P. Delgado, recipient of the James Deetz Book Award for his book Khubilai Khan’s Lost Fleet: In Search of a Legendary Armada (2008), accepting the award, with award presenter Don Hardesty of the Department of Anthropology at the University of Nevada, Reno, to his left. (Photo courtesy of Bill Pierson.)

John L. Cotter Award
John L. Cotter Award recipient Cheryl Janifer LaRoche and award presenter Akin Ogundiran, Chair of the Africana Studies Department at the University of North Carolina, Charlotte.

John L. Nau III receives an SHA Award of Merit.
From left, 2011 Conference Co-Chair and award presenter Jim Bruseth, SHA President William B. Lees, SHA Past President and Chair of Museum Studies at St. Mary’s College of Maryland Julia A. King, Mr. Nau, and SHA Awards Committee Chair Teresita Majewski. (Photo courtesy of Bill Pierson.)
Vergil E. Noble receives the Carol V. Ruppé Distinguished Service Award
From left, SHA President William B. Lees, Vergil Noble, and SHA Awards Committee Chair Teresita Majewski. (Photo courtesy of Bill Pierson.)

J.C. Harrington Medal

Harrington Medalist Pilar Luna Erreguerena

Pilar Luna Erreguerena displays the Harrington Medal
From left, Margaret Leshikar-Denton, William B. Lees, Pilar Luna Erreguerena, Teresita Majewski, and Toni Carrell

Pilar Luna Erreguerena (seated, center) with family and friends
Lynn Evans and SHA Newsletter editor Alasdair Brooks relaxing during the scavenger hunt. (Photo courtesy of Dena Doroszenko.)

The interior of the Texas state capitol dome. (Photo by the editor.)

2009 Conference co-chair Eva MacDonald enjoys a fish taco at one of Austin’s famous food carts. (Photo courtesy of Dena Doroszenko.)
Public Education and Interpretation Committee

Notes from the Trenches: Archaeologists Engaging the Public

The Public Education and Interpretation Committee (PEIC) strives to promote public archaeology within the Society for Historical Archaeology, disseminate archaeological knowledge to the public, and develop public archaeology resources for use by SHA members. In addition to a committee progress report, this column will be a point of reflection designed to spark dialog about the state of public archaeology, successful projects, and innovative outreach techniques. While it is tempting to simply fine-tune the craft of engagement, we must also address the need for archaeologists to include a public component within their projects. In addition to a message of stewardship, it is imperative that we continuously educate the public and elected officials on the importance of the work we do. A case in point is Texas Governor Rick Perry’s proposal that funding for the Texas Historical Commission and the Texas Commission on the Arts be eliminated altogether, as part of spending reductions in the state budget (Root 2011). At the time of this writing, this issue is still unfolding. That this is happening after our tremendously successful annual meeting in Austin, Texas sends a clear message: In an era of budget cuts and mantras of “governments living within their means,” engaging the public through archaeological education, activism, and other forms of outreach is a continuous process and is more critical than ever.

If the SHA 2011 meeting was any indication, we are well on our way to addressing this issue. This year, public archaeology and political concerns were prevalent. We want to take this opportunity to discuss the sessions that we attended. A PEIC-sponsored workshop, “Print and Social Media,” featured Sarah Miller (Florida Public Archaeology Network) and Jay Stottman (Kentucky Archaeology Survey), who guided participants through the use of a variety of print and digital media to maximize community engagement. Integrating web technology with any archaeological project eliminates geographic and temporal barriers to public engagement. For a great example of this, see the National Park Service’s Twitter stream for the African Burial Ground. <http://twitter.com/alburialgm-dnps>. Amber Grafft-Weiss (Florida Public Archaeology Network) demonstrated successful approaches to sharing archaeology through her organization’s blog and Facebook page. Terry Brock (Michigan State University) and Nicolas Laracuente (University of Kentucky) discussed how Twitter enhances professional collaboration and public engagement. Get involved with social media and learn the ropes by contacting Amber (@FPANortheast), Terry (@brocker), and Nicolas (@archaeologist) on Twitter.

The forum, “Archaeologists as Activists: Moving Forward on a Practice of Activist Archaeology,” provided conference attendees with the opportunity to converse with contributors to the edited volume Archaeologists as Activists: Can Archaeologists Change the World? The dialog focused on the need for today’s archaeologists to be more active in the political arena. To effect change in the community, we need not only to understand local ordinances, but to get involved in public service as well. If you don’t want to run for mayor or participate in a neighborhood association, then support those who do. In another form of civic engagement, k–12 education, we need to be ‘fluent’ in the language of educational curriculum to be effective contributors to that community. When engaging educational and political populations, remember that there are a few thousand archaeologists and millions of people who are not. Despite the odds, that does not detract from the impact of a powerful message delivered with savvy.

How we do public archaeology was the focus of the session “Toward an Archaeological Agora.” Dr. John Jameson (National Park Service) and Dr. Harold Mytum (University of Liverpool) chaired a session featuring an incredible set of papers that focused on moving from an interacting-with-the-public-as-consumer model to an engaging-the-public-as-collaborator model. Examples of this type of engagement are not new, but Dr. John Carman (Birmingham University) passionately argued for a change in the focus of archaeological projects from the past to the interaction that is taking place in the present. By sacrificing historical authority and offering public service we facilitate “archaeology of the community, for the community, by the community [which] moves us forward into the future rather than examining the past.” Thinking in these terms helps us wrap our minds around the sticky question, “What is the benefit of archaeology and why should we fund it?”

The crowning achievement of public archaeology at the conference was the Public Archaeology Expo, “Crossroads in Texas History,” held on Saturday. The conference hotel’s third-floor ballroom was home to reenactors, a variety of displays, a mock dig, and over 500 Boy Scouts, homeschoolers, and other members of the public.

The room was set up with stations that fulfilled the requirements for a Boy Scout merit badge. The expo was organized by Pam Wheat-Stranahan (recently retired as Executive Director of the Texas Archaeological Society) with assistance from the organizing committee composed of Karen Fustes, Brenda Whorton, Jonelle Chapman, and May Schmidt. This was a perfect way to segue from talking about public archaeology to doing public archaeology.

The PEIC has developed short-term and long-term goals, which include creating a public education “tool kit” of ready-made programs and activities for the SHA website; collaborating with other scholarly organizations to promote public outreach; and compiling a public-education-oriented volume in the Historical Archaeology
Reader series. These projects are coming to fruition soon, so stay tuned!

This column will be a place to highlight successful outreach programs, innovative engagement techniques, and other public archaeology concerns. To achieve maximum breadth and depth in our discussion, we need your help. If you want your project, concerns, or ideas to be featured in this column, please contact us: Nicolas L. Laracuente (University of Kentucky), at <nicolas.laracuente@gmail.com>, and Adrianne B. Sams (University of West Florida), at <asams@uwf.edu>.

Reference

Root, Jay

The 2011 APTC/ACUA Combined Student Fora

Alicia Caporaso, Lewis C. Jones, and David M. Markus

For the second consecutive year, the Student Subcommittee of the Academic and Professional Training Committee and the Advisory Council on Underwater Archaeology sponsored fora with panels of advanced graduate students and professionals speaking on issues significant to students. This year, the topics were “Transitioning Between Terrestrial and Underwater Archaeologies” and “Old World, New World, Real World,” the latter a discussion of the realities of starting a career in archaeology.

Over the last decade, archaeological research programs have increasingly combined the investigation of sites and the use of techniques both on land and underwater to study human behavior in the past. For many students, navigating between the methods and theories traditionally applied to terrestrial and submerged archaeologies can be challenging. Students may not know what resources exist or what steps need to be taken to successfully transition between the two, especially when choosing graduate academic programs.

The panel answered the questions of students interested either in making the switch between subdisciplines or in broadening the scope of their skill sets. Undergraduate and early-career graduate students in terrestrial programs who did not have exposure to underwater archaeology in their training, but were greatly interested in studying maritime sites that would incorporate both dry and submerged resources, posed the majority of the questions. Students were primarily concerned with whether additional field and laboratory training was required. The panel was able to address the concerns of those in attendance and provide resources for those students wishing to attend field schools to receive underwater training.

Of concern to several students who had already begun their graduate careers was whether or not it was possible to incorporate underwater survey and excavation into their thesis projects in programs that do not have faculty currently working with submerged resources. While there are certainly challenges in doing so, the panelists were adamant that such projects were possible. It became very clear to both the students and panelists that there is significant interest in the viability of using techniques, training, and methodology acquired in archaeological field schools wherever an archaeologist may find that they are working in the future.

The second forum, “Old World, New World, Real World,” was attended by many of the same students who had participated in the earlier forum. The panel was comprised of archaeologists who had recently begun their professional careers; several were finishing their doctoral degrees. Panelists represented academic, government, and cultural resource management career tracks, and worked both on land and underwater.

As most of the attendees were undergraduates or students early in their graduate careers, there were few questions from the audience. The panelists therefore discussed different issues they had encountered in beginning their careers, including what was expected of them, how their responsibilities had evolved, and how their academic and field training had prepared them for their work. Several panelists had held several types of archaeological jobs while in graduate school, and were able to compare and contrast their experiences.

Additionally, the panelists described how their early careers have affected their personal lives, including how they manage relationships, family, and time away from home. For those still in graduate school, finding a balance between work and school responsibilities was discussed. Overall, the panel left the audience with the understanding that starting a career in archaeology may not always be easy, but it can be very rewarding.

While attendance in the fora did not reach the levels achieved in previous years, this year’s panels were successful in part because those students who did attend had their questions answered and many of their concerns resolved. The APTC and ACUA plan to continue the combined student fora in the future. They encourage all students to suggest topics which they believe are important for their ongoing professional and academic development as members of SHA.

SHA Books Received: Need Reviewers

Contact SHA Reviews Editor Charles Ewen (<EWENC@ecu.edu>) to offer to review a book on this list.

Persistent Memories – Andreassen et al.
Scientific Methods and Cultural Heritage – Artioli
Living in Historic Cairo – Daftary
The Harlow Pottery Industries – Davey and Walker
Der Tod Auf Der Schippe – Franz
Mining Archeology in the American West – Hardesty
A Passion for the Past – Hume
Oxon Hill Manor – Jefferson Patterson Park and Museum and Maryland Historical Trust
The Jeffersons at Shadwell – Kern
Casts and Colonialists – Klingelhofer
Shipwrecked: Tang Treasures and Monsoon Winds – Krahl et al.
Critical Historical Archaeology – Leon
Handbook of Postcolonial Archaeology – Lydon and Rizvi
Pox, Empire, Shackles and Hides – Marcoux
The Archaeology of American Capitalism – Matthews
Topfizien in Bayern (1600-1745) – Mehler
Cosmopolitan Archaeologies – Meskell (Ed)
Behavioral Archaeology: Principles and Practice – Schiffer
Death in the New World – Seeman
New Philadelphia: An Archaeology of Race in the Heartland – Shackel
Beneath the Ivory Tower – Skowronek and Lewis
Archaeologists as Activists – Strotman (Ed)
Ritual, Belief and the Dead in Early Modern Britain and Ireland – Tarlow
Natives, Europeans, and Africans in Colonial Campeche – Tiesler et al. (Eds)
Microrarchaeology – Weiner
Online Searchable Database
for Historical Archaeology

A project to enhance significantly the research accessibility of SHA’s online journal articles has come to fruition after a little over a year’s work. During this time, C. Riley Augé, a doctoral candidate at the University of Montana, read and categorized using 13 criteria every Historical Archaeology article from 1967 to 2008 and input this data into a newly designed searchable database created by Craig McNinch of Spectral Fusion. The 2009 articles are currently being categorized and will be uploaded shortly. The new tool allows researchers to quickly search all articles at multiple levels of focus, from the most general to the most precise.

This new tool lends itself to numerous applications, including the researching of particular topics; the location of comparative studies; the generation of topical course reading lists; the generation of author-specific bibliographies; and the analysis of regional or topical studies. Additionally, the database will allow the editorial board to assess which topical and regional areas have received the least and greatest coverage in Historical Archaeology, information which can be used to elicit submissions on underrepresented topics and regions.

Everyone is encouraged to go to the SHA website and play with this new feature. Those of you with articles in the database are especially encouraged to check them out to see if there are any keyword additions or changes you would like made. Contact C. Riley Augé at <cynthiaarlley.auge@umontana.edu> if you have any questions or requests for changes to the database information. To access the feature, use the following procedure:

1 - Go to the SHA webpage (<http://sha.org>)
2 - Click on Publications Explorer on left menu bar
3 - Search Tab: Gives two options (Basic and Advanced)
4 - Basic Search—enter keyword
4a - Generates a list of articles
4b - Click on Details for the full breakdown of classifications and summary. Classifications include: thematic topic, subjects, continent, country, region, century, historical period, and keywords.
5 - Advanced Search—allows you to choose any of the classifications categories (or any combination of categories) by which to search in order to narrow your search results. Once a list is generated, you can again click on Details to see all the classification information.
6 - Alternatively, you can go to the Browse Tab to pick a particular journal volume and issue.
7 - Click on the publication and then publication details to see the classification information.

An Update on Technical Briefs in Historical Archaeology

Thad M. Van Bueren
Technical Briefs Editor

This peer-reviewed SHA publication series has grown since its inception in 2006. Six new articles were added to the series in 2010, bringing the total number of articles available on the SHA website to 25. The series focuses on technical advances that may be of interest to professionals in the field of historical archaeology. The subject matter is diverse, with articles sometimes contributed by international scholars and experts outside of the discipline. Titles published over the past year (Volume 5) include the following:


As a companion to Adrian Myers’ article, Jack H. Tod’s 1977 book A History of the Electrical Porcelain Industry in the United States will be made available soon on the Resources page of the SHA website as a companion to other useful dating tools already available there. Manuscripts of 3000 to 5000 words covering technical issues in the practice of historical archaeology are encouraged. As with other SHA publications, submissions should be formatted according to the SHA style guide and may be submitted electronically. Peer reviews are carried out by technical experts with the help of an editorial committee presently including Scott Baxter, C. Wayne Smith, and Emily Williams. Contact me at <thadvanbueren@directv.net> or 707.964.7272 if you are interested in submitting a manuscript.

Start planning for future SHA conferences now!

SHA 2012: Baltimore, Maryland
SHA 2013: Leicester, England, UK
SHA 2014: Québec City, Québec, Canada
Call for Papers

2012 SHA Conference on Historical and Underwater Archaeology
Waterfront Marriott, Baltimore, Maryland
January 4–8, 2012

Submission Guidelines

Call for Papers Opens: May 1, 2011
Online Call for Papers Available: May 1, 2011
Final Submission Deadline: July 10, 2011

After 13 years, the SHA conference will once again be held in the vibrant city of Baltimore, Maryland. The city was named in honor of Cecilius Calvert, Lord Baltimore, Maryland’s first Proprietary Governor. The Maryland General Assembly created the Port of Baltimore in 1706 to service the tobacco trade, and Baltimore achieved “Town” status in 1729. It soon became one of the most important North American colonial cities for its role in shipping to and from the Caribbean.

During the 19th century, the city’s population expanded rapidly with the construction of the National Road and the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad. This development made Baltimore a major shipping and manufacturing center. Today, heavy industry has been replaced with many large companies and universities such as Under Armour, Black & Decker, Lockheed Martin, Legg Mason, the University of Maryland, and Johns Hopkins University.

Known as “Charm City,” Baltimore is remarkable for its working-class roots, and its residents are known for their down-to-earth personalities. The city has over 225 neighborhoods, each with its own style. The conference hotel is located within the neighborhood known as Harbor East. This modern, upscale area is located just blocks from the famous Inner Harbor, and has numerous shops and restaurants for every taste and pocketbook.

The Inner Harbor has undergone an urban renaissance, and has been transformed from a downtrodden district of wharves and piers into a vibrant cultural center with waterfront museums, restaurants, and shops. There are plenty of attractions within walking distance of the hotel, including the National Aquarium, Harbor Place, the Baltimore Maritime Museum, and the Reginald F. Lewis Museum of Maryland African American History and Culture.

Let the aroma of basil and garlic lead you to Little Italy, an authentic Italian neighborhood located just a few blocks from the conference hotel. With over 25 family-owned eateries from which to choose, a walk along the quaint streets is a great ending to a hearty meal. The neighborhood of Fells Point is one you won’t want to miss! This National Register Historic District was historically one of America’s most important colonial seaports. Once known for the “three B’s” — boarding houses, brothels, and bars — traces of its roots can be seen in the 18th- and 19th-century homes, storefronts, and cobblestone streets. Here you can enjoy local cuisine at its finest: crab and oysters on the half shell are served at many of the pubs and taverns in this unique neighborhood. The influences of minority communities can be felt in everything, from music and dining to architecture, art, and history. It is a perfect location in which to explore this year’s conference theme.

Be sure to follow SHA 2012 on Facebook at http://facebook.com/SHAConference; on our blog at www.shaconference.wordpress.com; and on Twitter at http://twitter.com/HistArchConf. Here you will learn about great restaurants, places to see, and things to do! You can also catch important updates regarding conference sessions and events.

Conference Theme

By the Dawn’s Early Light: Forging Identity, Securing Freedom, and Overcoming Conflict

The year 2012 marks the bicentennial of the War of 1812, which makes Baltimore the ideal location for this year’s conference. The Battle of Baltimore was one of the most significant turning points in the war. American forces successfully repulsed a sea invasion of the city, and defeated British army forces on land. The bombardment and defense of Baltimore’s Fort McHenry during the battle inspired Francis Scott Key to compose the poem “The Star-Spangled Banner.” This poem, set to the tune of a popular English drinking
song, became the official national anthem of the United States of America in 1931.

The Battle of Baltimore was a seminal and symbolic moment in American history, when the new government was tested along with the nation’s identity. But other battles were being fought and lost, other identities were being defined and redefined, and other conflicts persisted within the state of Maryland. In its early colonial period, Maryland offered religious tolerance to Catholics and Puritans who had been driven out of other colonies, and thus became one of the few places within the English Empire where Catholics held positions of power. The Mason–Dixon Line, drawn during a land dispute between Maryland and Pennsylvania, took on new significance following the initial emancipations of slaves in northern states. Maryland remained with the Union during the Civil War, but many sympathized with the South’s cause and worked for the Confederacy. Other Marylanders, including Frederick Douglass and Harriet Tubman, fought alongside antislavery Quakers and other abolitionists. These kinds of tensions are part and parcel of Maryland history; the state has always been remarkable for its decidedly contentious and contradictory nature. As expressed by historian Robert Brugger in *Maryland: A Middle Temperament*:

Here the tensions and ironies of the American experience have taken concrete form and become vividly, at times painfully, a part of everyday life. Marylanders both championed liberty and relied on slavery. They welcomed opportunity yet clung to tradition. As they came to grips with (or sidestepped) the choices facing them, [Marylanders] cultivated a middle-state ethos – a sensibility founded on compromise given conflict, on toleration given differences among people and their failings, on the pursuit of happiness given the brevity of life and the allurements of Maryland scenery and the Chesapeake Bay.

[T]he elusive character of Maryland may lie in its search for what we can abbreviate as the middle way, between extremes, where the human spirit thrives.

In its own unique ways, Maryland embodies the themes of identity, freedom, and conflict, and we invite research that highlights any of these thematic elements as part of ongoing processes in human societies. Archaeologies of battlefields and conflict are particularly encouraged, but there is substantial flexibility in how a “battlefield” may be defined. The most obvious interpretation is the actual location where violent physical conflict occurs, but there are other spaces and places where the issues of identity and freedom can be engaged by opposing sides. Even physical battlefields can be contested, shifting spaces where interpretations of events, landscape, and meaning are constantly negotiated. We are interested in broad interpretations of our theme that relate to various issues and practices in the past and present. Further details about sessions and symposia will be forthcoming in the final call for papers, but there will be sessions devoted to the War of 1812, and we encourage anyone with research relevant to the topic to submit abstracts for consideration within these sessions.

While all submissions will be considered for the 2012 Conference Program, we encourage symposia organizers to include papers that reflect both terrestrial and underwater aspects of their chosen topics.

### International Participants in SHA 2012

*Conference attendees from outside the US and travel grants for international participants:*

For more information about international participation, contact the International Liaison, Filipe Castro, at <fvcastro@tamu.edu> or the Program Chair, Lisa Kraus, at <SHA2012programchair@gmail.com>.

### Getting to Baltimore

The Baltimore/Washington International Thurgood Marshall Airport (BWI) makes it easy to get to Baltimore by air. The airport is named after Thurgood Marshall, a Baltimore native and the first African American to serve on the United States Supreme Court. BWI is located 10 miles from Baltimore and is served by all major airlines. BWI is easy to navigate and was ranked the best airport for its size by Airports Council International in 2010.

To get to the conference hotel from the airport, we recommend a rental car, airport shuttle, or taxi. BWI has a full-service car rental facility. SuperShuttle is a shared-ride airport van service; its stop is located outside baggage claim, and will take you directly to the hotel. It currently costs $13 one way and reservations should be made in advance, either online or by calling 1.800.BLUE.VAN. The airport also has a taxi stand and the fare to the hotel is about $35 one way.


Baltimore is a convenient drive from many major cities. Located on I-95, it is three hours from Richmond, less than four hours from New York City, and around eight hours from Columbus, OH. E-ZPass is accepted on all Maryland toll roads. Information on parking rates in the hotel vicinity is forthcoming.
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Roundtable Luncheons

If you have a suggestion about a roundtable luncheon topic, or wish to lead a luncheon, please contact Patricia Samford, <psamford@mdp.state.md.us>, with a short description of your topic. A formal abstract is unnecessary.

Online Submission

Individuals responding to the Society for Historical Archaeology’s 2012 Call for Papers are strongly encouraged to use the online abstract submission and conference registration system, which can be accessed through the SHA website (<www.sha.org>). The online system will be available starting May 1, 2011. For those unable to access the SHA website, submissions can be mailed to SHA Headquarters, 9707 Key West Avenue, Suite 100, Rockville, MD 20850. Please be certain that mailed submissions contain all required information as specified in the “What You Need to Submit” Section of this Call for Papers.

Each Session Organizer and Individual Presenter at the SHA 2012 Conference must complete the required forms and submit them by the deadlines indicated. In addition, presenters, organizers, and discussants must register for the 2012 Conference in the fall at the full or student conference rate. Presenters cannot register at the one-day rate. Presenters who fail to register for the 2012 Conference will not be allowed to present their papers.

Symposium Organizers: You will be responsible for submitting all materials relating to your symposium. Please submit your session abstract and Symposium Organizer Submission Form as well as all abstracts for individual papers in the symposium. We ask symposium participants not to submit their own individual abstracts.

The regular abstract submission period is from May 1 to July 10, 2011. Individual contributors, symposium organizers and presenters, and forum organizers are asked to respond to the 2012 Call for Papers online through the SHA website (<www.sha.org>) beginning May 1, 2011.

No abstracts will be accepted after July 10, 2011

Any changes to titles, authors, presenters, or affiliations after July 10, 2011 must be sent directly to the Program Chair, Lisa Kraus, <SHA2012programchair@gmail.com>. Do not send requests for these types of changes to the SHA Business Office.

PLEASE NOTE: By submitting an abstract in response to this Call for Papers, the author(s) consents to having their abstract, name(s),

---
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and affiliation(s) posted on the SHA website or listed in other published formats.

Session Formats

NOTE: THIS SECTION IS DIFFERENT FROM PREVIOUS CONFERENCES: PLEASE READ CAREFULLY.

General Information

The SHA 2012 Planning Committee hopes to encourage flexibility in the types of sessions offered. Sessions can take the form of formal symposia, panel discussions, or electronic sessions, and each session organizer may organize the time within each session as s/he wishes. Sessions may contain any combination of papers, discussants, and/or group discussion. All sessions must, however, be organized into 1.5- or 2-hour blocks, with up to four blocks allowed for each session (note: there is no guarantee that all four blocks will be scheduled on the same day). More than one “discussion” segment is permitted within a block, and a formal discussant is encouraged, but not required. All formal papers will be 15 minutes long.

During the conference period, participants will be allowed to serve as:

Primary Symposium Organizer — one time during the conference.
Primary Author of paper or poster — one time during the conference.
Discussant — one time during the conference.
Panelist in a panel/forum or Moderator — as many times as desired. However, the committee will only attempt to protect each participant from being “double booked” once. Therefore, if you choose to participate in more than one panel, you will need to let us know your primary choice. If this applies to you, please indicate your primary choice in an email to the Program Chair, Lisa Kraus, <SHA2012programchair@gmail.com>.

Secondary Author or Secondary Organizer — as many times as desired. No guarantee can be offered regarding “double booking,” although every effort will be made to avoid this.

Types of Submissions and Submission Requirements

Individual Papers and Poster/Media Displays

Papers are presentations including theoretical, methodological, or data information that synthesize broad regional or topical subjects based upon completed research; focusing on research currently in progress; or discussing the findings of completed small-scale studies.

Using the information and keywords provided, the conference Program Chair will assign individually submitted papers to sessions organized by topic, region, or time period, and will assign a chair to each session.

Please note: If you are presenting a paper as part of a symposium, your submission is not considered an individual contribution. You should submit as a Symposium Presenter: that is, submit Form 4, not Form 2.

For Student presenters (either individual presenters or those participating in larger sessions) are encouraged to submit their papers for the annual Student Paper Prize Competition (for details see <http://www.sha.org/stu_priz.htm>). Entrants must be student members of SHA prior to submission of their papers. There may be a maximum of three authors on the paper; however, all of the authors must be students and members of SHA. Questions regarding the Student Paper Prize Competition should be directed to Jamie Brandon at <jbrando@uark.edu> or 479.879.6229.

Posters/Media Displays are free-standing, mounted exhibits with text and graphics, videotapes, etc. that illustrate ongoing or completed research projects. Bulletin boards will be provided; electronic equipment may be available at an additional charge. Authors are expected to set up their own displays and to be present at their displays during their designated poster sessions.

Forums/Panel Discussions

These are less-structured gatherings of 1.5 or 3 hours, organized around a discussion topic to be addressed by an invited panel and seeking to engage the audience. Forum proposals must identify the moderator and all panelists, the number of which should be appropriate to the time allotted (up to 6 participants for each 1.5-hour block).

Electronic Symposia

An electronic symposium has the same basic structure as a traditional symposium; however, completed papers are posted on the SHA website well before the annual meeting. Individuals who plan to attend the symposium can then read the papers in advance. As a result, there will be no need for a participant to read his/her paper during the actual symposium, though a very brief summary of the paper is recommended (no more than 5 minutes). Instead, the bulk of the symposium will consist of a discussion among the presenters and audience. The conference program will list all of the participants but will not assign specific time blocks for each presenter.

Anyone interested in utilizing the Electronic Symposium format must contact the Program Chair, Lisa Kraus, <SHA2012programchair@gmail.com>, by July 1, 2011, for details and suggestions.

Symposia

These consist of four or more papers organized around a central theme, region, or project.
Symposium Organizers are responsible for ensuring that all presenters in their sessions have submitted their completed forms, abstracts, and payment prior to the close of the Call for Papers. We also ask that all Symposium Organizers submit the session abstracts and Symposium Organizer Submission Forms before individuals participating in their symposia submit their abstracts and forms. Symposium Organizers should also provide the formal title of the symposium to all participants before the latter submit their individual abstracts and forms, so that all forms will contain the correct session title.

Organizers will be the primary point of contact for session participants on such issues as changes to titles and/or abstracts, audiovisual requirements for a session, order of presentation, and cancellations. Organizers must direct any changes in authors, presenters, or affiliations to the Program Chair, Lisa Kraus, <SHA2012programchair@gmail.com>.

Organizers should submit a 150-word abstract of the proposed session along with a list of participants (including a 150-word abstract for each paper proposed), plus 3 keywords.

As noted on Form 3, during any 1.5-hour period, a symposium may include:

- 4 or 6 papers and two 15-minute discussion segments,
- 4 or 6 papers, one discussant, and one discussion segment,
- 6 or 8 papers,
- 5 or 7 papers plus one discussant, or
- an introduction, 4 papers, and one discussant.

If you wish to have a longer session with more participants, you still need to organize your proposal so that each part of your session will fit into 1.5-hour blocks. This may involve recruiting more papers or restricting the number of participants.

**WHAT YOU NEED TO SUBMIT**

The following information applies only to those persons responding to the Call for Papers by mail. (If you are using the SHA online system, all of the required information will be captured at that time. Please do not send hard copies of your materials to SHA if you have applied online.)

**Individual Paper Presentation or Poster/Media Display**

An author who will be presenting the paper/poster must submit:

- Form 1 – General Submittal Form
- Form 2 – Individual Contribution Abstract Submission Form
- Paper abstract on a CD-ROM clearly marked with the author’s name and the title of the presentation. Please provide the abstract in Microsoft Word format.

**Organized Symposium**

The organizer/s must submit:

- Form 1 – General Submittal Form
- Form 3 – Symposium Organizer Submission Form
- Symposium abstract on a CD-ROM clearly marked with the organizer’s name and the title of the symposium. Please provide the abstract in Microsoft Word format.

**Paper within an Organized Symposium**

An author who will be presenting a paper within an organized symposium must submit:

- Form 1 – General Submittal Form
- Form 4 – Symposium Presenter Submission Form
- Paper abstract on a CD-ROM clearly marked with the author’s name and the titles of the presentation and the symposium. Please provide the abstract in Microsoft Word format.

**Organized Forum or Panel**

The organizer/s must submit:

- Form 1 – General Submittal Form
- Form 5 – Forum/Panel Organizer Submission Form
- Forum abstract on a CD-ROM clearly marked with the organizer’s name and the title of the forum. Please provide the abstract in Microsoft Word format.

**ACUA Underwater Archaeology Proceedings 2012**

Individuals presenting underwater archaeology papers are eligible to submit written versions of their papers to be considered for publication in the ACUA Underwater Archaeology Proceedings 2012 (edited by Brian Jordan and Troy Nowak). To be considered for inclusion in the proceedings, presenters must register through the link on the ACUA website by February 1, 2012 (<www.acuaonline.org>). Final papers must be received by the editors no later than March 1, 2012. Submitters are required to follow carefully the formatting and submission guidelines for the proceedings posted on the ACUA website. For
ACUA Archaeological Photo Festival Competition
The ACUA invites SHA members and conference attendees to participate in the ACUA 2012 Archaeological Photo Festival Competition. Photos relating to either underwater or terrestrial archaeology may be submitted. Entries must be received by December 15, 2011. Images will be displayed at the SHA conference in Baltimore and winning entries will be posted to the ACUA website. Please consult the ACUA website for further information and to download an entry form (<www.acuaonline.org>).

ACUA Student Travel Award
Students who are interested in applying for this award should go to <www.acuaonline.org> for more information. Information will be available by May 1, 2011.

Audiovisual Equipment
A digital (LCD) projector used for PowerPoint presentations, a microphone, and a lectern will be provided in each meeting room. The Session Organizer is responsible for coordinating among the presenters in his/her session to ensure that one laptop computer is available to all presenters during the session. The SHA will not provide laptop computers for presenters. If you are chairing a session in which PowerPoint presentations will be used, you must make arrangements for someone in your session to provide the necessary laptop computer. All laptops must be PC format, NOT Macintosh.

PowerPoint presentations must be brought on either a CD-ROM disk or a portable USB flash drive. All PowerPoint presentations should be loaded onto the laptop computer designated by the Session Organizer prior to the beginning of the session to allow for a seamless transition between papers. Presenters are discouraged from using a computer other than the one designated by the Session Organizer to prevent delays arising from disconnecting/reconnecting the digital projector.

Thirty-five mm carousel slide projectors and overhead projectors will NOT be provided by SHA. Anyone wishing to use a slide or overhead projector for his/her presentation should contact Susan Langley by December 1, 2011 at <slangley@mdp.state.md.us> for rental information.

Deadline
The deadline for abstract submission is July 10, 2011. All submissions must be postmarked on or before July 10, 2011. No abstracts will be accepted after July 10, 2011.

Eligibility
Membership in the Society for Historical Archaeology is not required in order to give a presentation at the 2012 Conference on Historical and Underwater Archaeology. It is necessary, however, for all participants and their presentations to conform to the ethical standards upheld by the Society. Participants submitting abstracts must acknowledge their agreement with the SHA Ethics Statement, provided here.

SHA Ethics Statement
Adopted 21 June 2003
Historical archaeologists study, interpret and preserve archaeological sites, artifacts and documents from or related to literate societies over the past 600 years for the benefit of present and future peoples. In conducting archaeology, individuals incur certain obligations to the archaeological record, colleagues, employers and the public. These obligations are integral to professionalism. This document presents ethical principles for the practice of historical archaeology. All members of The Society for Historical Archaeology, and others who actively participate in society-sponsored activities, shall support and follow the ethical principles of the society. All historical archaeologists and those in allied fields are encouraged to adhere to these principles.

Principle 1
Members of the Society for Historical Archaeology have a duty to adhere to professional standards of ethics and practices in their research, teaching, reporting, and interactions with the public.

Principle 2
Members of the Society for Historical Archaeology have a duty to encourage and support the long-term preservation and effective management of archaeological sites and collections, from both terrestrial and underwater contexts, for the benefit of humanity.

Principle 3
Members of the Society for Historical Archaeology have a duty to disseminate research results to scholars in an accessible, honest and timely manner.

Principle 4
Members of the Society for Historical Archaeology have a duty to collect data accurately during investigations so that reliable data sets and site documentation are produced, and to see that these materials are appropriately curated for future generations.
Principle 5
Members of the Society for Historical Archaeology have a duty in their professional activities to respect the dignity and human rights of others.

Principle 6
Items from archaeological contexts shall not be traded, sold, bought or bartered as commercial goods, and it is unethical to take actions for the purpose of establishing the commercial value of objects from archaeological sites or property that may lead to their destruction, dispersal, or exploitation.

Principle 7
Members of the Society for Historical Archaeology encourage education about archaeology, strive to engage citizens in the research process and publicly disseminate the major findings of their research, to the extent compatible with resource protection and legal obligation.

CALLS FOR NOMINATIONS
2012 SHA AWARDS

NOMINATIONS SOUGHT FROM MEMBERS, AUTHORS, AND PUBLISHERS FOR THE 2012 SOCIETY FOR HISTORICAL ARCHAEOLOGY JAMES DEETZ AWARD

The James Deetz Award is named for James Deetz (1930–2000), whose books are classics for professional archaeologists as well as for nonspecialists. Deetz’s accessible and entertaining style of writing gives his books influence beyond the discipline because they are read by a broad audience of nonspecialists. The Deetz Award is intended to recognize books and monographs that are similarly well written and accessible to all potential readers.

Books and monographs bearing a date of publication of 2008, 2009, or 2010 will be eligible for consideration for the award, which will be presented at the 2012 SHA Conference in Baltimore, Maryland.

Submissions must meet the following criteria:

- Historical or postmedieval archaeology must be the major focus of the work;
- The work must be based upon archaeological evidence rather than strictly upon historical evidence;
- The work may deal with European, colonial, or indigenous cultural groups in early modern and modern times, but not solely with prehistory;
- The work may be a monograph or an edited volume of essays on the same theme; and
- The work must be well written and accessible and have appeal both to crossover audiences and to the public (i.e., it must not be aimed specifically at scholarly or specialist audiences).

Deadline: June 1, 2011

Please send the Letter of Nomination and three sample copies for distribution to the committee, or direct questions to:

Deetz Book Award
c/o Teresita Majewski, Chair
SHA Awards Committee
Statistical Research, Inc.
6099 East Speedway Blvd.
Tucson, AZ 85712
Phone: 520.721.4309 (office)
Fax: 520.298.7044
Email: <tmajewski@sricrm.com>

Previous Winners
2009 James Bruseth and Toni Turner, From a Watery Grave: The Discovery and Excavation of La Salle’s Shipwreck, La Belle (Texas A&M University Press, 2005).

ANNOUNCING THE SOCIETY FOR HISTORICAL ARCHAEOLOGY’S 2012 KATHLEEN KIRK GILMORE DISSERTATION AWARD

In January 2011, the SHA Board of Directors voted to rename the SHA Dissertation Prize the Kathleen Kirk Gilmore Dissertation Award to honor Kathleen Kirk Gilmore, who passed away in 2010. She was a pioneer in the field of historical archaeology and a past president of SHA. The 2012 Kathleen Kirk Gilmore Dissertation Award will be awarded to a recent graduate whose dissertation is considered by the Kathleen Kirk Gilmore Dissertation Award Subcommittee to be an outstanding contribution to historical archaeology. The awardee will receive $1,000 at the time the award is presented at the annual meeting. Receipt of the award and the monetary prize are no longer dependent upon publication of the dissertation with the University Press of Florida. A prize winner may take his or her dissertation to any press, including SHA.

If the winner chooses to work with SHA on publication of his or her dissertation, he or
she will
• receive the endorsement of the Society and an associate editor to guide him or her through the publication process;
• receive assistance from SHA in finding the appropriate press and contract arrangements;
• be required to assign copyright of the manuscript and donate any royalties for his or her book to SHA; and
• agree not to submit the dissertation for consideration elsewhere.

If the choice is made not to publish through SHA, the winner is responsible for arranging publication on his or her own.

To be considered for the 2012 prize, which will be awarded at the annual meeting in Baltimore, Maryland, in January 2012, nominees must have defended their dissertations and received a Ph.D. within three years prior to May 30, 2011. One unbound hard copy of the complete dissertation and three copies on CD-ROM or DVD must be provided to James E. Ayres, chair of the Kathleen Kirk Gilmore Dissertation Award Subcommittee, by the date noted below. The dissertation copies will not be returned. The nominator or nominee must provide the chair of the subcommittee with the nominee’s contact information, including current mailing address, email address, and telephone number(s). Nominations must be made by nonstudent SHA members and must consist of a nomination letter that makes a case for the dissertation. Self-nominations will not be accepted. NOMINEES MUST BE MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY FOR HISTORICAL ARCHAEOLOGY.

Deadline for receipt of all materials—nomination letter(s) and copies of dissertations—is Wednesday, June 15, 2011. Materials received after that time will not be eligible for consideration for the 2012 prize. The subcommittee expects to reach a consensus on the winner by the end of October 2011. For more information or to submit nomination materials, contact:

James E. Ayres
1702 East Waverly
Tucson, AZ 85719
Phone: 520.325.4435
Fax: 520.620.1432;
Email: <jammar@post.com>.

Kathleen Kirk Gilmore Dissertation Award Subcommittee: James Ayres (Chair), Charles Ewen, Teresita Majewski, Paul R. Mullins, Mark S. Warner, and LouAnn Wurst

Previous Dissertation Prize Winners:
2001 – Michelle M. Terrell, An Historical Archaeology of the 17th- and 18th-Century Jewish Community of Nevis, British West Indies, published by SHA-UPF in 2005 as The Jewish Community of Early Colonial Nevis: A Historical Archaeological Study
2002 – No prize was awarded
2006 – Elizabeth Kellar, Construction and Expression of Identity: An Archaeological Investigation of the Laborer Villages at Adrian Estate, St. John, USVI
2007 – Elizabeth Jordan, “From Time Immemorial”: Washertwomen, Culture, and Community in Cape Town, South Africa
2010 – Meredith Linn, From Typhus to Tuberculosis and Fractures in Between: A Visceral Historical Archaeology of Irish Immigrant Life in New York City 1845–1870
2011 – Gérard Chouin, Forests of Power and Memory: An Archaeology of Sacred Groves in the Eguabo Polity, Southern Ghana (c. 500–1900 A.D.)

CALL FOR NOMINATIONS
2012 JOHN L. COTTER AWARD

The Society for Historical Archaeology Awards Committee is pleased to announce its call for nominations for the 2012 John L. Cotter Award. Nominators must be SHA members. Established in 1998, this award is named in honor of John Lambert Cotter (1911–1999), a pioneer educator and advocate for the discipline. No more than one award is presented each year for outstanding achievement by an individual at the start of his/her career in historical archaeology. The awardee may either be in training as an undergraduate or graduate student or a professional beginning his or her career. The award is given for a single achievement that is truly outstanding in its respective category, but the nature and variety of categories is open. An achievement may be the production of an individual item (e.g., a first book) or a more general category (e.g., building historical archaeology within a local archaeological society). Examples of such achievements include:
• a first major publication (book, monograph, or report);
• a significant article;
• major political work for historical archaeology;
• an outstanding master’s thesis;
• publicity for the discipline in the mass media;
• a major museum exhibit; or
• significant work for a scholarly organization.

The range and variety of contributions and achievements are fully open, however, and the categories listed above are only obvious examples.

The file will consist of:
• the nomination form and formal statement of nomination;
• an up-to-date curriculum vitae for the nominee;
• a copy or sample of the specific achievement; and
• supporting materials, including summations or different evidence of the achievement and endorsements from secondary nominators.

Note: Secondary nominators are not required but if used they can either add their names to the original nomination statement or they can write separate letters of support. If they write letters, the letters are to be no longer than two double-spaced typed pages. Secondary nominators, unlike the primary nominator, do not have to be members of SHA or even in the field of historical archaeology.

Nominators must fill out the Nomination Form and return it to the chair of the Awards Committee by June 30, 2011, or earlier. The nominator will work with the chair to assemble a nomination file which, in turn, must be completed by September 1, 2011. Submissions must be in digital format.

A hardcopy nomination form is also available on the next page.
NOMINATION FORM

JOHN L. COTTER AWARD IN HISTORICAL ARCHAEOLOGY

NOMINATION
NAME (nominee) ________________________________
FULL ADDRESS ___________________________________
REASON FOR NOMINATION (please attach a typed [double-spaced] statement)

NOMINATOR
NAME ___________________________________________
FULL ADDRESS _____________________________________
TELEPHONE ________________________________________
EMAIL ____________________________________________

Return form via email to: Teresita Majewski, Chair, SHA Awards Committee, Statistical Research, Inc., 6099 East Speedway Blvd., Tucson, AZ 85712 USA; email: <tmajewski@sricrm.com>.

DEATH NOTICE

Dr. Geoff Egan
(Written by Paul Courtney)

Dr. Geoff Egan FSA, vice-president and former president of the Society for Post-Medieval Archaeology, died at home in Harrow, London over Christmas 2010. He had recently joined the British Museum after three decades of working in the Museum of London Archaeology Service (MOLAS). Geoff was an internationally regarded authority on medieval and later metal artifacts, especially textile seals and toys. He attended several SHA conferences and had many friends in North America. Geoff co-edited Old and New Worlds, the proceedings of the 1997 joint SHA/SPMA conference in Williamsburg, Virginia.

Geoff at the SPMA conference in Denmark, 2009. (Photo courtesy of David Cranstone.)
Please send summaries of your recent research to the appropriate geographical coordinator listed below. Photographs and other illustrations are encouraged. Please submit summaries as Word or text-only files. Submit illustrations as separate files (.jpeg preferred, 300 dpi or greater resolution).

AFRICA
  Kenneth G. Kelly, University of South Carolina, <kenneth.kelly@sc.edu>

ASIA
  Edward W. Gonzalez-Tennant, <gonzaleztennant.ed@gmail.com>

AUSTRALASIA AND ANTARCTICA
  Susan Piddock, Flinders University, <spiddock@ozemail.com.au>
  Amanda Crompton, Memorial University of Newfoundland, <ajcrompt@mun.ca>

CANADA-ONTARIO
  Jon K. Jouppien, <jouppien@niagara.com>

CANADA-PRINCIPAL MOUNTAINS AND PLAINS (Atlantic Provinces, British Columbia, Quebec, Prairie Provinces, the Northwest Territories)
  Jennifer Hamilton, Parks Canada, <jheitzmann@pc.gc.ca>

CANADA-QUEBEC
  Stéphane Noël, Université Laval, <stephane.noel.2@ulaval.ca>

CANADA-WEST (Alberta, British Columbia)
  Rod J. Heitzmann, Parks Canada, <rod.heitzmann@pc.gc.ca>

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

CONTINENTAL EUROPE
  Natascha Mehler, University of Vienna, <natascha.mehler@univie.ac.at>

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND
  James Symonds, University of York, <js1072@york.ac.uk>

MEXICO, CENTRAL AND SOUTH AMERICA
  Pedro Paulo Funari, <ppfunari@uol.com.br>

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

UNDERWATER (Worldwide)
  Toni L. Carrell, Ships of Discovery, <tlcarrell@shipsofdiscovey.org>

USA-ALASKA
  Doreen Cooper, R&D Consulting, <dccooper_99840@yahoo.com>

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

USA-GULF STATES (Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Texas)
  Kathleen H. Cande, Arkansas Archeological Survey, <kcande@uark.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 Starbuck, <dstarbuck@frontiernet.net>

USA-NORTHERN PLAINS AND MOUNTAIN STATES (Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming)
  Steven G. Baker, Centuries Research, <sbaker@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 Wooten <kimberly_wooten@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, <sageb@sagebrushconsultants.com>

CURRENT RESEARCH BEGINS ON NEXT PAGE
The Maison Blanche and Moulin de l'Hôpital Général Projects in Québec City (submitted by Serge Rouleau, Archéologue, Division du design, de l'architecture et du patrimoine, Ville de Québec): In 2009, two archaeological projects were initiated in and around the Saint-Roch district area of Québec City.

Projet Maison Blanche

One project centered on a domestic site known as the “Maison Blanche,” built in 1677 by the merchant-entrepreneur Charles Aubert de la Chesnaye. At that time, the property was located on the outskirts of the city, a few meters away from Jean Talon’s brewery (1668–1675) (Figure 1). Because of the white walls of de la Chesnaye’s two-story masonry house, the local population referred to the dwelling as “la Maison Blanche” (Figure 2). That designation was soon extended to the whole property. This structure enlarged de la Chesnaye’s estate in the area, which already included a farm complex and a large warehouse known as “la Potasse,” built in the early 1670s for the production of potash. The house remained the most elaborate and largest dwelling of the growing faubourg Saint-Roch through the 18th century until its destruction by fire in 1830.

The project included manual excavations and monitoring of mechanical excavations around an existing portion of a house (Figure 3). Various archaeological deposits, identified in the north and south yards, were associated with the occupation of the site from 1677 to 1875. The remains of a vaulted cellar, as well as the foundations of the Maison Blanche, were uncovered on the eastern side of the property. The excavations revealed 65% of the original plan of the building. An underground canal presumably connected to a latrine pit was also identified along the north wall. The importance of the site lies in the activities of the original owner Aubert de la Chesnaye, one of the most active merchant-entrepreneurs of the colony. De la Chesnaye also owned a large house used as a warehouse in the Lower Town, on rue du Sault-au-Matelot near the Saint Lawrence River. After passing out the hands of de la Chesnaye, the Maison Blanche was owned by two other prominent merchants, Henry Hiché and William Grant. Although the house escaped destruction during the attacks on Québec in 1759, the site was damaged by the British during the American attack on the city in 1775.

Moulin de l'Hôpital Général de Québec

At the west limit of the Saint-Roch district, another investigation was carried out on the site of a windmill built during the first decades of the 18th century by the Augustine sisters of the Hôpital Général de Québec. The hospital was established in 1692 on the site of the monastery of the Recollet Friars. In 1709, the Augustines decided to build a windmill to support the existing water mill already in operation near their hospital. In 1710, a wooden mill was built on a masonry foundation. In 1730, the mill was completed with masonry. The windmill remained in activity through the...
Continental Europe
Natascha Mehler
<natascha.mehler@univie.ac.at>

Czech Republic
The Grave of Tycho Brahe, Prague, Czech Republic (submitted by Jens Vellev, Aarhus University, Denmark, <jens.vellev@hum.au.dk>): The large Gothic church of Our Lady Before Týn in Prague’s Old Town is the location of the grave of the famous Danish astronomer Tycho Brahe (1546–1601). In 1597, after a falling-out with the young King Christian IV (1577–1648), Brahe travelled from Hven, a small island where he had been living and owned two observatories, to Prague, arriving two years later. Here he was employed by the Holy Roman Emperor Rudolf II (1552–1612) and worked on publishing the results of the observations he had made on Hven.

The emperor provided a house for Brahe near Prague Castle, from where he could quickly reach the emperor if called upon. Unfortunately, this building no longer exists. However, Tycho’s employment with the emperor lasted for a mere two years. On 13 October 1601 he dined with the Baron of Rosenberg, during which it is reported that much drinking took place. This led to a painful swelling of Tycho’s bladder, but the astronomer held back from relieving himself out of courtesy for his guest. When he arrived home later he was no longer able to pass water. Much is written about his obvious physical decline over the following days leading up to his death on 24 October. As Tycho was a Protestant he was buried in the Church of Our Lady Before Týn, the most important church in that part of Prague. His coffin was placed in a crypt near the altar, and the site was marked with a large gravestone of reddish marble, manufactured in a local workshop. It took some time before the grave slab was finished, and the stone shows an incorrect date: instead of 1601, the inscription reads 1603. To hide the mistake, the last two digits—“II” (in Roman numerals)—were covered. His wife died in 1604, and was buried next to her husband.

In 1901, the 300th anniversary of his death, Tycho Brahe’s grave was the subject of an excavation. His grave was opened for the first time, but no survey of the remains was done, and hardly any photographs were taken. One of Tycho’s buildings on the island of Hven (a paper mill) was excavated between 1933 and 1934. Recently, a third archaeological project on the astronomer was undertaken. As part of this project, on 15 November 2010 a team of Danish and Czech archaeologists, medical anthropologists, chemists, and textile and heritage conservators opened the grave of Tycho Brahe. The aim of the project was to investigate the physical remains of the astronomer with the help of CT scanning and DNA analysis, in hopes of learning the cause of his death, his general state of...
health, and the medication he took. The crypt, sealed with masonry, was opened by boring, and a small camera was inserted. The astronomer’s remains were found in a pewter coffin 1.5 m in length, which was then transported to a laboratory in Prague and opened. The skeleton was in quite good condition, with most of the bones and parts of the beard preserved. In addition, Renaissance textiles, some of them decorated extensively, were recovered. After a number of medical investigations were carried out and samples were taken, the body was reinterred on 19 November at the same spot, accompanied by a ceremony. The results of the investigations will be made public during 2011. Please visit the project website for more information: <http://humaniora.au.dk/events/tychobrahe/>.

For information on the 1930s excavation, see:

Vellev, Jens

Germany

The Swedish Wreck Prinsessan Hedvig Sophia near Kiel, Germany (submitted by Martin Segschneider, <Martin.Segschneider@alsh.landsh.de>):

In 2008, a large wooden wreck was located in the shallow water of the Baltic Sea near Kiel, Germany. Investigations carried out by the Archaeological State Service Schleswig-Holstein, Schleswig, revealed not only the lower hull of a wooden ship, but also hundreds of cannon balls and some 12 iron cannons. Artifacts such as birchbark shoe fragments and a sword handle associated with the Swedish Navy from around 1710, as well as dendrochronological dating, indicated that the wreck is the lost man-of-war Hedvig Sophia, named after Princess Hedvig Sophia Augusta of Sweden (1683–1708). After a fierce engagement in April 1715 between 10 Danish and 6 Swedish ships, the weakened Swedish forces scuttled their vessels and jettisoned weapons and ammunition in order to prevent them from falling into Danish hands. This effort was largely unsuccessful, as the Danish Navy managed to raise many cannon and five of the six Swedish ships. Only the flagship Hedvig Sophia remained in situ and after being damaged by storms and shipworms, her location was soon forgotten. The Danish victory altered the balance of power among the Baltic states: the end of the war saw the significant loss of power not only on the part of the count of Holstein-Gottorp, Freidrich IV, to whom Princess Hedvig Sophia was married, but also Sweden.

Underwater work in order to document fully the wreck and its surroundings is now being carried out through a collaboration between Esbjerg University (Denmark), Kiel University (Germany), and the Vasa Museum (Sweden). In 2015, exactly 300 years after the sinking of this historic ship, an exhibition will present the discovery and the research results in the State Museum Gottorf Castle in Schleswig.

Mexico, Central and South America

Pedro Paulo A. Funari<ppfunari@uol.com.br>

Brazil

Archaeological Recovery at the Padre Anchieta Street 1417 Site, Pelotas (RS): The recent accelerated economic growth in Brazil has brought about some challenges with regard to the protection of cultural heritage, particularly because of the increased number of civil construction projects. Pelotas, the largest city in the extreme south of Brazil (near the frontier with Uruguay), has in recent years put in place important legislation for the protection of cultural heritage, in particular architecture. The Inventário do Patrimônio Cultural de Pelotas was completed in the early part of the previous decade. More recently, the Plano Diretor Municipal de Pelotas was introduced; this identifies areas of cultural interest, including areas of archaeological potential, one of which is the entire city center. Regulations to protect the archaeological heritage have not yet been fully enacted, however. The lack of enforcement measures and the focus of the register of buildings being primarily architectural importance mean that demolition prior to construction cannot proceed without archaeological monitoring.

The situation with the structure at number 1417 Padre Anchieta Street illustrates the current state of affairs. The large house on this site was built between 1939 and 1941 but is not listed in the register. It was torn down between April and May of 2010 to make way for a high-rise residential
building. With the authorization of the owner, a rapid—and wholly voluntary, as opposed to mandatory—archaeological recovery was undertaken from 17 to 27 May. However, persistent rain limited the actual fieldwork to four days. The project was carried out by archaeologists and students at the Institute of Human Sciences of the Universidade Federal de Pelotas (UFFEL), under the direction of Dr. Pedro Luís Machado Sanches and Dr. Fábio Vergara Cerqueira. The work is part of a larger research project begun in 2002, the "Archaeological Recovery of the Central Area of Pelotas (RS)," developed under the direction of Dr. Fábio Vergara Cerqueira and with support from the Laboratório de Ensino e Pesquisa em Antropologia e Arqueologia (LEPAARQ/UFFEL).

A surface survey and small-scale core sampling at the site revealed two distinct levels of occupation. The top level featured a brown, sandy, and variegated soil. A second layer, argillaceous, dark, and rich in ceramic fragments, bovine bones, and metal, glass, and architectural objects, was located a few decimeters below street level. The horizontal deposition of some ceramic plates that were more than 60% complete allowed the archaeologists to conclude that the archaeological material from the dark layer was not deposited during the 1940s rebuilding of the house foundations.

Preliminary analysis has yielded an interpretation of this material as a mid-19th-century to early-20th-century domestic deposit. Materials include fragments of refined white-bodied earthenware with blue decoration (shelledged, chinoiserie, and floral transfer printed); fragments with black or purple transfer prints; polychrome and floral transfer printed); fragments with refined white-bodied earthenware with white decoration; some molded motifs; and many unidentified decorations. They were clearly manufactured by many different factories, but are fairly close together in terms of date of production.

Underwater (Worldwide)

Toni Carrell
<tlcarrell@shipsofdiscovery.org>

Hawaii

Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument, NOAA: Maritime heritage archaeologists working with NOAA’s Office of National Marine Sanctuaries have found the nationally significant wreckage of a famous 1800s Nantucket whaler, Two Brothers, on a reef off French Frigate Shoals, nearly six hundred miles northwest of Honolulu, in the remote Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument.

This is the first discovery of a wrecked whaling ship from Nantucket, Massachusetts, the birthplace of America’s whaling industry. All of America’s whalers are now gone, broken up or sunk, except one, the National Historic Landmark Charles W. Morgan at Mystic Seaport Museum in Connecticut.

Two Brothers was captained by George Pollard, Jr., whose previous Nantucket whaling vessel, Essex, was rammed and sunk by a whale in the South Pacific, providing the inspiration for Herman Melville’s famous Moby-Dick. Pollard gained national notoriety after the Essex sinking, when he and a handful of his crew members resorted to cannibalism in order to survive their prolonged ordeal drifting on the open ocean. The story of Pollard, the Essex, and the Two Brothers was reintroduced to American audiences by Nathaniel Philbrick’s New York Times best seller, In the Heart of the Sea (read excerpts here).

Capt. Pollard went to sea again as the Master of Two Brothers and was likely the last person to think “lightning would strike twice,” but it did on the night of 11 February 1823, when Two Brothers hit a shallow reef off French Frigate Shoals. Pollard did not want to abandon ship but his crew pleaded with him and they clung to small boats for survival during a long and harrowing night. The next morning they were rescued by the crew of another Nantucket whaler.

For the past 188 years, the wreckage of Two Brothers has lain on the ocean floor. The vessel was part of a fleet of several hundred whaling ships that helped drive America’s economic and political expansion into the Pacific, transforming the region, including Hawaii, both economically and culturally, and resulting in the near extinction of many whale species. The whaling fleets also contributed to the exploration of the Indian Ocean and the polar regions.

A 2008 NOAA-led expedition to the northwestern Hawaiian Islands to study marine life, remove floating marine debris, and look for cultural resources turned up the initial clues about the resting place of the Two Brothers. Maritime archaeologists first spotted a large anchor, followed by three trypots (cast-iron pots for melting whale blubber to produce oil), another large anchor, hundreds of bricks, and the remains of the ship’s rigging. These artifacts conclusively indicated the wreckage was from a whaler dating to the early 19th century. Subsequent expeditions in 2009 and 2010 resulted in the discovery of more artifacts, including blubber hooks, five whaling harpoon tips, three whaling lances, four cast-iron cooking pots, and ceramics and glass indicating a U.S. origin. This helped confirm the dating of the wreckage. Additional scholarly research provided first-hand accounts from crew members of the Two Brothers, including an approximate location of where the ship grounded, which matched the location of the wreckage.

“Shipwreck sites like this are important in helping tell the stories of the early days of sailing, including whaling and maritime activities both in the Pacific and around the world,” said Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument maritime archaeologist Kelly Gleason, Ph.D., who led the on-site expeditions using the NOAA ship Hi’ialakai.

Massachusetts

Stellwagen Bank National Marine Sanctuary, NOAA: The shipwreck of a mid-20th-century fishing vessel, associated with a distinctive regional fishing technique, has been listed on the United States National Register of Historic Places. The Edna G. shipwreck site lies within NOAA’s Stellwagen Bank National Marine Sanctuary off the coast of Massachusetts. The Edna G. was a 54-foot eastern rig dragger launched in 1956 by the Morehead City Shipbuilding Corporation of Morehead City, North Carolina. From its launch until 1974, the Edna G. fished off the North Carolina and Virginia coasts, and in 1974 new owners moved it to New England. The vessel sank on 30 June 1988 off Gloucester, Massachusetts, as her two-man crew set out its trawl net. A strange noise alerted the crew to water rapidly filling Edna G.’s engine room. The fishermen were able to abandon ship and were picked up by another fishing vessel. The exact cause of the sinking was never determined. “Edna G. was listed on the National Register of Historic Places due to its exceptional importance as a remarkably intact example of 20th century fishing technology,” said Craig MacDonald, superintendent, Stellwagen Bank National Marine Sanctuary. “The shipwreck represents a rapidly disappearing watercraft variety emblematic of the region’s maritime traditions.”

Scientists from NOAA and the University of Connecticut’s Northeast Underwater Research Technology and Education Center (NURTEC) documented the shipwreck site in 2003 with a remotely operated vehicle. The fieldwork recorded the vessel’s features, including its intact wooden hull, wheelhouse, and trawl winch. NOAA and NURTEC scientists have collaboratively located and documented more than three dozen historic shipwrecks in the sanctuary using side scan sonar and...
Stellwagen Bank National Marine Sanctuary provides protection unafforded in other federal waters off Massachusetts. Sanctuary regulations prohibit moving or attempting to move, removing, or injuring any sanctuary historical resource, including artifacts and pieces from shipwrecks. Anyone violating this regulation is subject to civil penalties. Stellwagen Bank National Marine Sanctuary encompasses 638 square nautical miles of ocean, stretching between Cape Ann and Cape Cod offshore of Massachusetts. Renowned for its remarkable productivity, the sanctuary is famous as a whale-watching destination and supports a rich assortment of marine life, including marine mammals, seabirds, fishes, and marine invertebrates. The sanctuary’s location astride historic shipping routes and fishing grounds for Massachusetts’ oldest ports also make it a repository for shipwrecks representing several hundred years of maritime transportation and industry. For more information visit the sanctuary website at <http://stellwagen.noaa.gov>.

Washington, DC

Office of National Marine Sanctuaries (ONMS), NOAA: In honor of Black History Month, ONMS, the National Association of Black Scuba Divers (NABS), and Murrain Associates (an African American firm) are partnering to launch Voyage to Discovery, an initiative to highlight untold stories of African Americans and the sea. It is our hope that these stories will promote interest in marine careers and ocean conservation within the African American community. The partners are working on the website, and are developing a Facebook page in conjunction with this website. Please consider joining Facebook and becoming a fan of this page before it goes “live” with the site to build up support for the Voyage to Discovery. To become a fan, please visit <http://www.facebook.com/pages/Voyage-to-Discovery/106197022788185>.

Yukon Territory, Canada

Institute of Nautical Archaeology (INA): INA conducted three projects in the Yukon Territory during the summer of 2010. The largest project—led by Lindsey Thomas—involves a detailed investigation of the A. J. Goddard, a small 1898 iron-hulled stern-wheeler steamboat hauled in pieces over the coastal ranges and assembled at Lake Bennett in the headwaters of the Yukon River, at the onset of the Klondike Gold Rush. The 15.2 m (50 ft.) vessel foundered in a fall storm on Lake Laberge in 1901, with the loss of three lives. The intact wreck was located in shallow water in the summer of 2008. Initial dives and site maps were made in 2009, after which Ms. Thomas and other INA members organized a multidisciplinary investigation of the ship and its artifacts in June 2010. A Blueview Technologies and Oceangate team used a tripod-mounted multibeam sonar (the BV5000) to create a 3D point cloud of the vessel. A valuable aspect of the unit was the amount of detail it could capture in a low-visibility environment, and the ease with which it could be positioned within the hold to record construction details otherwise inaccessible to divers. Additionally, the A. J. Goddard contained personal effects and tools for the operation of a small, northern steamboat. Over 100 artifacts were located and recorded, and many more lie scattered around the hull. Divers recovered 38 artifacts for conservation and display, including tools, boots, clothing, lanterns and navigation lights, the steam whistle, bottles, and a record player and three records.

Two months later, a second INA team—led by John Pollack and Dr. Robyn Woodward—made a 253 km (152 mi.) wilderness trip down the river between Lake Laberge and Carmacks to the north of the A. J. Goddard site. En route they completed an earlier survey of the hull of the 1908 stern-wheeler steamboat Evelyn at Hootalinqua. A few hours to the north, low river levels had exposed the hull of the 1926 Klondike 1 (Figure 1), 64.1 m (210 ft.) in length. The team capitalized on the situation by conducting a total station survey of the main deck, frames, and longitudinal bulkheads, and inspected half-flooded compartments near the bow and stern. Considerable machinery was found in situ within the hold, including a previously undocumented variant of a rudder-and-tiller system.

The surprise find of the trip was the 1906 wreck of the 1898 Columbian, 44.7 m (147 ft.) in length—the most famous steamboat disaster in the Yukon Territory. INA searches in 2005 and 2008 had turned up some wreckage and narrowed the search area to 1 km (0.6 miles) of river. This general location was confirmed in 2009 with the discovery of an historic river navigation map in the Library of Congress. The 2010 search—this time aided by low water—located the remains of the lower portion of the hull at the head of a side channel. In addition to the lower hull, hog chains, engine beds, and some machinery were observed during an evaluation of the site by snorkel, and an ornate white metal drinking mug was recovered. The Columbian was a large vessel fully loaded with cargo at the time of the disaster, and we expect a substantial number of artifacts to be scattered downstream in the slough. Determination of the precise location of the site was the sole priority for 2010, and a multiday documentation and mapping project will be organized in 2011.

The third and final project of the season involved a six-day hull documentation project at the ships’ graveyard at West Dawson, 530 km (330 mi.) to the north of Whitehorse, where seven large stern-wheelers were abandoned in an old shipyard. A four-person team led by Pollack and Woodward prepared a detailed hull plan, including longitudinal and transverse elevations of a 1908 stern-wheeler steamboat, the 43.3 m (142 ft.) Julia B. Twin locomotive-style boilers, two of three original tillers-and-rudders, and one of two high-pressure engines were in situ. The West Dawson site represents the largest intact collection of late-19th- and early-20th-century stern-wheeler steamboats known.

FIGURE 1. The wreck of the Klondike 1 at low water, June 2010 (Image courtesy of D. Reid.)
in North America.

Substantial support for this season came from PROMARE, Spiegel-TV, Blueview Technologies, Oceangate, Texas A&M University NAP, the Yukon Transportation Museum, the Government of Yukon, the Institute of Nautical Archaeology, and many Canadian and American volunteers.

Mexico

National Institute of Anthropology and History (INAH), Vice-Directorate of Underwater Archaeology (SAS): The course “Research and Management in Underwater and Maritime Archaeology” was offered from 27 September to 8 October 2010 in the port of Campeche, Mexico. It was organized by UNESCO’s Secretariat for the 2001 Convention on the Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage and the National Institute of Anthropology and History (INAH), through its Vice-Directorate of Underwater Archaeology (SAS).

Twenty Latin American and Caribbean countries were invited by UNESCO to participate. Of these, 14 countries sent a total of 27 participants, who ranged in age from their early 20s to their 50s. There were archaeologists, anthropologists, lawyers, curators, cultural managers, and two architects, as well as undergraduate students in archaeology and conservation.

The main part of the course was given by Dr. Dolores Elkin, National Institute of Anthropology in Argentina, and Chris Underwood, Nautical Archaeology Society (UK). Both lead the Underwater Archaeology Program (PROAS) at the National Institute of Anthropology. A portion of the course was based on NAS Guide to Principles and Practice courses, and complemented with particular projects and experiences from other parts of the world, mainly Mexico and Argentina.

Six Mexican professors taught as well, covering topics such as the development and achievements of Mexican underwater archaeology, specific projects, archive consultation and historical archaeology, archaeobiology, conservation of materials coming from submerged sites, legislation, and the 2001 Convention. Archaeologist Tatiana Villegas, Especialista Adjunto de Programa from UNESCO’s Oficina Regional in Cuba, offered a session on the 2001 Convention. Archaeologist Helena Barba and her team from SAS/INAH did an incredible job of handling the logistics for the course, making things easier for all in all respects.

This course was very much the result of a joint effort on the part of many people, and a turning point for all of us who participated in it. It demonstrated the importance of human relationships based on respect and solidarity.

Conferences and Calls for Papers

Call for theme and session organizers: The Inaugural Asian Academy for Heritage Management (AAHM) Asia-Pacific Regional Conference on Underwater Cultural Heritage will take place November 8–12, 2011 in Manila, Philippines. It is being hosted by the National Museum of the Philippines and the University of the Philippines. This is a call for expressions of interest in being involved as theme or session organizers.

Theme and session organizers will form the Scientific Committee for the conference.

Each theme and session will require a minimum of two, and no more than three, organizers. Preference will be given to groups of theme and session organizers who are prepared to work to ensure gender balance, have a blend of experienced and early-career professionals/academics (or graduate students), and at least one member whose first language is not English. The conference organizers can help interested individuals to make contact with suitable organizers. Theme and session organizers will be expected to attend the conference in person and to present an individual, or jointly written, paper in either his or her own or another theme or session.

Theme Organizers

Themes will encompass ‘large-scale’ issues in maritime archaeology and/or underwater cultural heritage management in the Asia-Pacific region, which includes countries around the Indian and Pacific Oceans. Themes should involve at least three sessions and should run for a minimum of a day; it is possible for a theme to run over all three days of the conference itself.

Theme organizers will be required to draft a suitable theme description of 300 to 500 words, which will appear on the conference website. They will be responsible for the overall coordination of their theme within the conference program: they will be involved in the recruitment, evaluation, and selection of sessions and session organizers for their theme. They will also seek funds to bring participants to the conference. Theme organizers will be expected to chair a session within their theme and be prepared to stand in as chair of a session, if required. Finally, theme organizers will be expected to play a significant role in the publication(s) that arise from the conference.

Session organizers

Sessions will address a significant, specific issue in maritime archaeology and/or underwater cultural heritage management. The conference organizers wish to encourage a variety of approaches to sessions, including workshops, panel discussions, demonstrations, and poster sessions, as well as innovative ideas using digital media and communications. Ordinary sessions will consist of one or more parts, each of which will consist of four presentations (each 20 minutes in length plus 20 minutes for questions). A session needs to have a minimum of four presenters but can consist of multiple parts that will run over a day or days.

Session organizers will be required to draft a session description of approximately
USA - Midwest

Lynn Evans
<EvansL8@michigan.gov>

Michigan

Michilimackinac: The 2010 field season saw the continuation of excavations begun in 2007 on House E of the Southeast Rowhouse within the palisade walls of Fort Michilimackinac. House E was constructed during the 1730s expansion of the fort and demolished when the garrison transferred to Mackinac Island in 1781. The only name we can associate with the house is Charles Henri Desjardins de Rupallay de Gonville. De Gonville owned the house by 1749 and at least through 1758. House E is listed as an English trader’s house on the 1765 Magra map. This is somewhat unusual as most houses were inhabited by French traders or rented to British foot soldiers. Comparing the English trader’s assemblage with the previously excavated assemblages associated with French traders is one of the main foci of this project.

The main objective of the season was to define the south wall trench of the house. Late in the season two possible wall features were discovered. The first was an east-west trench with one post and several vertical stones. It is where we expected the south wall to be, based on excavation of the house unit to the east carried out in the 1990s. The second is a north-south trench with five wood posts. Its function is unknown at this time. It connects to the potential south wall at a right angle running to the south (into the yard) rather than to the north (into the house). What is puzzling is that it meets the wall in the middle, not at the property line as the yard fences do.

Most, if not all, of the soil removed in 2010 appears to date to the 1781 demolition of the fort. As with other areas in the southeast corner of the fort, the demolition layer is quite thick here, cutting down to the underlying sterile beach sand in some places. The 1781 demolition layer is typically rich in artifacts, and this season’s deposit was no exception. Notable items recovered include a bone gaming die with dots of vermilion stain, an intact trade silver circle brooch, a lead seal, a “Jesuit” ring with a secular “XXXX” design (very similar to a ring found in 2008), a silver and gilt button, and a religious medallion with Jesus on one side and the Virgin Mary on the other. Other artifacts were unusual for being found in concentrations, including a cluster of hawk bells, a cluster of very small (.10 cal. and under) lead shot, and a group of barrel bands. Also notable was the presence of sherds of a variety of English ceramics including creamware, powdered purple tin-glazed earthenware, and some polychrome salt-glazed stoneware, the last extremely rare at Michilimackinac.

Excavation of this house unit will continue for several more summers. The project was sponsored by Mackinac State Historic Parks and directed by Dr. Lynn Evans, MSHP curator of archaeology, with field supervision by Western Michigan University graduate student Justin Baetsen. Artifact analysis is now underway. The final report will follow completion of the house unit. The artifacts and records are housed at MSHP’s Petersen Center in Mackinaw City.

USA - Northeast

David Starbuck
<dstarbuck@Frontiernet.net>

Maine

Popham Colony (submitted by Jeffrey P. Brain): We returned to Fort St. George after a portion of the site that we had never been able to explore was sold and the new owner invited us to excavate. Our excavations provided further evidence of the reliability of John Hunt and his map. According to Hunt, the smithy was located there, as well as residences and the bakery.

We did indeed find residential features and artifacts at one location and evidence of ironworking exactly where Hunt had placed the smithy. The latter consisted of the remains of bloomeries where the colonists had smelted iron ore. This adds a whole new dimension to the colony, as the motivations, planning, and competence of the colonists are now diversified and substantiated. A blacksmith shop was expected, as one would be essential to the maintenance of a military garrison and the construction of a ship. But that the colonists also came prepared to smelt iron is a revelation. Not only did this task require craftsmen—a smelter and charcoal burners, as well as a smith—but there was the obvious intent to exploit another natural resource and demonstrate self-sufficiency in developing a complete ironworking industry.

Thus we have further evidence of the firm intentions and determination of the colonists as they strove to establish a viable plantation. They intended to stay and exploit all available natural resources in order to become as self-sustaining as practicable.
Recent Work at the Yorba and Slaughter Families Adobe (CA-SBR-2317H), San Bernardino County, California

Recent Work at the Yorba and Slaughter Families Adobe (CA-SBR-2317H), San Bernardino County, California (submitted by Richard Ciolek-Torrello): Located in the southwest corner of San Bernardino County, the Yorba and Slaughter Families Adobe stands astride the old Pomona Rincon Road and just east of what is today California State Highway 71. The adobe is situated on a hilltop on the east slope of the Chino Hills overlooking the Chino Plain and Chino Creek, a tributary of the Santa Ana River. The construction of Prado Dam in the 1940s has resulted in an elevated water table, which today supports extensive riparian woodlands that have replaced much of the historic-period farmland on the Chino Plain.

The adobe, CA-SBR-2317H, California Historical Landmark No. 191, is listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and is an historic site and house museum maintained by the San Bernardino County Museum. The grounds surrounding the adobe and several associated buildings are currently landscaped with lawns, ornamental plants, and sidewalks. Mature eucalyptus and olive trees dominate the landscaping along with introduced cacti and other plants.

The adobe was built between 1852 and 1853 by Raymundo Yorba, grandson of Jose Antonio Yorba, one of the soldiers who escorted Father Junipero Serra during his early travels in California. The adobe served as the headquarters of a large rancho used for sheep and cattle herding. Fenton M. Slaughter bought the property from his friend Yorba in 1869. Slaughter subsequently expanded the rancho into one of the largest and wealthiest in the area. He built vineyards and a winery, expanded the sheep herds, and raised racehorses. Slaughter died in 1897, but the adobe remained in the hands of his descendants until 1960. In 1971, Walter Fryer, husband of Louise Fuqua, the last direct descendant of Fenton Slaughter, sold the property to the San Bernardino County Museum Association. In 1975, the adobe was listed on the NRHP.

Excavations at the adobe were undertaken by Statistical Research, Inc. (SRI), in May and June of 2010 for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District, as a result of planned construction of a protective dike around the perimeter of the landscaped area surrounding the buildings. This dike was necessary because Prado Dam has recently been raised, increasing the likelihood of the property being flooded.

The research was directed by Teresita Majewski and Richard Ciolek-Torrello of SRI. Excavations were restricted to the 20 ft. wide footprint of the dike surrounding the main property. A total area of approximately 26,000 ft.² was mechanically stripped and trenched to locate historic-period features. These excavations resulted in the discovery of approximately 35 features, including concrete foundations, metal and concrete water lines and drains, gravel lenses, rock clusters, and historic-period trash deposits. The majority of these features date to the mid- to late 20th century and relate to the operation of the property as a dairy farm and horse and cattle ranch during this time. Several rock clusters and the trash deposits, however, are much older in age, dating from the mid-19th century to the early 20th and representing occupation of the site by the Yorba and Fenton Slaughter families. In addition, at least three of the rock clusters appear to be prehistoric in age and represent hearths or hearth cleanouts associated with fire-affected rock and small numbers of ground- and flaked-stone tools.

Three historic-period trash deposits yielded over 13,000 artifacts dating to the mid-19th century to the first decades of the 20th. Feature 192 is a deposit consisting largely of burned and highly fragmented bone. The 5,400+ pieces of bone, primarily from sheep and cattle, recovered from this feature represent the majority of the faunal remains recovered during the project. This collection appears to be associated with activities of the Yorba family, who were required by local ordinances to burn butchered bone prior to disposal. Near this feature is a rock cluster, Feature 184, which contained a similar but smaller faunal collection, a small number of local Native American and British ceramics, and three ground-stone tools. This feature may be associated with activities of Native American laborers, who built the adobe and resided in an annex that was demolished in the 19th century. Together, these two features provide a glimpse into early life at the adobe.

Feature 276 is a much larger and more diverse deposit dating to the time of the Fenton Slaughter residence. This deposit was contained in an irregular oval-shaped pit about 2 x 4 ft. in size and 5 ft. deep. Over 11,000 historic-period artifacts, including food, beverage, and medicine bottles, British ceramics, house furnishing and clothing items, tools and hardware, and construction materials, as well as over 700 pieces of bone, were recovered from this feature alone. Included in this assemblage was a large brass bell similar to a set of bells housed in the museum’s collection at the adobe and a complete hinged-frame 1877 Smith & Wesson .38-cal. revolver. Feature 470 is a smaller deposit representing a similar and contemporaneous collection. Together, these two deposits provide a detailed picture of life and consumer habits of the Fenton Slaughter family in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The final
project report will be available later in 2011.

For more information on the adobe see:

Greenwood, R. S., J. M. Foster, and A. Q. Duffield

Stoll, Anne Q.

Gold Dredging the Mississippi and Sailor Bars on the American River, Folsom, California (submitted by Judy D. Tordoff): An intensive cultural resources survey of Mississippi and Sailor bars on the American River near Folsom, California, was conducted in 2009 by AECOM’s (formerly EDAW) Sacramento office. The project was carried out for the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, the Water Forum (a diverse group of stakeholders), and city and county governments, whose purpose is to assure the Sacramento region’s water supply through 2030. The survey was performed in advance of a program to replenish spawning gravel and rearing habitat in the American River. This program supports one of the objectives of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act, which directs the U.S. Department of the Interior to develop and implement a continuing program for the restoration and replenishment, as needed, of salmonid spawning gravel.

Bucket-line dredge tailings are present on both river bars and reflect the earliest dredging in the Folsom region, the state’s second-largest dredge field. Bucket-line dredging made the mining of buried placer gold deposits yielding as little as five cents per cubic yard profitable, and by the end of 1941 U.S. dredges had recovered over 18 million ounces of gold valued at one-half billion (1941) dollars.

The bucket-line dredge combines machinery for digging, sorting, washing, and tailings disposal on a massive floating hull. A dredge consists of the hull, a continuous chain of excavating buckets supported by a structural-steel digging ladder, a revolving screen into which excavated material is dumped, riffled gold-saving tables for sluicing the fines from the screen and from which the gold is recovered, a rubber conveyor belt to stack oversize material behind the dredge, a steel spud at the stern of the plant that holds the dredge in position, and a multidrum winch to control the movements of the dredge. As the material was processed, oversized rock went up the stacker at the rear and was dumped on top of the sluiced sands. The dredge floated in its own pond, which it carried with it as it progressed. Originally steam driven, dredges began to run on electrical power as soon as it was available.

The first successful bucket-line dredge in California commenced operation on the Feather River, near Oroville, in March 1898. The tailings from that operation were removed in the 20th century and evidence of the dredge’s progress is no longer visible. California’s second dredge, the Pacific No. 1 (Figure 1), began work on Mississippi Bar across the American River from Folsom in April 1899. The dredge was owned by a Colorado mining syndicate led by R. G. Hanford and was built by the Risdon Iron Works of San Francisco, California. It was the Folsom district’s only steam-powered dredge. Its hull was 70 ft. long by 30 ft. wide. Pacific No. 1 had buckets which could hold 3/4 cubic feet and a capacity of 35,000 cubic yards per month. In contrast, the largest dredges were over twice the length of Pacific No. 1 and had buckets which held 17 cubic feet.

The early New Zealand-type dredges, of which Pacific No. 1 was one, were relatively small and lightly built. They were held in place by head lines, which worked adequately for loose gravels such as those in the Oroville district. Many of California’s inland deposits, however, were deeper and more compact, requiring design changes to meet those challenges. What became known as the “California dredge” featured a spud—a heavy column-like pole that anchored the dredge in its digging position—as well as larger and stronger buckets and a long belt-type stacker that carried coarse rock behind and away from the dredge. These improvements evolved rapidly. The spud, which worked as a pivot during the digging process, led to the creation of the arc-shaped tailings piles so common across the dredging landscape.
The Joint Courts Complex Archaeological Project: Excavation of an Historic-Period Cemetery and Urban Neighborhood in Downtown Tucson, Arizona (submitted by Michael Heilen): A multiyear data recovery project designed to completely excavate and move an historic-period cemetery and investigate all historic-period and prehistoric archaeological remains within a 4.3-acre parcel of land in downtown Tucson was recently completed. The project was conducted by Statistical Research, Inc., for Pima County in order to permit the construction of a new city/county joint courts facility. The focus of investigations was a cemetery used from the late 1850s or early 1860s until 1881, referred to as the Alameda-Stone cemetery. In addition to the cemetery, the project investigated the remains of a late-19th- and 20th-century urban neighborhood and several prehistoric features dating to the Middle Archaic and Late Archaic periods. The project was one of the largest and most complex undertakings of its kind ever conducted in North America and involved methodological advances not only in the investigation of historic-period cemeteries and urban contexts, but in project planning, administration, repatriation, and reburial.

During the time of the Alameda-Stone cemetery’s operation, Tucson was an increasingly diverse community that had recently become part of the U.S. as a result of the Gadsden Purchase in 1854. The once-remote, multiethnic town on the northern frontier of Mexico now became a rapidly growing and urbanizing town on the southwestern frontier of the U.S. While the cemetery was in use, many individuals were migrating to Tucson from other parts of the U.S., northern Mexico, Canada, Europe, the Caribbean, South America, North Africa, the Middle East, and East Asia. At the same time, many other individuals who lived and died in Tucson had deep roots in the local community. Some individuals buried in the cemetery were descended from Hispanic inhabitants of the original Tucson presidio, founded in 1776 to protect the northern frontier of New Spain from the relentless attacks of Apachean bands. O’odham, Yaqui, and Apache individuals also lived in and around Tucson, as did a small number of African Americans.

The cemetery was used during a time of changing political, economic, and demographic conditions in Tucson and elsewhere in the American Southwest. Settlements such as Tucson were rapidly incorporated into an expanding American economy and political system, a process that involved the commodification of land and other resources, intensified exploitation of natural resources and emerging labor markets, and conflict and contestation among native and immigrating groups. At the same time, approaches to death and burial were undergoing major changes in both the U.S. and Mexico. The cemetery thus represents a period of transition in the composition and life experience of the community, its relationship to other communities, and in burial practice among diverse groups. The cemetery’s diversity, large size, representativeness, and brief period of use during an era of major social change make this an especially important sample with regard to the understanding of a wide variety of issues as well as comparison with other excavated cemeteries.

The Alameda-Stone cemetery consisted of a military and a civilian section. The former was in use from 1862 until 1881; the latter was in use from the late 1850s or early 1860s until it was officially closed by the Village Council in 1875. Analysis of archival data collected in advance of the project for Pima County (O’Mack 2005, 2006) revealed that the Alameda-Stone cemetery was the only one in Tucson while the civilian section was open and suggested that approximately 1,800–2,100 individuals were originally buried in the cemetery. Archival records also suggested that around three-quarters of the burial population represented in the cemetery would have been Hispanic, with the remainder consisting of non-Hispanic European American, Native American, and African American individuals.

A combination of archaeological excavation and historical information revealed that the civilian section of the cemetery was bounded by an adobe wall on its west and north sides and was likely further subdivided into four separate sections. Based on the interpretation of burial characteristics, skeletal demography, and grave-pit distribution, and many other factors, the northern sections of the cemetery appear to be associated with the local and largely Hispanic Catholic community. By contrast, the southern sections, including the military section, appear to be the site of burials of later migrants to Tucson, many of whom were adult males and a larger percentage of whom were non-Hispanic European Americans. The smaller, walled military section was divided into four quadrants with an entrance in the south wall and originally contained the burials of around 100 individuals, including soldiers, commissioned officers, prominent citizens,
and civilians associated with the military. As a consequence of the cultural diversity likely represented in the cemetery and the need to involve stakeholders from a wide variety of potential descendant groups, the project involved a much greater depth of planning, cultural sensitivity, and coordination than is normally required for cemetery excavation projects. To facilitate repatriation and reburying, one aspect of the project involved the assessment of cultural affinity for each individual buried in the civilian section (Heilen et al. 2008). These assessments took into account the complexities of cultural affinity in a bioarchaeological context and were based on the equal interpretation of multiple lines of contextual, biological, and historical evidence, without privileging one form of evidence over another. As such, the cultural affinity assessments represent a unique approach that can serve as a model for future projects involving repatriation to multiple groups.

The availability of more complete records on the burial locations and identities of individuals in the military section enabled an assessment of identity for grave pits excavated in the military section (Heilen et al. 2008). Remarkably, we were able to closely correlate archaeologically excavated grave-pit features with historically mapped grave pits but, due to a lack of surviving biological information, were unable to positively identify any individual in the military section for legal purposes.

Methodological advances in recovery methods and the implementation of cutting-edge technology were another contribution of the project. These were needed to satisfy unique challenges, including the requirement to (1) ensure recovery of all human remains by completely excavating and screening all cultural deposits within the project area; (2) track the location and status of all human remains and burial-associated materials throughout the duration of the project; (3) collect and analyze detailed data on grave-pit and burial features, human remains, and burial-associated artifacts in support of cultural affinity and identity assessments; and (4) meet the contractual obligation of completing the project in just over four years. The advanced methods employed by the project included the use of a large, automated mechanical sifter to screen overburden; the use of digital photogrammetry to document all grave-pit and burial features; the use of three-dimensional laser scanning to document grave-pit and burial features in the field and individual osteological elements in the laboratory; and the use of bar-coded inventory labels and a sophisticated relational database system to track materials and facilitate analysis. To complete the project on time, as many as 70 individuals worked in the field at any one time, and analyses were conducted concurrently with fieldwork at an on-site laboratory.

One of the major pieces of information that was not known prior to excavation was the number of intact burials that would be encountered. Exhumation and other extensive disturbances were known to have occurred during the historic period, but their effects on the integrity of the cemetery were largely unknown. For instance, in 1882, after the civilian section had been closed for several years, the city planned to construct a road through the heart of the cemetery. Notices were issued in local English- and Spanish-language newspapers advising residents that they had 60 days to move friends and family buried in the cemetery to burial plots in a more recently established cemetery on the northern edge of town. Archival information revealed that some burials were exhumed as a result of these notices and that many citizens complained of “indiscriminate digging” in the cemetery, but it was unclear prior to the data recovery project how many burials were actually exhumed. A variety of government and other documents showed that burials in the military section were exhumed under contract with the U.S. government in 1884, but the completeness of these exhumations was not certain.

Numerous other disturbances to the cemetery occurred after the above-mentioned exhumations took place. The land containing the cemetery was surveyed into lots and auctioned by the city in the late 1880s. The newly sold lots were soon graded, a process that destroyed all evidence of the original ground surface, including grave markers and offerings placed on the surface of grave pits. Sediment from the cemetery was also quarried at one time by a local resident for the manufacture of adobe bricks. Despite its former use as a cemetery, residences and other buildings were constructed in the project area, which functioned primarily as a residential neighborhood from the 1890s into the 1920s. Many residents were renters who had recently migrated to Tucson from other parts of the U.S. or from other countries. Despite their recent arrival in Tucson, at least some residents must have been aware of the existence of a cemetery beneath them, as burials would have likely been exposed during most ground-disturbing activities and memory of the cemetery survived among at least some segments of the population.

The project area was transformed into a commercial district by the mid-20th century and continued to be used commercially into the 21st century, resulting in still more disturbances. The largest of these was the construction of the Tucson Newspapers Building basement in the 1940s and 1950s. At the time of construction, newspaper accounts suggested that the order of 150 burials were removed during excavation of the basement, some of which were studied by anthropologists from the University of Arizona. By contrast, estimates based on archaeological evidence obtained during the current project suggest that perhaps several hundred burials were destroyed. The remains of 47 of those individuals had been curated at the Arizona State Museum (ASM) and were analyzed and reburying as part of the current project.

By 2008, after two years of fieldwork, archaeological excavation conducted as part of the data recovery project was able to define the limits of the cemetery and recover all human remains within the project area. A few areas in the southwestern part of the cemetery were not part of the project area and have not been excavated—they contain a small percentage of the total burials. Otherwise, the results of this project represent all that remained of the cemetery. Excavation revealed that within the project area, the vast majority of burials in the civilian section had not been exhumed. Moreover, most grave-pit and burial features were largely intact, despite more than a century of disturbance, and the level of preservation was generally fair to good throughout the cemetery. Prior exhumation of most burials in the military section was corroborated archaeologically and was

FIGURE 2. Historical photograph of the excavation for the expansion of the Tucson Newspapers Building.
shown to have been incomplete. At least several burials were overlooked, and many previously exhumed grave-pit features in the military section still contained personal artifacts, osteological remains, or both, a pattern that has been noted at other military cemeteries of the period. Together, these factors make the project results unusually representative of both the cemetery and the burial population.

Ultimately, the project recovered the complete or partial remains of 1,386 individuals and completely excavated and documented 1,083 grave-pit features and associated burial features. Of the recovered individuals, 1,044 were found in primary contexts within grave-pit features, whereas the remainder were found as partial or fragmentary remains in secondary, disturbed contexts. This number represents more than half of the original burial population.

Archival, mortuary, and osteological analysis conducted for the project revealed a wide variety of patterns that allowed the interpretation of variation in social identity, burial practice, demography, health, and other factors and their relationship to cemetery organization and to broad economic, political, and demographic processes occurring at regional, national, and international scales. Several aspects of the cemetery are unique in comparison to most historic-period cemeteries in the U.S., including its (1) large size, (2) majority Hispanic component, (3) representativeness of the community, and (4) relatively brief period of use. In addition to the significance of the cemetery with regard to the understanding of broad trends and processes, many other contributions were made by the project, including the intensive documentation and cataloging of more than 500 different button types buried with individuals in the cemetery.

Another particularly unique aspect of the project was the approach toward consultation, repatriation, and reburial. The project was not conducted under NAGPRA but in accordance with Arizona state law. This required the complete removal of all burials and burial-associated objects from the project area and their repatriation to cultural groups who would claim cultural affinity. To be successful, an intense level of frequent, frank, and open consultation with a wide variety of potential claimants throughout the project and coordination among planning organizations, descendant groups, research organizations, and cemetery organizations was required. Ultimately, 36 sets of remains were repatriated to the Tohono O’Odham Nation and reburied in the San Xavier District. Five sets of individual remains were repatriated to the Pascua Yaqui Tribe and were reburied on the Pascua Yaqui Reservation. Remains from the military cemetery were repatriated to the Arizona Department of Veterans Services and were reburied in a newly designated section for historic-period burials at the department’s cemetery at Fort Huachuca in Sierra Vista. Reburial of remains from the military section was accompanied by a series of public events, which included participation by numerous local, state, and federal government officials, local history groups, and members of the interested public.

The majority of remains recovered from the cemetery, representing approximately 1,200 individuals, were buried at All Faiths Cemetery, on the east edge of Tucson. Many of these individuals were represented by Los Descendientes del Presidio del Tucson, a group representing the descendants of Hispanic individuals in the cemetery. In addition, the San Carlos Apache Tribe requested that the four individuals identified as Apache be reburied at All Faiths Cemetery. There, burials were placed in the ground in the same relative position they had been in the Alameda-Stone cemetery in a new section for historic-period burials. To complete the reburial process, Pima County constructed a memorial on the reburial site to honor the memory of Tucson’s early residents.

The large postcemetery urban neighborhood component, which included the excavation and analysis of 736 features and more than 50,000 historic-period artifacts, represents another important contribution of the project. Feature types included building foundations, privy pits, basements, refuse pits, cesspits, pet burials, utility trenches, and roadbeds. As a result of the need to recover all human remains from the project area, an unusually complete record of the postcemetery component was developed. The large sample and level of documentation allowed for a wide variety of topics to be investigated for a period of major demographic, political, and economic change. These included ethnicity, racialization, foodways, personal hygiene, economics, consumerism, commercialization, and the social and economic circumstances surrounding the closure and erasure of the Alameda-Stone cemetery.

The Joint Courts Archaeological Project was recently completed with the repatriation and reburial of all remains from the cemetery component, curation of project data and all prehistoric and a sample of postcemetery artifacts at the ASM, and publication of a four-volume series: Deaths Ways and Lifeways in the American Southwest: Tucson’s Historic Alameda-Stone Cemetery and the Transformation of a Remote Outpost into an Urban City. The volumes contained in the series consist of three richly illustrated paper volumes and a volume describing cemetery features that is contained on CD, as it would be more than 2,700 pages if printed out. Volume 1 is a stand-alone volume that presents the project history and historic context and synthesizes all the major findings from the project. Volume 2 is a detailed scientific analysis of the cemetery component and includes chapters on methodology, environmental context, history and archaeology of the cemetery, mortuary studies, and osteological studies on paleodemography, biodistance, morphology, trauma, pathology, dental anthropology, and individual case studies. Volume 3 presents detailed information on the residential and commercial use of the project area after the cemetery was closed and abandoned. The final volume, Volume 4, provides feature descriptions and maps for each grave pit and burial feature excavated in the project area. Digital versions of the volumes can be obtained at a nominal cost from Statistical Research, Inc., or can be downloaded at the Pima County website: <http://www.pima.gov/Jointcourts/finalReport.html>.
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PAST Foundation presents
Slobodna: Amidships

12 positions available

Dates: July 24 thru August 5, 2011

Location: Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary, Key Largo, Florida

Director: Dr. Sheli Smith

Cost: $2000 per student (apply online at <www.pastfoundation.org/current-programs/>)

Contact: fieldschools@pastfoundation.org for college-credit options

The Challenge
Shipwrecks in dynamic environments do not give up information easily. The late-19th-century Polish cotton carrier is spread across Molasses Reef in the Florida Keys. Understanding the systematic pattern of wrecking can provide valuable insight for other sites in similar dynamic situations.

The Solutions
The recently discovered amidships section of the Slobodna wreckage is an excellent opportunity to combine learning, research, and action in underwater archaeology while providing the sanctuary with detailed information that promotes stewardship. Through a combination of lecture and hands-on experience, participants will work with material culture, learn archaeological techniques, and produce a publishable report of the team’s work on the newly found site of Slobodna.

The Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daily Activities</th>
<th>Evening Activities</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sun – July 24</td>
<td>Arrive by 5 p.m.</td>
<td>Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon – July 25</td>
<td>Material Culture</td>
<td>Lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tue – July 26</td>
<td>Material Culture</td>
<td>Lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed – July 27</td>
<td>Material Culture</td>
<td>Lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Underwater Survey</td>
<td>Pennekamp State Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu – July 28</td>
<td>Museum Tour</td>
<td>Database Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri – July 29</td>
<td>Site Orientation</td>
<td>Lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winch Hole/Slobodna Amidships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat – July 30</td>
<td>Slobodna Survey</td>
<td>Lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun – July 31</td>
<td>Slobodna Amidships</td>
<td>DAY OFF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon – August 1</td>
<td>Slobodna Survey</td>
<td>Lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tue – August 2</td>
<td>Slobodna Survey</td>
<td>Lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed – August 3</td>
<td>Slobodna Survey</td>
<td>Final Sprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu – August 4</td>
<td>Final Report</td>
<td>Team Dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri – August 5</td>
<td>Depart</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CALL FOR PAPERS

Society for Post-Medieval Archaeology

The Archaeology of Mercantile Capitalism

Douglas, Isle of Man, UK

September 2–4 2011

Despite the central importance of mercantile capitalism in many interpretations of the 17th–19th-century world, this is the first conference dedicated to the archaeology of this phenomenon. Intimately linked to the development of regional and global consumption networks, the increasing economic and political importance of the middle classes and the rise of urban centers, mercantile capitalism underlies many of the phenomena that interest archaeologists of this period.

The conference is international in scope, and papers are welcome from terrestrial and maritime archaeologists and those in cognate disciplines. This three-day conference will allow those involved in the study of artifacts, buildings, and ships to come together to discuss their archaeological contribution to the study of mercantile capitalism.

The conference will cover themes including:

- Mercantile institutions—guilds, trading companies;
- Maritime communities at sea and on land;
- Artifact distribution patterns and how they identify trading networks;
- Mercantile consumption and display; and
- The mercantile infrastructure—docks, warehouses, ships, and shops.

There will be a conference dinner on Saturday evening. There will be optional guided field and museum visits on the Isle of Man and in Liverpool before and after the conference; details will be posted once confirmed.

The Isle of Man has a long maritime heritage, closely connected to regional trade and exchange from earliest times and with a global contribution from the 17th century onwards. Liverpool, the nearest large port, was one of the major arteries for the distribution of goods on a global scale in the 18th and 19th centuries. The conference venue, and associated optional activity in Liverpool, will allow delegates to appreciate the rich mercantile heritage of the region. Liverpool and the Isle of Man are easily reached from many UK airports, or by ferry from the UK.

Both maritime and terrestrial papers are requested; potential speakers should contact the organizer, Harold Mytum, email <hmytum@liv.ac.uk>, with a title and a short abstract. The first call for papers will close on May 20, 2011. This major conference will lead to a proposal for publication in the Society’s monograph series. For more information and updates see <http://www.liv.ac.uk/manxstudies/SPMA2011/index.htm>.
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